

THE MAJOR-GENERALS IN THE
NORTH: CROMWELLIAN
ADMINISTRATION IN THE
NORTHERN COUNTIES DURING
THE ENGLISH PROTECTORATE
1655 – 1656.

S. A. HARPER

MA (by Research) 2017

The Major-Generals in the North:
Cromwellian administration in the
northern counties during the English
Protectorate 1655 – 1656.

Stephen Allen Harper

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements of the Manchester
Metropolitan University for the Degree of
Master of Arts (by Research).

Department of History, Politics and
Philosophy

Faculty of Arts and Humanities

Manchester Metropolitan University

2017

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Abstract	4.
Introductory Chapter	6.
Chapter 1: Charles Howard	45.
Chapter 2: Robert Lilburne	76.
Chapter 3: Charles Worsley	101.
Conclusion	137.
Bibliography	143.

Abstract

This thesis provides a full academic biography of the three northern major-generals appointed by government in 1655 to implement security and reform in the northern counties during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, namely Charles Howard (responsible for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland); Robert Lilburne (responsible for Durham and Yorkshire); and, Charles Worsley (responsible for Cheshire, Lancashire and Staffordshire). The thesis demonstrates how each of the three individuals operated their own distinctive local agendas, resulting in unique outcomes within the localities for which they were responsible. The thesis shows how these local agendas modified government policy, limiting its impact within the localities. The introductory chapter explains the historical context, highlighting how the major-generals' regime was created in 1655 as a result of concerns of regime change as a consequence of royalist conspiracy and providential fear of God's judgement on the nation. Chapter 1 provides a detailed analysis of the work of Charles Howard, demonstrating how his activities as major-general were shaped by his aristocratic background and power in the northern counties; attributes which made him indispensable to Cromwell in controlling the contentious Scottish border region. Chapter 2 considers Robert Lilburne, demonstrating how his radical Baptist religious beliefs, his links with powerful northern Parliamentarians and his effectiveness as a military figure combined to define his role as major-general in which he

sought to reform communities and punish royalist insurgents. Chapter 3 examines Charles Worsley, showing that his position and standing emanated from Cromwell's patronage and that he could only apply his strongly millenarian religious beliefs in north-west English communities through his role as a state agent. The thesis concludes that each of the three northern major-generals operated their own distinctive local agendas based on their unique backgrounds and the situations in which they operated. The thesis demonstrates how these local agendas had a significant effect in modifying and limiting Cromwellian policy within localities.

Introductory Chapter

This thesis provides the first academic biography of the three northern major-generals who were important figures in the Cromwellian regime. The study sheds light on the operation of the Cromwellian regime in the localities by demonstrating the importance of local power in modifying and changing how government policy was implemented.

In particular, this thesis shows how the local power and influence of the three major-generals responsible for the north of England impacted on the Cromwellian government's objective of achieving settlement after the civil war era, through new security measures and the reformation of manners. In this respect, this study demonstrates how the power and influence of northern major-generals limited the ability of central government to implement its policies in the north of England.

This study is important because it throws new light on the dynamics of the behaviour of the major-generals in implementing government policy, highlighting the significance of the local dimension to their work. Additionally, this work provides the first detailed academic biography of these important figures within the Cromwellian regime, illustrating the differences in their behaviour and characteristics.

On 16th October 1655, writing to his friend and correspondent Henry Cromwell, Major-General of Ireland, John Thurloe proudly declared that: "We have at last settled the major generals all over England, there being in all of

them ten; the greatest creation of honours, his highnes hath made since his accesse to the government.”¹

Thurloe’s words confirm that the Cromwellian regime intended that the major-generals were to be distributed throughout England; providing a clear example of policy delivered locally in the provinces. All of the men chosen by government to serve as major-generals in England, including those responsible for the northern counties had strong connections to the localities in which they served. This raised the possibility that they might have pursued local priorities and interests, rather than solely following the official instructions issued to them. Given the importance that the major-generals represented to the Cromwellian regime at this time, it is relevant to consider whether the individuals appointed to these roles engaged in any kind of local agenda.

Given its distance from Westminster, their proximity to Scotland where, in 1650 Charles Stuart has been proclaimed king, and its wide range of diverse communities, in which political and religious divides existed, England’s northern counties provide an excellent medium through which to examine whether the three major-generals for the northern counties pursued local agendas.

Whilst various historians have studied the regime of the major-generals, the issue of whether they pursued any kind of local agenda at the expense of the policy of government has been largely neglected. Studies such as those by

¹ 'State Papers, 1655: October (2 of 5)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656*, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 79-96. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp79-96> [accessed 29 April 2013].

Anthony Fletcher and Christopher Durston do consider issues within the localities; however neither involves detailed consideration of the impact of the regime within a defined geographical area.² However, as John Morrill has recently argued in relation to the civil war period, localities were each impacted differently due to exposure to distinctive experiences or issues. From this, Morrill highlights the importance of understanding both place and context in any assessment of the history and experience of those involved.³ Accordingly, in the north of England, factors such as the close proximity to the border region, relatively high levels of recusancy and support for the royalist cause are all vital in studying local events within different localities, each with its own unique context and dynamics. These all affected the operation of the northern major-generals during the mid-1650's.

This study concludes that local agendas were not part of a single coordinated approach across the work of all three individuals; but consisted of separate approaches by each major-general containing distinctive local elements, visible from an examination of the differing activities and approaches of the three men who carried out these roles.

Whilst Charles Worsley was appointed major-general in his own right, Charles Howard and Robert Lilburne were both deputies of John Lambert, a major northern Parliamentarian of this period. However, as Lambert could

² Anthony Fletcher, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Localities: the problem of Consent', in *Politics and People In Revolutionary England*, ed. by Colin Jones, Malyn Newitt and Stephen Roberts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 187 – 204. Christopher Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 75 – 96.

³ John Morrill, 'The English Revolution in British and Irish Context', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (ed), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 568 – 572.

not be spared from his role within government his two deputies exercised full powers as major-general, without reference to their nominal superior.

The local agenda of Charles Howard, (deputy) major-general for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland, arose from his seigneurial position in the north of England, which at the time of this study made him the singly most powerful individual with influence over the volatile border region with Scotland. This region with its distinctive history and past had become of increased importance during the interregnum given the Scots recognition of Charles Stuart as their king, and the ensuing conflict with republican England.

Within this context Howard became an indispensable asset to the Cromwellian regime, a position he used to promote and protect his interests and those of his clients and tenants. Additionally, Howard used his position to promote northern causes such as the proposed court at York, similar in function to the disbanded Council in the North; and was a member of Cromwell's Scottish Council, which he used to further his influence in the border region. Howard made important contacts necessary to work effectively with the Cromwellian regime, which he did with some success. Howard's role as major-general was part of this political management process, in which he used his power and influence both locally and with the regime in London to operate in the way he considered to best further his interests.

Howard appreciated the importance of his northern powerbase in sustaining his national standing. Howard's distinctive approach to his role as major-

general was motivated by his desire to protect his local interests. In doing this Howard adopted a selective approach to the implementation of government policy, showing greater preference for promoting security and for collecting the taxes to fund this, than to godly reform. From this we can see Howard favoured supporting local priorities over implementing government policy.

Robert Lilburne (deputy) major-general for Durham and Yorkshire was a leading member of an established family from the Durham area. Lilburne's background as an experienced northern military figure with strong bonds to other influential northerners, such as John Lambert provides strong evidence of his northern identity. As governor of Newcastle, Lilburne worked closely with other leading Baptists to establish the church in Newcastle and the Tyne valley. Later as Commander in Chief in Scotland, Lilburne used the northern Baptists he had helped to found, as part of a strategic intervention designed to reduce the influence of the Scottish Kirk to which he and other Cromwellians were strongly opposed. Lilburne's use of his northern Baptist networks underlines his strong identification with northern England.

Lilburne's local agenda as major-general is visible in his strong dislike of local royalists, who he considered had abused their positions both locally and nationally. Lilburne also took steps to consolidate his power base in Durham and Yorkshire by appointing family members and supporters to positions of influence, and also by his approach to reforming local administration to ensure that this aligned with his own agenda as major-general.

Finally, as major-general Lilburne used his authority both locally and nationally to advance the case for the foundation of Durham college, an institution designed to benefit inhabitants of all northern counties. The college would promote education and learning within the north of England, an area generally less well provided than other parts of the country at this time. Robert Lilburne's support for the college provides a strong demonstration of a northern local agenda in practice. Additionally, it is important to note that the support of initiatives such as this whilst not prohibited by his instructions as major-general was certainly not an expected part of their remit. This further shows how Lilburne adapted and extended his brief as major-general in an attempt to accomplish his agenda.

The local agenda of Charles Worsley, major-general for Cheshire, Lancashire and Staffordshire, was critically dependent on the standing and status he achieved from his role as a state agent, a central part of which was reliant upon Cromwell's patronage. In addition Worsley was sincerely committed to his strongly millenarian and providential religious beliefs, which brought with them the conviction that moral reform was essential within his county association. Added to this conviction was the clear position that whilst godly beliefs existed in certain sections of Lancashire and Cheshire, they were also lacking in large parts of these counties, affecting both the size and urgency of his mission. The only realistic way for Worsley to achieve the implementation of godly reform was however through state agency, using this as a means to increase his standing and influence, through the acquisition of office, and the reform of local administration.

A major part of the currency on which Worsley depended to achieve these objectives was through the Protector's support. However, given Cromwell's other large responsibilities and his ambivalent attitude towards the major-generals, this support was unsustainable, and may have been in decline in the period immediately prior to Worsley's early death in the summer of 1656. Worsley's efforts at improving his own standing and his attempts at placing his supporters in positions of influence were all concerned with enabling him to put his beliefs into practice. Worsley's northern local agenda was therefore one centred on godly reform within his northern counties.

The men appointed as major-generals throughout England were all from military backgrounds.⁴ Additionally, all were selected for their loyalty to the regime.⁵ However, another important aspect of the government's selection of the individuals to undertake these roles was the desire to ensure some pre-existing connection with the areas for which they were responsible.⁶ The families of the majority of those appointed as major-generals had been settled in the localities for which they were responsible since before the civil war era; and the remainder had strong connection with their areas.⁷ This was certainly the case for Charles Howard, Robert Lilburne and Charles Worsley, who were all born and raised in the localities for which they would be responsible as major-generals.⁸ This shows that whilst government wished to

⁴ Evidence concerning the military background of all major-generals is drawn from various references within the history of Cromwell's army undertaken by Sir Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies (Firth and Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army*, 2 Vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940). The military background of the three northern major-generals is described later within this thesis.

⁵ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 38.

⁶ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 39 – 40.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Gordon Goodwin, 'Howard, Charles, first earl of Carlisle (1628–1685)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct

appoint men loyal to the regime as major-general, it was of equal importance that appointees had good local connections. This is particularly important, as whilst having local connections added to the understandings which major-generals had of the areas for which they were responsible, it also brought with it the possibility that they would use their office to pursue their own local interests, meaning that Cromwell's desired outcomes might not be delivered in practice.

Historical Context

During the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell the regime of the major-generals was introduced in an effort to improve security against the threat of royalist insurgency, and to introduce a reformation of manners. The government believed the two were effectively indivisible, in that whilst achieving a godly society required security, the latter could only be accomplished once the nation had achieved godliness.

The major-generals were appointed during a time of uncertainty when the Protectorate regime believed its survival was at stake, due to continued plots and planned risings by royalist supporters, who wished to restore the monarchy, abolished in 1649.⁹ These plots culminated in plans for a rising

2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13886>, accessed 3 Nov 2013]; Barry Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert (bap. 1614, d. 1665)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16655>, accessed 31 Oct 2013]; Christopher Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29980>, accessed 11 Oct 2012].

⁹ Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament 1648 – 1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 172 – 173; Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution 1625 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 450.

against the Cromwellian regime, to take place in March 1655.¹⁰ With responsibility for both regime security and for reforming communities, the major-generals were to be local agents of Cromwell's policy of achieving settlement following the civil war era, which viewed security and godly reform as "indivisible twin goals".¹¹ Both Christopher Durston and Barry Coward argue that several political developments following the establishment of the Protectorate combined to motivate Cromwell to establish the major-generals regime, resulting in a shift towards more interventionist policies.¹² These developments included the perceived threat from royalist conspirators seeking the restoration of Charles Stuart.¹³ In this regard, in March 1655 a number of risings of royalists were planned to take place at several locations within England.¹⁴ The only rising which actually took place occurred in Wiltshire, and was soon suppressed by government forces.¹⁵

In the north of England, royalist insurgents planned to capture the strategically important towns of Chester, Newcastle and York,¹⁶ as well as the border town of Carlisle, constituting a threat to the control of northern England.¹⁷ Partly as a result of poor royalist organisation,¹⁸ and actions by

¹⁰ A. H. Woolrych, *Penruddock's Rising, 1655* (London: published for The Historical Association by G. Philip, 1955), pp. 113 - 121; David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649 - 1660* (London: Archon Books, 1971), pp.127 - 158.

¹¹ Christopher Durston, 'Settling the Hearts and Quieting the Minds of All Good People': The Major-Generals and the Puritan Minorities of Interregnum England', *History*, 85 (2000), pp. 249 - 250; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 34.

¹² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 15, 21, 33; Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 51.

¹³ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England*, pp. 56 - 126; Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict 1603 - 1660* (London: Hodder Headline, 1999), p. 297

¹⁴ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*. pp. 127 - 158;

¹⁵ Woolrych, *Penruddock's Rising*, pp. 122 - 127.

¹⁶ Roger Howell, Jr, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 206 - 208; Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 148 - 149.

¹⁷ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 114, 142 - 143.

¹⁸ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 138 - 141; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 17.

the forewarned authorities,¹⁹ the only occurrence within the north was a gathering of royalist supporters outside York.²⁰ This was a half-hearted effort which very soon dispersed without attempting its original objective of capturing the city.²¹ The planned risings led to repressive measures against former royalists, including making these communities pay for the cost of ensuring the nation's security; visible in measures such as the decimation tax, levied on former royalist supporters to fund the cost of a new local militia.²²

Additionally, developments outside England had a major effect in increasing fears within the Protectorate government regarding their security. These include a massacre of Vaudois Protestants by the Catholic Duke of Savoy in 1655, which shocked the Protectorate regime, reinforcing a millenarian view of the "Antichristian nature of Catholicism."²³

Furthermore, the failure of the 'Western Design', a combined military and naval expedition to capture Hispaniola,²⁴ from Spanish occupation,

¹⁹ 'Volume 95: March 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1881), pp. 61-111. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655/pp61-111> [accessed 14 August 2017]; Philip Aubrey, *Mr Secretary Thurloe: Cromwell's Secretary of State 1652 – 1660* (London: Athlone Press, 1990), pp. 94 – 101; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 17 – 18; Julian Whitehead, *Cavalier and Roundhead Spies Intelligence in the Civil War and Commonwealth* (Barnsley, Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2009), pp. 147 – 161.

²⁰ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 140 – 141; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 17.

²¹ Austin Woolrych, 'Penruddock's Rising 1655', in *The Historical Association Book of the Stuarts*, ed. by K. H. D. Haley (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973), p. 120; Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War – A Historical Companion* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 2000), p. 191; Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, p. 621.

²² J T. Cliffe, 'The Cromwellian Decimation Tax of 1655: the Assessment Lists', in *Camden miscellany. Vol.33, Seventeenth-century political and financial papers*, Royal Historical Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1996), p. 407.

²³ Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, pp. 56 – 57.

²⁴ Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, pp. 631 – 634; James Robertson, 'Re-Writing the English Conquest of Jamaica in the Late Seventeenth Century', *English Historical Review* Vol. 117,

specifically authorised by Cromwell in 1654,²⁵ was viewed as a major blow.²⁶

When news of the failure came through in early 1656, this was seen as a providential judgement on the policies of the regime,²⁷ requiring even greater efforts to remove ungodly behaviour from English communities,²⁸ explaining further why security and reformation were indivisibly linked.

Additionally, a financial crisis within English government in early 1655 forced the consideration of new ways of meeting the cost of national security.²⁹

Central to this issue was the cost of the army,³⁰ one of the major physical and political bulwarks of the regime.³¹ In early 1655, during the First Protectorate Parliament, a parliamentary committee, called for restrictions on financial support provided to government.³² As a result, Cromwell was forced to agree to a reduction in the monthly assessment, a tax on communities to pay for the cost of the army, and to a reduction in the army's establishment.³³ This led the government to consider new ways of meeting the cost of

No. 473 (2002), pp. 813 – 839; Carla Gardina Pestana, 'Imperial Designs: Cromwell's move on Jamaica transformed Britain's early empire' *History Today* Vol 67, Issue 6 (2017), pp. 8 – 11.

²⁵ Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, p. 632.

²⁶ Blair Worden, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan', in *Cromwell and the Interregnum*, ed. by David L. Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 49 – 54.

²⁷ Anthony Fletcher, 'The Religious Motivation of Cromwell's Major-Generals', in *Religious motivation: biographical and sociological problems for the Church historian Studies in Church History*(15), ed. by D. Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), p. 261; J. C. Davis, 'Cromwell's Religion', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (Harlow: Longman, 1990), pp. 186 – 187.

²⁸ Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, p. 69; David L. Smith, 'English Politics in the 1650s', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael Braddick (ed), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 192 – 193.

²⁹ Maurice Ashley, *Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate* (London: Frank Cass, 1962), pp. 96 – 99.

³⁰ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 16.

³¹ Henry Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England 1649 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 88 – 93.

³² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 16.

³³ *Ibid.*

national security, eventually leading to the formation of a new local militia funded by a tax on royalist communities, known as the decimation tax.³⁴

Taken together, these developments heightened fears of regime change within government, which could be brought about if godly practices were not instilled throughout England. Additionally, there was a need to respond to Parliament's concerns and to consider military reforms, in order to maintain national security. In the north of England, where the turbulent border region was an ever present cause of disturbance, and where supporters of the royalist regime in exile presented a potential threat to the regime, these issues were of particular concern.³⁵

The government developed plans which constituted a major radical intervention within localities. These plans highlight the serious concerns within government regarding the degree of opposition to the regime, where setbacks were viewed as God's judgement on the nation, requiring renewed efforts to achieve a more godly society. The measures implemented by government included the creation of the major-generals' regime: central to which was the organisation of England into 12 regional associations, each comprising of a number of counties under the control of a major-general, or deputy, expected to work in accordance with a set of government instructions.³⁶

³⁴ Hirst, *England in Conflict*. pp. 297 – 298; Ronald Hutton, *The British Republic 1649 – 1660*, second edition (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), p. 68.

³⁵ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 39 – 40, 46, 50, 91 – 92, 114, 138 – 139, 148 – 149; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 17, 19.

³⁶ J. B. Kenyon, ed. *The Stuart Constitution – Documents and Commentary 1603 – 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 348 – 350.

Durston argues that the security and reform were indivisible objectives to the Cromwellian government; reflected in the major-generals' role, as whilst achieving a godly society required security, the latter could only be truly realised once godliness had been achieved.³⁷ Accordingly, the instructions required major-generals to put in place a range of security measures including disarming royalists and imposing heavy security bonds on them. Additionally, the instructions required major-generals to "encourage and promote godliness and virtue and discourage and discountenance all profaness and ungodliness", and included detailed provisions such as measures against drunkenness, blaspheming and taking the name of God in vain.³⁸ Major-generals were also to keep a watch on disaffected persons and were to ban a range of activities, including horseracing, and stage plays.³⁹ Major-generals were also expected to control alehouses; and subsequently, further instructions were issued adding responsibility for controlling the activities of ejected clergymen.⁴⁰ To ensure local security, major-generals were to have control of the new militia paid for through the 'decimation tax'. Whilst the main parameters of the tax were determined centrally, major-generals were responsible for local assessment and collection.⁴¹ Additionally, major-generals were supported by a set of local 'Commissioners for Securing the Peace of the Commonwealth', who assisted in the delivery of the policy within each county, and who were expected to work alongside rather than to replace local magistracy.⁴² The new Commissioners were

³⁷ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 34.

³⁸ Kenyon, ed. *The Stuart Constitution*, p. 349.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 154 - 186.

⁴¹ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, p. 74.

⁴² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 59 – 96.

selected by major-generals who appointed their own supporters, reflecting their power and influence within localities.

The major-generals' instructions were developed at high pace during the summer and autumn of 1655 and initially did not include the appointment of deputies. However, it soon became apparent to government that two of those appointed as major-generals for: Cumberland, Durham, Northumberland, Westmorland and Yorkshire; and for: Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Isle of Ely, Norfolk, Oxfordshire and Suffolk, namely John Lambert and Charles Fleetwood respectively, could not be released from their duties as members of the Council of State. Accordingly, in October 1655 this decision was revisited and Charles Howard and Robert Lilburne were appointed Lambert's deputies in the north of England; being made responsible for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland, and for Durham and Yorkshire respectively. Whilst being appointed as Lambert's deputies, both Howard and Lilburne operated with full executive authority under the Council of State, and as such were not required to refer matters to Lambert for approval. There is no evidence that Lambert intervened in the work of his two deputies, meaning that each exercised full authority within the counties for which they were responsible.⁴³

The short duration of the major-generals regime is an important factor when undertaking an assessment of their impact. In this respect, whilst in overall terms, the regime lasted for no more than eighteen months, because of Cromwell's decision to recall them from their associations for discussions with government, in practice they were in operation for less than twelve

⁴³ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 27, 29.

months. However, despite their short duration, the major-generals played an important part in shaping the operation of the Cromwellian government in the localities. Following their appointment in late summer of 1655 most major-generals only became active in their associations in late autumn/early winter of the same year.⁴⁴ However, in May 1656, only six months after their arrival in their associations, Cromwell considered a worsening of the government's financial situation required the recall of all major-generals to London to participate in discussions regarding how to respond.⁴⁵ As a result Cromwell decided to call another Parliament with the objective of seeking additional funding for the government.⁴⁶ Elections to the Second Protectorate Parliament took place in late summer of 1656 and the outcome produced a Parliament largely unsympathetic to the regime.⁴⁷ Political developments during this Parliament included an unsuccessful attempt to make the decimation tax a permanent feature through the militia bill, which included provisions for the continuation of the major-generals. During early January 1657 Cromwell's increasing ambivalent attitude to the major-generals was added to by the activities of a coterie who sought the Protector's break with the army and his assumption of the crown. These developments led to the demise of the militia bill and with it the major-generals' regime.⁴⁸ This highlights the short duration of the major-generals work in the localities, further underlining the importance of gaining a wider understanding of the

⁴⁴ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 5.

⁴⁵ Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, pp. 68 – 70, 133 – 136, 219 – 220; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 187 – 189.

⁴⁶ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 187 – 205; Patrick Little and David L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 59 – 79,

⁴⁷ Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, pp. 73 – 80; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 187 – 205; Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, pp. 59 – 79,

⁴⁸ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 206 – 207, 215 – 220.

individuals involved and their context in order to understand their role as major-general.

Historiography of the Major-Generals

This study throws new light on the dynamics of the behaviour of the major-generals in implementing government policy, highlighting the central importance of the local dimension to their work. It challenges traditional interpretations of the major-generals' regime by David Hume, Henry Hallam and Leopold von Ranke by arguing that rather than being instruments of tyranny they in fact limited the impact of government policy on communities. Additionally, this work provides the first detailed academic biography of these important figures within the Cromwellian regime, showing them in a new light and illustrating the differences in their behaviour and characteristics. This is in contrast to earlier works, which ignore the importance of local power and influence of the three northern major-generals to modify government policy to accord with their own objectives within localities.

Most early historians of the major generals for example Hume and Hallam, relied heavily on the work of contemporaneous commentators who were critical of the regime, resulting in an overly negative view of the operation of the major-generals. The surviving accounts of most contemporaneous commentators viewed their regime as despotic and operated by individuals of low social status. For example, writing in 1656, the lawyer, pamphleteer and general opponent of the regime, William Prynne regarded the major-

generals as being guilty of apostasy, impiety and tyranny.⁴⁹ Writing after the Restoration, the royalist grandee, Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon concluded that they had too much power; pejoratively comparing them to Turkish “bassas with their bands of janizaries”.⁵⁰ In a similar vein, in 1675, Cromwell’s arch-critic James Heath,⁵¹ complained of their “arbitrary exercise of power.”⁵² The diarist John Evelyn described them as “men of high flight and above Ordinances.”⁵³ The humble and modest backgrounds of several major-generals is referred to negatively within the contemporaneous diary of MP Thomas Burton,⁵⁴ and following this line, the post Restoration political writer Roger Coke described them as “an obscure company of mean fellows”.⁵⁵ Whilst these criticisms might be expected from opponents of the Protectorate era, or from those who supported the Restoration, they provide a useful indication of how, using sources such as these, early historians such as Hume and Hallam came to view the major-generals’ system as a despotic tyrannical regime operated by social upstarts.⁵⁶ This helps us understand

⁴⁹ W. Prynne, *A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Human Rights, Liberties, Properties of all Englishmen* (London, 1656), p. 34.

⁵⁰ Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England*, W. Dunn. Macray., ed, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888).vol. 4, pp. 16 – 17.

⁵¹ Wendy A. Maier, ‘Heath, James (1629?–1664)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12836, accessed 19 August 2015].

⁵² James Heath, *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine War in the three Kingdoms of England Scotland and Ireland* (second edition, London:1675), p. 378

⁵³ Guy.de la Bedoyere, ed. *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1995), p. 105.

⁵⁴ ‘The Diary of Thomas Burton: 8 January 1656-7’, in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653 - April 1657*, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. 322-334. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol1/pp322-334> [accessed 19 February 2014].

⁵⁵ R. Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the last Four Reigns and Interregnum* (2 vols, London 1694), vol. 2, p. 52.

⁵⁶ David Hume, *History of Great Britain from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688*, 4 Vols (Montrose: 1766), Vol 4, pp. 511 – 512; H. Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England* (London, 1827), pp. 465 – 466; F. Guizot, *The History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, trans. A. R. Scoble, 2 vols (London: 1854), vol. 2, p. 153.

why the major-generals' regime has generally been viewed negatively by early historians.

This negative image can be observed within the comments of the Enlightenment historian David Hume who, writing in 1766, concluded that they used their powers to act arbitrarily, in what he believed constituted despotic government, akin to the "maxims of eastern tyranny".⁵⁷ Other early historians took a similar view, for example the Whig historian Henry Hallam in his work of 1827 labelled their rule as "despotism", and in 1854, the French historian François Guizot, viewed their regime as an example of what he described as the "viciousness of government".⁵⁸ Robert Vaughan (1840) concluded the major-generals were instruments of Cromwell's tyranny, suggesting they operated despotically, leading to "many acts of severe oppression".⁵⁹

This was a theme pursued further by Leopold von Ranke, who in his work of 1875, grossly overstated the military presence during the major-generals regime by suggesting that soldiers were posted every two miles throughout England.⁶⁰ Taking a slightly different approach, the early twentieth century historian George Macaulay Trevelyan (1926) viewed the major-generals' regime as Cromwell's military instrument for ruling England whilst avoiding an accommodation with his Protectorate Parliaments.⁶¹ While historians

⁵⁷ Hume, *History of Great Britain* Vol 4, pp. 511 – 512.

⁵⁸ Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England*, pp. 465 – 466; Guizot, *The History of Oliver Cromwell*, vol. 2, p. 153.

⁵⁹ Robert Vaughan, *The history of England under the House of Stuart, including the commonwealth 1603-88* (London: Baldwin and Craddock, 1840), pp. 522 - 523.

⁶⁰ Leopold von Ranke, *The History of England Principally in the Seventeen Century*, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875), vol. 3, pp. 144 – 145.

⁶¹ George Macaulay Trevelyan, *History of England* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1926), p. 429.

portrayed an image of the major-generals' regime as an extra-legal, despotic affair, contrary to what they regarded as the principles of civil society, the major-generals were never military tyrants, and as this study demonstrates, Cromwell's military power was in fact limited by local factors and religious beliefs, which modified the impact of central policy within localities.

A number of nineteenth and early twentieth-century historians took a different view of the major-generals' regime. For example, in 1828, commenting upon their methods of operation and standards of behaviour, the radical historian William Godwin suggested major-generals displayed diligence, zeal and equity in discharging their duties.⁶² In 1888, Cromwell's admirer and editor of his letters and speeches, Thomas Carlyle, argued that their appointment was a required aspect of the application of Puritan beliefs and viewed major-generals as "men of real wisdom."⁶³

In the first detailed scholarly assessment of the major-generals published in 1895, David Watson Rannie concluded that whilst their rule was disliked, those appointed to these roles were nonetheless "high-minded conscientious men".⁶⁴ In 1903, Samuel Rawson Gardiner whilst criticising particular aspects of their work, concluded that if the major-generals had been able to

⁶² William Godwin, *The History of the Commonwealth of England*, 4 Vols, (London: 1828), vol. 4, pp. 229, 239, 241 – 242.

⁶³ R. C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution*, 3rd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp. 85 – 86; Thomas Carlyle, *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 3rd edn, 5 Vols, (London: Chapman and Hall 1888), vol. 4, pp. 114 – 115.

⁶⁴ D. W. Rannie, "Cromwell's Major Generals", *English Historical Review*, 10 (1895), pp. 500 – 502.

concentrate on policing and security issues rather than moral reform they might have faced less opposition.⁶⁵

Influenced by the events of the two World Wars, some twentieth-century historians including Wilbur Abbott and John Buchan commented negatively on the nature of the major-generals' operation comparing them to Nazi or Soviet regimes.⁶⁶ Whilst these studies provide little detailed analysis of the major-generals' regime, generally their main contribution has been to help stimulate far wider debate regarding their role and contribution. However, it is clear that works by Abbott and Buchan have also been heavily influenced by events during the time they were writing, limiting their ability to produce generalised conclusions.

Recent historians have explored these themes in more detail and have also examined other dimensions of the major-generals' rule. However, these studies do not consider the role of the major-generals as local actors or especially whether they operated any identifiable local agenda. Following on from their earlier counterparts, Godfrey Davies, Lois G. Schwoerer and Christopher Hill examined the military nature of the major-generals' regime; arguing that this had created a lasting legacy in England of distaste for the involvement of the military in politics and a desire to ensure separation of these activities.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of the commonwealth and Protectorate*, 4 Vols, London: Longmans Green and Co, 1903), Vol I, pp. 29 – 30.

⁶⁶ John Buchan, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934), p. 459; Wilbur C. Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 4 Vols (Cambridge [Mass.]: Harvard University Press 1945 Vol. 4, pp. 62, 373.

⁶⁷ Godfrey Davies, *The Early Stuarts 1603 – 1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 178; Lois. G. Schwoerer *"No Standing Armies" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth Century England* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. 71; *Christopher*

Austin Woolrych argues that the major-generals represented Cromwell's ad hoc response to a security crisis, countering suggestions that their tenure represented military rule.⁶⁸ Additionally, work by Henry Reece concludes that the major-generals' rule did not result in any significant increase in military presence in England at this time.⁶⁹ Furthermore, G. E. Aylmer argues that rather than acting like satraps or tyrants they operated within the legal framework.⁷⁰

Accordingly, whilst historians have different views about the nature of the regime and its legacy, recent evidence questions the view that this was in essence part of a military dictatorship which ruled with little regard to the established legal framework. This clearly demonstrates the limited value of early studies of the major-generals' regime, which presented an overly negative view of their regime. Additionally however, whilst countering these negative views recent studies largely ignore the contribution of major-generals as local actors.

A number of historians including Paul Christianson and Clive Holmes have argued that the major-generals represented a centralisation of local governance. However, whilst central direction existed, the majority of activities were locally delivered by men from local communities, with support from their established networks and connections. Additionally, many local

Hill, *God's Englishman – Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 168 – 169.

⁶⁸ Austin Woolrych, "The Cromwellian Protectorate – A Military Dictatorship?" *History* 75 (1990), pp. 219 – 224.

⁶⁹ H. M. Reece 'The Military Presence in England 1649 – 1660' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1981), pp. 201 – 211; Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England*, pp. 138 – 169.

⁷⁰ G. E. Aylmer, *The State's Servants: The Civil Service of the English Republic 1649 – 1660* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973). pp. 48 – 49.

institutions such as municipal corporations were relatively impervious to change imposed externally. Christianson and Holmes argue that the major-generals' regime reflected a centralisation of power involving an emasculatation of the tradition and authority of the established system of local government, and arising from this a reduction in the influence of the local gentry, who at this time were responsible for leading this.⁷¹

Whilst accepting the centralising nature of some features of the major-generals regime, such as the top-down imposition of the reformation of manners, David Underdown argues that the role of the gentry increased in other ways, for example in relation to the system for appointing local clergy, in which local gentry had a key role.⁷² Furthermore, studies by: Anthony Fletcher, Lynn Beats, Ann Hughes, Andrew Coleby and Barry Coward all show that long established gentry families returned to the Justices' bench and that whilst in some counties there had been greater involvement by men of lower status, the overall position was one of significant continuity in terms of who ran the localities during the major-generals' era.⁷³ In his Staffordshire case study, John Sutton shows that the majority of the Commissioners for Preserving the Peace of the Commonwealth, appointed to support Charles

⁷¹ Paul Christianson, 'The Causes of the English Revolution: a Reappraisal', *Journal of British Studies*, 15 (1976), p. 74; Clive Holmes, *Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln: History of Lincolnshire Committee, Society for Lincolnshire History & Archaeology, 1980), p. 214

⁷² Underdown, 'Settlement in the Counties', pp. 173 – 174.

⁷³ Anthony Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600 – 1660* (London: Longmans, 1975), pp. 311 – 316; Lynn Beats, 'Politics and government in Derbyshire, 1640-1660' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield, 1978), p. 299; Ann Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-60* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 273; Andrew Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649 – 1689* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 17 – 18, 20; Barry Coward, 'The Experience of the Gentry 1640 – 1660', in *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution*, ed. by R. C. Richardson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), pp. 214 – 217.

Worsley as major-general came from the local gentry;⁷⁴ countering claims by Ronald Hutton that these commissioners were all social upstarts.⁷⁵

In his detailed study of the major-generals, Durston considers that whilst there is some truth in the assertion that many major-generals themselves came from modest backgrounds, the position has been overstated, as a number came from either the pre-war county elites, or from other gentry families with local standing. Also of relevance in countering the argument that major-generals local unpopularity stemmed from their position as outsiders within their associations, is the fact that a specific design feature of the regime was the appointment of men with local connections as major-generals.⁷⁶ As Sutton and Durston clearly show, whilst an individual major-general such as Worsley could not expect to be strongly connected within all three counties for which he was responsible, he had local commissioners, well known in their communities to assist him.⁷⁷

Hutton further argues that the Cromwellian government failed to respond to the major-generals, neglecting them, and leaving them very much to carry on without detailed guidance or instruction.⁷⁸ However, it is difficult to accept that these arguments align closely with those such as Christianson and

⁷⁴ John Sutton, 'Cromwell's commissioners for preserving the peace of the Commonwealth: a Staffordshire case study', in *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution*, ed. by Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 178.

⁷⁵ Hutton, *The British Republic*, p. 83.

⁷⁶ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 28, 41.

⁷⁷ Sutton, 'Cromwell's commissioners', pp. 153 – 155; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 60, 62 – 64, 69 – 70;

⁷⁸ Hutton, *The British Republic*, pp. 69 – 70.

Holmes who suggest that Cromwell's government actively interfered in local administration.⁷⁹

A further important area of local administration was municipal government, within towns and cities, and operating under charters of incorporation, with administrative authority within their boundaries.⁸⁰ Here, work by William Schilling, David Scott and Philip Styles confirms that central government did little to interfere with or to enforce change on these communities.⁸¹ Paul Halliday highlights that where changes did occur these were most often internally driven at the behest of members of these municipal bodies.⁸² This is reinforced by Ann Hughes' findings (relating to Coventry) that whilst government might have supported changes of a godly nature, these mostly emanated from local sources and not central diktat.⁸³

Fletcher considers that the major-generals did not achieve any appreciable degree of centralisation, and their regime illustrates the limitations of government at this time.⁸⁴ Additionally, Christopher Durston and Stephen Roberts conclude that any centralising effects of the major-generals' regime

⁷⁹ Christianson, 'The Causes of the English Revolution' p. 74; Holmes, *Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire*, p. 214

⁸⁰ Ian Roy, 'The English Republic, 1649 – 1660: the view from the Town Hall', in *Republiken und Republikanismus im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Helmut G. Koenigsberger and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner, (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1988), pp. 214 – 215.

⁸¹ William A. H. Schilling, *The Central Government and the Municipal Corporations in England 1642 – 1663* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Vanderbilt, 1970), pp. 105 – 107; David Scott, 'Politics and Government in York 1642 – 1660', in *Town and Countryside*, Richardson, ed, pp. 58 – 60, 64; Philip Styles, *The City of Worcester during the Civil Wars, 1640 – 1660*, in *The English Civil Wars Local Aspects*, ed. by R. C. Richardson (Stroud: Sutton, 1997), pp. 222 – 225.

⁸² Paul D. Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns* (Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 1998), pp. 65 – 67.

⁸³ Ann Hughes, 'Coventry and the English Revolution', in *Town and Countryside*, Richardson, ed. pp. 80 – 81, 91 – 92; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 87 – 91.

⁸⁴ Anthony Fletcher 'Oliver Cromwell and the Localities', in *People and Politics in Revolutionary England*, ed. by Colin Jones, Malyn Newitt and Stephen Roberts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 203.

were at best transient and ineffective and that there was no sustained shift from local to central government resulting from this regime.⁸⁵

Accordingly it is clear that the argument that the major-generals represented a centralisation of local governance is both overly simplistic and incorrect. Whilst central direction existed, the majority of activities were locally delivered by men from within local communities, with support from their established networks and connections. Additionally, many local institutions such as municipal corporations were relatively impervious to external change, with most reform being driven internally by activists rather than by central intervention.

Finally, however whilst a number of studies, such as those by Fletcher clearly question the notion that the major-generals' regime resulted in a greater centralisation they do little to examine whether major-generals, as local actors, pursued any kind of local agendas of their own. Accordingly, in the debate about the balance of power between centre and locality, this aspect of the major-generals' role and operation has been neglected. However, it is clear that understanding this aspect of the major-generals' system is crucial to achieving a balanced appraisal of their regime. Furthermore, an analysis of whether the major-generals were state agents, local actors, or some combination of the two can add considerably to our understanding of whether key individuals acted and pursued issues as part of a wider agenda.

⁸⁵ Stephen Roberts, 'Local Government Reform in England and Wales during the Interregnum', in *'Into Another Mould': Aspects of the Interregnum*, ed. by Ivan Roots (Exeter, University of Exeter Press, new edition, 1998), p.67; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 92; Stephen K. Roberts, 'State and Society in the English Revolution', in *The Oxford Handbook*, ed. by Braddick, pp. 306 – 307.

One point on which historians agree is that the major-generals' scheme was in overall terms a failure.⁸⁶ Whilst the security aspects of the operation were more effective, the reformation of manners elements of their role was generally seen as unsuccessful.⁸⁷ A number of explanations have been put forward to explain why the regime did not succeed. These include the short duration of its operation;⁸⁸ and the fact that godly reform never appealed to anything more than a minority of people within localities.⁸⁹ Additionally, the unpopularity of some aspects of the scheme, such as the decimation tax are cited as factors.⁹⁰ Hirst, Roberts and Durston all conclude that the scheme was overly ambitious, reflected in the fact that to implement this required sustained commitment and resourcing, and a need to operate at the limits of government at this time.⁹¹ Finally, as discussed earlier, Cromwell's enthusiasm for the scheme declined, and without his support the regime was doomed to fail.⁹²

The impact of local factors continues to have relevance in understanding the effectiveness of central policy implementation within localities within this era.

⁸⁶ Aylmer, *The State's Servants*, pp. 313 – 314; Woolrych, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate', p. 225; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 228 – 232; Smith 'English Politics in the 1650s', pp. 192 – 193.

⁸⁷ Underdown, *Royal Conspiracy in England*, pp. 167 – 170; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 127 – 179, 228, 231.

⁸⁸ Aylmer, *The State's Servants*, p. 314; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 232; Smith 'English Politics in the 1650s', pp. 192 – 193.

⁸⁹ Durston, 'Settling the Hearts and Quieting the Minds of All Good People', pp. 263 – 267; Christopher Durston, 'Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution 1645 – 1660' in *The Culture of English Puritanism 1560 – 1700*, ed. by Christopher Durston and Jaqueline Eales, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 221 – 222, 229 – 233; Bernard Capp, *England's culture wars: Puritan reformation and its enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012), pp. 160 – 162.

⁹⁰ Ivan Roots, 'Swordsmen and Decimators – Cromwell's Major-Generals, in *The English Civil War and After 1642 – 1658*, ed. by R. H. Parry (London: Macmillan, 1970), pp. 78 – 92; Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, pp. 59 – 79.

⁹¹ Roberts, 'Local Government Reform in England and Wales', pp. 65 – 67; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 119; Hirst, *England in Conflict*, pp. 297 – 298; Roberts, 'State and Society in the English Revolution', pp. 306 – 307.

⁹² Woolrych, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate', p. 222; Hirst, *England in Conflict*, pp. 297, 299 – 300; Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, pp. 86 – 873.

This thesis adds further weight to the importance of these approaches by demonstrating the pivotal role of which local factors play in relation to the outcomes of central government policy at this time.

Many studies of the civil war era use the concept of the 'county community', first developed by Alan Everitt, as a means for studying their selected topic.⁹³

These studies whilst of importance do not provide any real analysis of the interplay between the local and national identities of individual major-generals, generally viewing them as central agents interfering and intervening in county affairs. However, the county community model is of relevance to this study, as a central part of its approach focusses on the consideration of the importance of the locality for its own sake, rather than merely as a reflection of the picture nationally.⁹⁴ The county community approach has also been developed and adapted by later writers who have used local considerations as a means of examining wider issues within early modern society. In this regard, studies by Charles Pythian-Adams and by Adrian Green highlight the importance of shire and county to local identity within seventeenth-century England.⁹⁵ Additionally, a recent review of the concept by Jaqueline Eales and Andrew Hopper confirms the continued relevance of the concept in studies of social and regional history.⁹⁶

⁹³ Alan Everitt (ed), *Suffolk and the Great Rebellion* (Ipswich: Suffolk Records Society 1960); Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Leicester: Leicester University Press 1966).

⁹⁴ Richardson, *The Debate*, pp. 119 – 120.

⁹⁵ Charles Pythian-Adams, 'Introduction: an Agenda for Local History', in *Societies, Culture and Kinship, 1580 – 1850: Cultural Provinces and English Local History*, ed. by idem (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993), p. 19; Adrian Green, 'Houses in north – eastern England: regionality and the British beyond, c. 1600 – 1750, in *Archaeologies of the British: Explorations of identity in Great Britain and its colonies 1600 – 1945*, ed. by Susan Lawrence (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 59, 60 – 61;

⁹⁶ Jacqueline Eales and Andrew Hopper, eds. *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hatfield, Herts: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2012;

The county community approach has also been utilised within recent studies focussing on north east England. As part of this, Keith Wrightson highlights how distinctive local factors within Durham and Northumberland were crucial in defining the nature of these areas and the actions and behaviours of local communities, and as such are essential to an appreciation of their full importance.⁹⁷ Although recent writing within the field of regional and local history provides a number of useful perspectives on the county community during this era, this has not been applied in studies of the Protectorate or major-generals. Many of these works have neglected to ask whether major-generals as agents appointed for their local credentials pursued any kind of local agenda in their own right. Additionally, the above studies fail to demonstrate any kind of awareness of the complexity of the potentially contradictory roles of state agent and local actor, or of the multiple identities this implies. In contrast, this thesis provides a detailed academic biography of the northern major-generals, showing the importance of their unique and individual backgrounds in explaining their behaviour as local actors in the implementation of government policy in the localities in which they served.

Historiography of Charles Howard, Robert Lilburne and Charles Worsley

Historical accounts of the three northern major-generals have lent themselves to sweeping stereotyping, and historians have used the major-generals' regime as a metaphor for everything which Cromwell's critics

Stephen K. Roberts, 'Conclusion County counsels: some concluding remarks', in *The County Community*, ed. by Eales and Hopper, p. 125.

⁹⁷ Keith Wrightson, 'Elements of Identity: the re-making of the North East 1500 – 1760', in *Northumbria History and Identity 547 – 2000*, ed. by Robert Colls (Chichester: Phillimore and Co Ltd, 2007), pp. 126, 128, 150

viewed as negative about his rule. Historians have generally undertaken limited analyses of Charles Howard, Robert Lilburne and Charles Worsley, tending to highlight particular selected characteristics, resulting in unhelpful and inaccurate stereotypes. Worsley in particular often been used to characterize what have been viewed as the extremes of the major-generals' regime. In contrast however, this thesis provides a full biography of these important figures within the Cromwellian regime, showing their differing backgrounds and behaviours and explaining the importance of this in terms of their contributions as powerful local actors with their own individual agendas.

Woolrych and Durston both question Howard's change of religious devotion, which occurred several times during his career suggesting this shows that he was a trimmer.⁹⁸ Bernard Capp highlights other aspects of Howard's lifestyle, suggesting that his outlook and lifestyle were un-puritan.⁹⁹ Both David Farr and David Scott consider Charles Howard as more relaxed and less conscientious than his other colleagues in his responsibilities as major-general.¹⁰⁰

Whilst there is no doubting of some truth in these conclusions, these overlook other aspects which are of equal importance in understanding Howard and particularly his activities as major-general. In particular, these

⁹⁸ Austin Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 201; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 51 – 52.

⁹⁹ Capp, *England's culture wars*, pp. 170, 208.

¹⁰⁰ David Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major-General, 1619 – 1684* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 139; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on John Lambert, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, pp. 40 - 41. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 14;

analyses miss the nature of Howard's relationship with the Cromwellian regime, and his great importance to government, given his vast influence in the contentious border region. Howard's importance as a state agent sprang directly from his own aristocratic power base in the far north of England, which he used all his efforts to protect and extend.

Howard's changes in allegiance and religious devotion are therefore concerned with his own political management to safeguard his power base and interests, which became one of his main reasons for engaging with the regime. Howard was a logical choice as major-general, a role he undertook proficiently to manage his own and government's interests in the north. As a footnote, it is interesting to highlight that Charles Howard subsequently prospered during the Restoration of Charles II, where he became Earl of Carlisle and later Governor of Jamaica.¹⁰¹ During this time, Howard changed religious sympathies yet again becoming a committed Anglican.¹⁰² This shows how Howard continued to adapt to new and changed situations, including changing his religious affiliation where this might be to his advantage.

With regard to Robert Lilburne, the historian Roger Howell, questioned his ability to cope with the various challenges he faced.¹⁰³ Howell depicts

¹⁰¹ Stephen Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General: The English Army and the Definition of the Empire, 1659 – 1681* (Chapel Hill : Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., University of North Carolina Press, 1979), pp. 69 – 100.

¹⁰² Gordon Goodwin, 'Howard, Charles, first earl of Carlisle; Helms and Cruikshanks, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/howard-charles-1628-85> Date accessed 31 May 2014.

¹⁰³ Roger Howell, Jr. 'The Army and the English Revolution: The Case of Robert Lilburne', in *Puritans and Radicals in North England*, ed. by idem (London: University of America Press, 1984), pp. 186, 195 – 197.

Lilburne as an ambiguous figure in terms of the degree of his commitment to revolutionary beliefs.¹⁰⁴

These conclusions are largely drawn from Lilburne's experience as Commander in Chief in Scotland, when under resourced he faced major difficulties in dealing with a Scottish royalist insurgency, and from comparisons with the beliefs of his better known brother. However, contemporaneous evidence confirms that Lilburne was an effective military commander.¹⁰⁵ Additionally, Frances Dow and Barry Coward consider that during his Scottish experience and in other parts of his career, Lilburne demonstrated sound political judgement.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, the significant role and influence of Lilburne's family in the Durham and Wear areas is often underplayed, as is the importance of his strong bonds with John Lambert, which assisted his career. Finally, little regard has been paid to the significance of Lilburne's Baptist beliefs and his support for northern causes and interests which formed part of his own local priorities.

Charles Worsley is often depicted as a puritan zealot, excessively committed to punishing his local opponents. This view is particularly expounded by John Morrill in his history of Cheshire, where Worsley's purchases of the properties of royalist delinquents and his actions against royalist supporters are all cited as indicators of a pushful self-interest, profiteering at the

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Carlyle, ed, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, Vol 3, pp. 118 – 119.

¹⁰⁶ Frances Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland 1651 – 1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), p. 99; Barry Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert (bap. 1614, d. 1665)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16655>, accessed 31 Oct 2013].

expense of his neighbours.¹⁰⁷ Finally, Ivan Roots, Aylmer, Woolrych and Hutton all regard Worsley's intense commitment to his cause, visible within his correspondence and reform agenda and finally his early death as signs of excessive fanaticism; concluding that he literally worked himself to death.¹⁰⁸

As with other major-generals discussed above, there is clearly more than a grain of truth in these observations. However, it has to be remembered that during the period prior to his appointment as major-general, Worsley's actions against royalists within his locality were simply those of a parliamentary officer dealing with government opponents. Whilst Worsley did purchase properties and did seek to gain discoverers fees for exposing concealed royalist property, this was no worse than many of his contemporaries, such as John Lambert and Charles Fleetwood who built up vast personal fortunes from such sources.¹⁰⁹

Additionally, it was fairly common practice at the time for payment for service to be made in grants of property rather than cash. The strength and sincerity of Worsley's religious convictions are clear from his correspondence and from his actions as major-general. Furthermore, it has to be remembered that as Cromwell's protégé Worsley's main claim to power was through his state agency, and that without this his position he would have little influence. Worsley therefore needed to demonstrate his loyalty to the regime's

¹⁰⁷ John Morrill, *Cheshire 1630 – 1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 276 – 287.

¹⁰⁸ Roots, 'Swordsmen and Decimators', p. 86; Aylmer, *The State's Servants*, p. 314; Woolrych, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate', p. 223; Hutton, *The British Republic*, p. 83; Hirst, *England in Conflict*, p. 298.

¹⁰⁹ D. N. Farr, 'Lambert, John (bap. 1619, d. 1684)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15939>, accessed 2 Nov 2013]; Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England*, p. 63.

objectives. The local nature of Worsley's work is visible in his desire to bring about godly reform throughout his association, particularly observable in his review of alehouses, in an area noted for recusancy and lack of godly ministry.

Primary Sources

This study uses a number of primary sources as its evidential base, including material in both manuscript and printed form..

This thesis uses manuscripts held within a number of archives throughout north-west England. These have been studied in order to supplement and add further depth to material reviewed through the core primary source material discussed above. Examining these sources has not only allowed issues of detail to be studied but has also added greater connection with and understanding of the source material, particularly in relation to how localities and individuals were impacted. Manuscript material reviewed includes: documents relating to the arrest and examination of Sir George Middleton of Leighton, Lancashire and his son-in-law Somerford Oldfield, 1655;¹¹⁰ the diaries of Thomas Mainwaring of Peover, covering the period 1649 – 1688;¹¹¹ together with Sir Peter Leycester's contemporaneous account of the seizure of himself and others.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Chester, Shakerley family of Hulme and Somerford, MSS, DSS 1/7/66

¹¹¹ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Chester, Diaries of Thomas Mainwaring of Over Peover, DDX 384

¹¹² Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Chester, Leicester-Warren family of Tabley, MSS, Peter Leicester's Books, DLT/B38.

The thesis also uses documents within the papers of the Kenyon family of Peel Hall including deputations and petitions relating to Charles Worsley;¹¹³ petitions regarding the county palatine and the court of duchy chamber;¹¹⁴ and Quarter Sessions records regarding the Return of Alehousekeepers in the Blackburn Hundred, 1655.¹¹⁵ Manuscript material within the Manchester Central Library includes: the records of the Carill-Worsley family of Platt, Rusholme, including the account of Charles Worsley's estate, post 1658;¹¹⁶ the declaration of the election of Charles Worsley as member of Parliament, 1654; and the records of the Assheton family containing a petition from the inhabitants of Manchester for the planting of a godly ministry, mid-1640's.¹¹⁷

The core primary source utilised has been the State Papers of John Thurloe (1616 – 1668). Thurloe acted as Secretary of State during the period 1652 – 1658 meaning that he had an excellent insight into the operation of the Cromwellian government.¹¹⁸ The Thurloe State Papers were published in 7 volumes in 1742 by Thomas Birch, and cover the period 1638 – 1658.¹¹⁹ Within these papers are letters from all major-generals reporting on their activities, including from Charles Howard, Robert Lilburne and Charles Worsley.

¹¹³ Lancashire Archives, Preston, Kenyon Family of Peel Hall MSS, DDKE.

¹¹⁴ Lancashire Archives, Preston, Lancashire Courts of Quarter Sessions, QDV/29, Return of Alehousekeepers in Blackburn Hundred, 1655 – 1656

¹¹⁵ Manchester Archives, Carill Worsley family of Platt, Rusholme MSS, GB127.M35. 5-4-2.

¹¹⁶ Manchester Archives, Declaration of election of Member of Parliament, 19 July 1654, GB127.M71/4/3/1

¹¹⁷ Manchester Archives, Assheton MSS, *The Humble Petition of the Gentlemen, Ministers and Freeholders and other inhabitants of the parish of Manchester in the County Palatine of Lancaster*, E7/28/5/8a-b.

¹¹⁸ Timothy Venning, 'Thurloe, John (*bap.* 1616, *d.* 1668)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27405>, accessed 27 April 2014]

¹¹⁹ *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 1, 1638-1653, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol1> [accessed 28 September 2017].

As such they constitute a rich source of material regarding the activities of major-generals, their individual approaches and the challenges they faced. The Thurloe State Papers contain 8 letters from Charles Howard, 29 letters from Robert Lilburne, and 31 letters from Charles Worsley. In addition, there are various other items of correspondence within these papers appertaining to these three major-generals, which reveal how their friends, family and supporters were involved in assisting in their work. This is the case in one particular example relating to Charles Worsley where a letter shows that in addition to friends and neighbours, his father is one of the Lancashire Commissioners.¹²⁰

Other primary sources have been used to further examine and explore particular issues and also to examine particular arguments and claims made in other source material. These other primary sources include the Calendar of State Papers Domestic – Interregnum 1649 – 1660 (13 Volumes), containing the records of the Council of State during this period.¹²¹ These records have been particularly useful in regard to individual cases submitted in the form of petitions and in connection with decisions on key issues, such as the major-generals instructions. One example here is the Council's decision to appoint Charles Howard and Robert Lilburne as John Lambert's deputies.¹²² Additionally, the Journals of the House of Commons and where

¹²⁰ 'State Papers, 1656: April (6 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 722-736. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp722-736> [accessed 23 March 2016].

¹²¹ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875), British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1649-50> [accessed 28 September 2017].

¹²² 'Volume 101: October 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1881), pp. 361-411. British History Online

applicable, the House of Lords, have been used to examine and verify particular issues.¹²³

A further primary source utilised are the diaries of Thomas Burton MP for Westmorland, 1653 – 1659. These diaries provide further detail of debates and discussions in the House of Commons and elsewhere including during the major-generals regime. One such detail refers to a discussion which took place within the Bull's Head and Half Moon taverns, London in January 1657 during which contemporaneous comments were made regarding the low social status of some major-generals.¹²⁴ This highlights how a source of this nature can add useful contextual information to a study of this nature.

Selective use has been made of Calendars of the Committees for the Advance of Money and the Committee for Compounding, mostly to examine individual cases, including those pursued by Charles Worsley, during the period prior to his appointment as major-general. The former committee which existed between 1643 and 1655 dealt with various matters including uncovering concealed resources of royalist delinquents.¹²⁵ The latter

<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655/pp361-411> [accessed 29 June 2015].

¹²³ *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7> [accessed 28 September 2017]; *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 10, 1648-1649* (London, 1767-1830), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol10> [accessed 28 September 2017].

¹²⁴ 'The Diary of Thomas Burton: 8 January 1656-7', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653 - April 1657*, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. 322-334. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol1/pp322-334> [accessed 2 October 2017].

¹²⁵ *Calendar, Committee For the Advance of Money: Part 3, 1650-55*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1888), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cttee-advance-money/pt3> [accessed 28 September 2017].

committee which was in existence between 1643 and 1660 had responsibility for negotiating the recovery of property and estates of royalists.¹²⁶

In addition to the above, John Rushworth's *Private Passages of State* have been utilised in order to deal with certain background details relating to individual major-generals, or to circumstances encountered within other material. Rushworth was a politician and historian who published works on the civil war period. These works cover the period 1618 – 1648, and so do not extend into the period covering the tenure of the major-generals.¹²⁷

Other printed primary source material which has been utilised includes the 'Naworth Estate and Household Accounts 1648 – 1660' edited by C. Roy Hudleston, and published by the Surtees Society in 1958.¹²⁸ This source provides an insight into the home life and circumstances of Charles Howard. Other examples include the *Clarendon State Papers* prepared by Edward Hyde later earl of Clarendon, which provides a record of the court of Charles Stuart in exile, prepared following the Restoration of Charles II, which provides an alternative perspective to the *Calendar of State Papers (Interregnum)*.¹²⁹ A further example of a primary printed source used within this study is J B. Kenyon's 'Stuart Constitution' which provides an edited

¹²⁶ *Calendar, Committee For Compounding: Part 5*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1892), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/compounding-committee/pt5> [accessed 28 September 2017].

¹²⁷ John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: Volume 7, 1647-48* (London, 1721), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol7> [accessed 28 September 2017].

¹²⁸ C. Roy Hudleston, ed. *Naworth Estate and Household Accounts 1648 – 1660* (Durham: Surtees Society, 1958).

¹²⁹ W. Dunn Macray., ed, *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, 5 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876).

collection of documents relating to this period. This includes a copy of the major-generals instructions authorised by the Council of State in 1655.¹³⁰

Additionally, a range of printed primary source materials have been used in this study. These include contemporaneously published original materials.

Some examples of this include: a number of items written by the radical pamphleteer John Musgrove during the 1650's containing his attacks on Charles Howard;¹³¹ several works by John Lilburne, published between 1645 and 1651, which have been utilised in order to explore the Lilburne family background;¹³² and a religious work by the puritan divine Christopher Goad, published in 1653, within which Charles Worsley has written a preface displaying his own religious beliefs, providing an insight into his approach as major-general.¹³³

These primary sources have been used to provide a pool of evidence from which to investigate the key questions posed by this study in relation to the degree to which the northern major-generals pursued their own local agendas, as opposed to acting solely as state agents. Additionally, arising from this, the extent to which these local factors impinged on the implementation of central policy to modify this to suit local circumstances favouring the interests of the major-general concerned. The use of these sources in the manner described has enabled the study to investigate and probe relevant key lines of enquiry and to produce detailed academic biographies of the northern

¹³⁰ J. B Kenyon, ed. *The Stuart Constitution – Documents and Commentary 1603 – 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

¹³¹ See for example: John Musgrave, *A Cry of Bloud of an innocent Abel against two bloody Cains* (London: 1654).

¹³² See for example: John Lilburne, *The Prisoners Plea for a Habeas Corpus*, (London: 1648).

¹³³ Christopher Goad, *Refreshing drops and scorching vials severally distributed to their proper subjects* (London: 1653).

major generals. These are based on the local circumstances of each individual casting new light on how Cromwellian administration operated at local level, demonstrating the limits of the power of central government to impose its policies within localities.

Chapter 1 – Charles Howard

This chapter argues that Charles Howard was both an agent of central government and also a northerner, with a local agenda. The chapter argues that Howard's status as a northern aristocrat with a significant propertied power base in the sensitive border region made him indispensable to the Protectorate regime. Howard's role as a state agent resulted from his status as a landed aristocrat, who was willing to work with the regime, to pursue his own objectives, central to which were extending his power base and protecting his interests. It is argued that Howard aimed to become the most powerful northern English border magnate and through this extending his influence in government. Howard's ambitions in the north of England were therefore intertwined with his desire to progress within government.

Evidence to support these arguments can be observed throughout Howard's career, including the period 1655 – 1657 when serving as John Lambert's deputy major-general for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland.

Howard's desire for independence from interference by central authorities is clearly seen through his surviving letters to Thurloe (although there are only eight in total).¹³⁴ The paucity of this evidence, confirmed through this research, also suggests Howard's apparent disdain for contacts with government bureaucrats such as Thurloe; confirming a desire to avoid interference by servants of the regime and to be left alone to pursue his own agenda in the northern counties for which he was responsible.

¹³⁴ Christopher Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals Godly Government during the English Revolution*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 195.

Howard's actions reflect his family's long standing ambitions to control the northern border region.¹³⁵ Understanding Howard's family background is therefore important, as this helps to explain his motivation and behaviour as major-general, and in his actions prior to this appointment.

Charles Howard (1628–1685) was born into the junior branch of a major landed aristocratic family, with direct ancestry to the 4th Duke of Norfolk, the 21st Earl of Arundel, the 3rd Earl of Suffolk, and the 1st Earl of Berkshire.¹³⁶ Howard's great grandfather, Lord William Howard, a younger son of the 4th Duke of Norfolk, married Elizabeth Dacre. Through his wife's inheritance Lord William Howard became a major English border magnate, with extensive property in Cumberland, Northumberland and Yorkshire.¹³⁷

Charles Howard inherited these estates following his father's death in 1643;¹³⁸ which by the late 1650s were each estimated to produce annual rentals of around £2,000, confirming his wealth.¹³⁹ This was in contrast to the majority of other major generals, who generally came from more modest backgrounds, and whose wealth was well below that of Howard's.¹⁴⁰ This is

¹³⁵ S. J. Watts, *From Border to Middle Shire Northumberland 1586 – 1625* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1975), p. 58

¹³⁶ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 6. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

¹³⁷ Watts, *From Border to Middle Shire*, pp. 58 – 59; Richard Ovenden and Stuart Handley, 'Howard, Lord William (1563–1640)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13947>, accessed 26 June 2017].

¹³⁸ Gordon Goodwin, 'Howard, Charles, first earl of Carlisle (1628–1685)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13886>, accessed 3 Nov 2013]

¹³⁹ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 8

¹⁴⁰ Ivan Roots, 'Swordsmen and Decimators', pp. 83 – 85; Robert Ashton, *Reformation and Revolution 1558 – 1660* (London: Paladin, 1985), p. 410; G. E. Aylmer, *Rebellion or Revolution? England from Civil War to Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 174; Fletcher 'Oliver Cromwell and the Localities', p. 189; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 41 – 43, Henry Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England 1649 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 160

certainly the case in relation to Howard's two northern colleagues. Whilst details of Lilburne's wealth are unclear, this certainly did not match that of Howard, and at his death Charles Worsley's total estate was valued at just £1,679.¹⁴¹ It is clear therefore that Howard's aristocratic pedigree and wealth made him atypical of the wider major-generals' group,¹⁴² marking him out from his other major-general contemporaries including his two northern colleagues.

Howard's upbringing and marriage further illustrate his difference from other major-generals, and show how he used his connections to provide protection and further his career. Howard was brought up a Catholic at the family seat at Naworth Castle, Cumberland and educated privately by his uncles, one of whom was a Benedictine monk.¹⁴³ At the outbreak of the first Civil War in 1644, it was decided by his uncles that he should travel to France; probably to avoid the conflict. Whilst the reasons for this are unclear, his party became involved in a skirmish with Parliamentary soldiers near Skipton, during which Howard was captured.¹⁴⁴ Whilst this was a minor engagement, it was to cause some difficulty for Howard's early career, resulting in him being charged with delinquency, and also having to face a series of claims by the pamphleteer John Musgrave that he was a royalist.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ Manchester Archives, Carill Worsley family of Platt, Rusholme MSS, GB127.M35/5/4/2.

¹⁴² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 41, 51 – 52.

¹⁴³ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 8: 28 August 1646', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 8, 1645-1647* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 473-477. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol8/pp473-477> [accessed 24 June 2017]; C. Roy Hudleston (ed), *Naworth Estate and Household Accounts 1648 – 1660* (Durham: Surtees Society, 1958), p. x.

¹⁴⁴ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 8

¹⁴⁵ David L. Smith, 'Musgrave, John (fl. 1642–1654)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19661>, accessed 27 January 2017]

Howard's response to the incident at Skipton shows how he used his powerful connections to protect his interests. In 1646, Howard had to answer charges of delinquency, arising from his alleged part in the Skipton incident.¹⁴⁶ When the case came before the Lords and Commons Sequestrations Committee evidence provided by Howard's ally and former ward, the Yorkshire MP Henry Darley resulted in the case being dismissed.¹⁴⁷

In this evidence Darley made much of Howard's apparent conversion from Catholicism to Presbyterianism and his marriage to the daughter of his prominent parliamentarian relative, as evidence of his good character.¹⁴⁸ In 1645, Howard married Anne daughter of his relative, the Presbyterian Lord Howard of Escrick, a powerful member of the Parliamentary Committees for the Advance of Money and for Compounding; forming an alliance with the pro-parliamentary members of the wider Howard family.¹⁴⁹ As a result of his marriage, Charles Howard became a Presbyterian, a change essential to a successful career in the service of Parliament.¹⁵⁰ Howard's capture, marriage and religious conversion show how he was adept at assessing the wider context and making changes which best suited and safeguarded his interest.

This not only demonstrates how Howard made use of powerful allies who

¹⁴⁶ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 8: 4 May 1646', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 8, 1645-1647* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 293-297. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol8/pp293-297> [accessed 31 May 2016].

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 8: 4 May 1646', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 8, 1645-1647* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 293-297. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol8/pp293-297> [accessed 24 June 2017].

¹⁴⁹ Victor Stater, 'Howard, Edward, first Baron Howard of Escrick (d. 1675)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13893>, accessed 27 June 2017]

¹⁵⁰ M. W. Helms / Eveline Cruickshanks, 'HOWARD, Charles (1628-85), of Naworth Castle, Cumb. and Hinderscliffe', Yorks. <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/howard-charles-1628-85> Date accessed 31 May 2014.

acted in his and also their own interest, but also how he utilised his pro-parliamentary credentials to protect his wealth.

Howard increased his power base in Cumberland and also worked closely with Sir Arthur Hesilrige, a senior parliamentarian who became an important contact. Howard used his office to make changes to local administrative arrangements, promoting his supporters into positions of trust. In doing this, he generated considerable local opposition from those who argued that his actions were improper. In the end however, the government was satisfied with Howard's administration which appeared competent, ensuring security in the aftermath of the second Civil War, during which the strategic importance of the border region had re-emerged.

In 1649 the Council of State appointed Howard as sheriff of Cumberland; an action prompting complaints from John Musgrave and Howard's other local opponents.¹⁵¹ Shortly after Howard's appointment as sheriff, Musgrave described him as "the most powerful man of the county".¹⁵² Referring to changes made by Howard to local administrative arrangements, Musgrave complained strongly that he used his role as sheriff to appoint royalist supporters and others disaffected to Parliament into local office.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ 'Volume 3: December 1649', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1649-50*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875), pp. 417-464. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1649-50/pp417-464> [accessed 27 June 2015].

¹⁵² T. C., *Strange Newes from the North*, (London: J. Clowes, 1650), p. 3

¹⁵³ C. B. Phillips, 'County Committees and Local government in Cumberland and Westmorland 1642 – 1660', *Northern History*, Volume 5, Issue 1, January 1970, pp. 58 – 60.

¹⁵³ Musgrave, *A Plain Discovery*, pp. 2 – 3.

Furthermore, Musgrave complained bitterly that this constituted malignancy in the government of both Cumberland and neighbouring Westmorland.¹⁵⁴ In the light of these complaints, in May 1650, the Council of State ordered Sir Arthur Hesilrige, the then prominent senior Parliamentary commander in the North of England, to investigate these issues further.¹⁵⁵ The outcome was that Hesilrige appeared satisfied with Howard's conduct.¹⁵⁶ Far from being contented by this response however, Musgrave then complained that Hesilrige's examination of Howard was itself flawed and biased in Howard's favour.¹⁵⁷ These further allegations were considered by the Council of State in January 1651 which adjudged the "charges to be false and scandalous".¹⁵⁸ As a result of this experience Howard forged a close association with Hesilrige, who became his mentor supporting his rise to prominence within Cromwellian circles.¹⁵⁹

Howard was able to reinvent himself, using his increasingly significant network of contacts in order to further his ambitions. It is also clear that this point in Howard's career marks something of a transition from mainly influencing issues within his home region, to involvement at national level. In

¹⁵⁴ Musgrave, *A Plain Discovery*, pp. 2 – 3.

¹⁵⁵ 'Volume 9: May 1650', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1650*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1876), pp. 135-185. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1650/pp135-185> [accessed 27 June 2015].

¹⁵⁶ 'Volume 9: March 1650', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1650*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1876), pp. 17-72. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1650/pp17-72> [accessed 27 June 2015].

¹⁵⁷ John Musgrave, *A true and exact relation of the ... pressures and grievances the well-affected of the northern bordering counties lye under by sir Arthur Haslerigs misgovernment, set forth in the petition [&c.] presented to the Councel of State* (London: 1650), p. 10

¹⁵⁸ 'Volume 15: January 1651', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1651*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1877), pp. 1-31. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1651/pp1-31> [accessed 31 May 2016].

¹⁵⁹ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 18.

April 1651, possibly as a result of the involvement of Hesilrige, Howard was made Captain of Oliver Cromwell's lifeguard, a highly important position affording him close access to the Lord General, as Cromwell then was.¹⁶⁰

Howard was present at the battle of Worcester in 1651, where he was wounded. Howard's position in Cromwell's lifeguard and his battle wounds gained in what Cromwell himself described as the 'crowning mercy' of Worcester, no doubt significantly boosted his credibility amongst the military and within Cromwellian circles.¹⁶¹

Howard gained further power and influence in the north of England following the fall of the Rump Parliament in 1653 and Hesilrige's associated break with Cromwell, which ended his role as senior commander in the north of England.¹⁶² As a result, Howard effectively replaced Hesilrige as commander of the forces on the Scottish border and also became governor of Carlisle.¹⁶³

Richard Spence and Sarah Barber have both highlighted the significant strategic importance of Cumberland and the Scottish border at this time, especially as a result of Scottish support for both Charles I and Charles II, and the consequent fear of invasion this produced.¹⁶⁴ This shows the highly significant nature of Howard's appointments, given the need for the government to ensure security over what was an increasingly unstable and

¹⁶⁰ George Wharton, *A Narrative of the late Parliament*, (London: 1657), p. 22.

¹⁶¹ Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, in five volumes*, vol 3, p. 158

¹⁶² Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament 1648 – 1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 284, 331; Christopher Durston, 'Hesilrige, Sir Arthur, second baronet (1601–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13123>, accessed 17 May 2014]

¹⁶³ Durston, 'Hesilrige, Sir Arthur, second baronet.

¹⁶⁴ R. T. Spence, 'The Pacification of the Cumberland Borders 1593 – 1628, *Northern History*, Volume 13, (1977), Issue: 1, p. 154; Sarah Barber, 'The People of Northern England and Attitudes Towards the Scots, 1639-1651: The Lamb and the Dragon Cannot Be Reconciled', *Northern History*, Volume: 35 (1999), Issue: 1, pp. 93 – 118.

turbulent border region. This illustrates not only the degree of trust and confidence government placed in Howard, but also the extent to which the regime was already reliant on his support in the north. This added considerable further weight to his standing both locally and at national level.

Howard's aristocratic background assisted his parliamentary ambitions making him an asset to the regime. In April 1653 the Barebone's Parliament was created in place of the Rump, and was formed of nominees from all nations of the British Isles. Howard was nominated by the Council of Officers as representative for Cumberland.¹⁶⁵ Woolrych suggests that it was through Cromwell that pro-parliamentary aristocratic houses such as that of Howard were called to serve, ensuring that moderate conservative interests were represented.¹⁶⁶ This is because Cromwell recognised that the inclusion of supporters with high social standing in positions of influence could improve the popularity and stability of his regimes.¹⁶⁷ This also further confirms how Howard's credentials as a moderate aristocrat willing to work with the Cromwellian government made him an asset to the regime.

During his time as a member of Barebones Parliament, Howard underwent a further stage of transformation in his religious devotion which improved his ability to progress within the Cromwellian regime. During the tenure of this Parliament Howard developed links with the Welsh Independent minister

¹⁶⁵ Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 117

¹⁶⁶ Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, pp. 123, 157, 169.

¹⁶⁷ J.S.A. Adamson, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (Harlow: Longman, 1990), pp. 49 – 53, 71 – 73; Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 1991), p. 101; Blair Worden, *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 200, 210 – 211; J. C. Davis, 'Oliver Cromwell', in *The Oxford Handbook*, ed. by Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 230 – 232.

Walter Cradock;¹⁶⁸ a moderate ecumenicist who viewed Presbyterianism and Independency as “but one religion,”¹⁶⁹ and later joined the congregation of George Cockayne at St Pancras, Soper Lane, London.¹⁷⁰ Cockayne, noted for his strongly millenarian views, was one of the early leaders of the Fifth Monarchist movement.¹⁷¹ Cockayne had close links with Cromwell and his associates, especially John Thurloe.¹⁷² Howard attended Cockayne’s services with prominent London civic leaders, such as Alderman Robert Tichborne, Alderman John Ireton, and Colonel Rowland Wilson and leading Cromwellians such as the lawyer Bulstrode Whitelocke from whom he gained important political contacts.¹⁷³ Woolrych however remains unconvinced at Howard’s apparent change of religious devotion to Independency, wryly observing that Howard would: “shed his Puritan past pretty thoroughly when Charles II made him earl of Carlisle”.¹⁷⁴ Irrespective of whether he was sincere in his new godly beliefs however, Howard clearly acquired credentials essential for credibility and success within Cromwellian circles.

The introduction of the Protectorate in late 1653 gave Howard increased responsibility for northern England. It is clear that dealing with border security

¹⁶⁸ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 8 August 1653', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), pp. 296-297. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/pp296-297> [accessed 27 June 2017]; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 11; Stephen K. Roberts, 'Cradock, Walter (c.1606–1659)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6564>, accessed 28 March 2017]

¹⁶⁹ Walter Cradock, *Gospel-libertie, in the extensions, limitations, of it. Whereunto is added good newes from Heaven; to the worst of sinners on earth, sermons* (London: 1648), p. 135.

¹⁷⁰ Wharton, *A Narrative of the late Parliament*, p. 22.

¹⁷¹ Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism* (London : Faber and Faber, 1972), p. 60.

¹⁷² Tai Liu, 'Cokayn , George (bap. 1620, d. 1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5820>, accessed 28 March 2017]

¹⁷³ Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, p. 201; Liu, 'Cokayn , George.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

met both the objectives of government and Howard's personal interests, confirming the central argument in this chapter that Howard used his own and his family's interests as a method of balancing the potentially conflicting roles of state agent and local actor. Additionally, this further confirms that Howard's importance within government at this time arose from his local influence in the north. It is plain therefore that resolving border security was a matter of national and local concern as well as in the interest of Howard himself as a major landowner, whose reputation would otherwise have been at stake.

In recognition of his influence in the north, in April 1654, Cromwell despatched Howard to deal with the response to a Scottish border incursion.¹⁷⁵ The Council issued further instructions to Howard in July, widening his role to encompass command of the garrisons of Berwick, Carlisle and Tynemouth, meaning that at this point he had total control of the Scottish border. In August 1654, the Council finalised its instructions to General George Monck, appointed Commander in Chief of the forces in Scotland. In finalising its instructions to Monck the Council sought advice from Howard regarding matters of border security, also providing him with the opportunity to ensure his own local security interests were addressed, a real necessity given the prevalence of cross-border raiding, which evidence confirms directly affected Howard's home at Naworth.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ 'Volume 69: April 1-19, 1654', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1654*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1880), pp. 69-110. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1654/pp69-110> [accessed 8 June 2015].

¹⁷⁶ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, p.92.

Howard's policing of the border was regarded as particularly effective.¹⁷⁷ In this respect Monck reported to Cromwell that with Howard's border patrols in place "I shall not fear any insurreccion behind mee".¹⁷⁸ As Stephen Saunders Webb acutely observes, Howard's "regional success was based not solely on his wealth in northern land, mines and herds, and the associated interest of his family; it also grew from his role as the central government's "man of business" in the north".¹⁷⁹ These examples provide ample evidence of Howard's growing power and influence in both London and within his home territory in the north of England..

Howard's presence in the north acted as a disincentive to those plotting a rising in 1654-55 preventing pro-royalist activities in Cumberland and Westmorland. By August 1655 along with Monck and George Fenwick, governor of Berwick, Howard was named as a commissioner to govern the border.¹⁸⁰ It is highly likely that one of the reasons for Howard being sent north in 1654, with clear instructions about preventing the gathering of groups of people, arose from intelligence reports about impending plots in Cumberland and Northumberland. This shows that whilst at that time the far north of England was an isolated area, it was still considered a suitable target from which to mount a rising, and was therefore an area of strategic importance.

David Underdown has confirmed that during the period between the summer of 1654 and the early months of 1655 plotting took place by royalist

¹⁷⁷ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, pp. 72 - 73

¹⁷⁸ Sir Charles Firth (ed), *Scotland and the Protectorate : letters and papers relating to the military government of Scotland from January 1654 to June 1659* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1899), pp. 103, 108, 113.

¹⁷⁹ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, p. 92.

¹⁸⁰ Firth, *Scotland and the Protectorate*, pp. 103, 108, 113.

supporters who planned a general rising during the spring of the same year.¹⁸¹ The lead player in local activities within Cumberland and Westmorland was Sir Philip Musgrave, who had been active during the Civil War period and as a result was a proscribed royalist.¹⁸² Musgrave was a former royalist commander of the Isle of Man, who in 1648 had seized Carlisle and raised forces in Cumberland, to support the duke of Hamilton's Scottish Engager army.¹⁸³ Musgrave was however under surveillance by Thurloe and his agents.¹⁸⁴ It is clear that Howard and his Commissioners were on the lookout for Musgrave.¹⁸⁵

In March 1655 Howard was in Morpeth, Northumberland taking information about a planned royalist rising near Berwick.¹⁸⁶ This was part of a badly coordinated plan by royalist supporters in the north east to capture Newcastle and Tynemouth. The attempt was led by Major Thomas Carnaby; whose plan entailed gathering forces on the pretence of inviting them "to a wedding and head-washing".¹⁸⁷

¹⁸¹ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 97 – 126.

¹⁸² Alan Marshall, 'Musgrave, Sir Philip, second baronet (1607–1678)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19662>, accessed 2 January 2015]

¹⁸³ C. B. Phillips 'The Gentry in Cumberland and Westmorland, 1600 – 1665' (University of Lancaster, unpublished doctoral thesis, 1973), p. 304; C. B. Phillips, 'The Royalist North: the Cumberland and Westmorland Gentry 1642 – 1660', *Northern History*, Volume 14 (1978), Issue 1, pp.176 - 177

¹⁸⁴ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 114 – 115.

¹⁸⁵ 'State Papers, 1656: February (6 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 559-569. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55443&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014

¹⁸⁶ 'State Papers, 1655: March (2 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 3: December 1654 - August 1655 (1742), pp. 195-219. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55369&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014; 'State Papers, 1655: March (3 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 3: December 1654 - August 1655 (1742), pp. 219-238. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55370&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014

¹⁸⁷ 'State Papers, 1655: March (2 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 3: December 1654 - August 1655 (1742), pp. 195-219; Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 142 – 143.

Howard's letter to Cromwell of 1st June 1655 confirms that he had "imprisoned all the most dangerous, and taken bond off the rest of the disaffected in these northerne parts".¹⁸⁸ This also shows that by this time Howard had become the singly most effective person to police the border area, reflecting both his power and influence locally, as well as the way in which this was increasingly recognised by the Protectoral regime.

Howard's career flourished during this period, adding to his ability to control the border area and illustrating his skill at judging the political temperature correctly. Howard became a member of the Council governing Scotland, gaining valuable experience and forging important alliances. Additionally Howard became a leading member of the 'civilian party' around Cromwell, influencing important constitutional changes. In July 1654 he was elected to the First Protectorate Parliament for Cumberland, on his own interest, reflecting his position in the county.¹⁸⁹ In January 1655, Cromwell promoted him to the rank of Colonel and gave him command of a cavalry regiment based in Carlisle.¹⁹⁰

It appears that during his work as an MP Howard formed an association with the Irish peer Lord Broghill,¹⁹¹ who became an important contact. Broghill would be one of the major supporters of the offer of kingship to Cromwell in

¹⁸⁸ 'State Papers, 1655: June (5 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 3: December 1654 - August 1655 (1742), pp. 560-572. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55391&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014.

¹⁸⁹ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 12.

¹⁹⁰ Sir Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army*, 2 Volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), Vol 1, p. 151.

¹⁹¹ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 29 November 1654', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), p. 392. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/p392a> [accessed 30 June 2017].

1657, which Howard also supported.¹⁹² As such Broghill is regarded as one of the leading moderates of the period, who represented an alternative to the dominance of the military within government.¹⁹³

In March 1655, along with several others including both Broghill and Monck, Howard was appointed to “his Highness' Council in Scotland, for the government of that nation”.¹⁹⁴ Saunders Webb says that Howard’s experience as a member of the Scottish Council of State, during which he worked closely with Broghill and Monck, provided him with experience which would benefit him in the future following the Restoration.¹⁹⁵

There can be no doubt that allegiances formed by Howard at this time would be of long term benefit to his future. Additionally, working with Broghill, a rising figure in Cromwell’s increasingly civilianised administration, advanced Howard’s political credentials in Westminster. This provided Howard with future political opportunities within the kingship debate, and with the subsequent Humble Petition and Advice, which resulted in important changes to the Protectorate constitution.¹⁹⁶ Howard’s close alignment with

¹⁹² Coward, *Oliver Cromwell*, p. 146; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 17.

¹⁹³ Toby Barnard, ‘Boyle, Roger, first earl of Orrery (1621–1679)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3138>, accessed 30 June 2017]

¹⁹⁴ ‘Volume 95: March 1655’, in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1881), pp. 61-111. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655/pp61-111> [accessed 30 June 2017].

¹⁹⁵ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, p.73.

¹⁹⁶ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, p. 120.

Broghill on these issues arose in part at least from working on the Scottish Council.¹⁹⁷

This evidence demonstrates how Howard became an important political figure at national level and also how he achieved this through forging relationships and expanding his network of like-minded political figures. This also shows that Howard was adept at judging the political temperature, in order to influence critical issues.

Howard as Major-General

Howard's appointment as Lambert's deputy, involving significant responsibilities as a government agent in the localities was clearly based on his local standing and credentials, which as Saunders Webb has suggested made him government's "man of business" in the north."¹⁹⁸

In October 1655, The Council of State agreed final details of the major-generals' regime, providing Howard with a role within this.¹⁹⁹ As part of this, it was resolved that John Lambert, initially named as the major-general with responsibility for the counties of northern England²⁰⁰, could appoint Charles Howard and Robert Lilburne, as his deputies for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland and for Durham and Yorkshire respectively.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Frances Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland 1651 – 1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), p. 165; Woolrych, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate', pp. 226, 228; Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, pp. 277 – 280.

¹⁹⁸ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, p. 92.

¹⁹⁹ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 22 – 35.

²⁰⁰ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 26.

²⁰¹ 'Volume 101: October 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1881), pp. 361-411. British History Online

This decision recognised that Lambert's role at the centre of government was too important to justify his release.²⁰² No evidence exists regarding how Howard and Lilburne were selected, however given their background and experience each was a logical choice. This was especially so given that the only other possible contender for these roles, or indeed for that allocated to Lambert, Sir Arthur Hesilrige, was not available due to his hostility to the Protectorate.²⁰³ It is possible that Howard's links with Cromwell might also have influenced his selection. However, the same cannot however be said of his relationship with Lambert. Whilst evidence exists suggesting Lilburne had bonds with Lambert,²⁰⁴ this was not the case for Howard. Lambert's background was heavily associated with the army and whilst he was of gentry stock, unlike Howard his family were not of the aristocratic kind.²⁰⁵ Additionally, Lambert's main local power base was in the West Riding of Yorkshire, particularly Leeds,²⁰⁶ and there is little to suggest that Lambert had good connections in Howard's local stamping ground around Cumberland and Northumberland.²⁰⁷

This suggests that aside from any input from Cromwell, Howard's selection as Lambert's deputy for Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland was on the basis of his own abilities and status, reflecting his power and influence

<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655/pp361-411> [accessed 29 June 2017].

²⁰² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 27.

²⁰³ Durston, 'Hesilrige, Sir Arthur.

²⁰⁴ Lilburne, *Supra*.

²⁰⁵ D. N. Farr, 'Lambert, John (bap. 1619, d. 1684)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

²⁰⁶ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on John Lambert for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 40. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

²⁰⁷ David Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier*, pp. 1 – 7, 13 – 22.

in these counties and his pre-eminence in the control of the contentious Scottish border.

Howard's desire to make his own decisions, without external interference, is shown by his statement in his letter to Thurloe dated 8th October that: "none ought to putt themselves upon us but by our generall consent, unless they bring an order from above; which I desire and hope you will prevent".²⁰⁸ This further underlines Howard's strong intolerance of central involvement as well as his attempt to influence Thurloe to prevent this, also displaying what Saunders Webb describes as "senatorial courtesy".²⁰⁹

Howard appears to have been notified of his appointment as major-general in the late autumn of 1655 as, in his letter to Thurloe he confirms that he "shall undoubtedly observe his highnes commands, soe soone as I understand his pleasure". In this letter Howard reminds Thurloe of the need for him to make decisions locally about those appointed to command his border force, showing his ongoing interest in the security of the border region.²¹⁰

From the start of the major-generals regime Cromwell expected that, Lambert's two deputies would work together on certain issues, implying some degree of planned coordination of government across the five northern counties for which they were collectively responsible. In practice however both Howard and Lilburne concentrated on their own associations,

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Saunders Webb, *The Governors-General*, p. 73.

²¹⁰ 'State Papers, 1655: October (1 of 5)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 64-78. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55409&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014.

reinforcing conclusions that each had prime influence within their respective areas and that they did not carry out Cromwell's instructions to the letter.

Whilst most major-generals took up their new responsibilities in October or November, Howard did not arrive in his association until December 1655.²¹¹ This appears to be due to his other commitments in Edinburgh for the Scottish Council.²¹² Shortly after arriving in northern England in early December, Howard travelled to Durham in order to meet with Robert Lilburne. From the letters both sent to the Protector, it appears that this meeting took place on Cromwell's orders, suggesting from the outset there was some expectation within the regime that Lambert's two deputies would coordinate their activities in certain areas of responsibility.²¹³

It appears that contacts between Howard and Lilburne centred solely on the application of the decimation tax.²¹⁴ Their letters to Cromwell about their meeting suggest that both were keen to assure the Protector that his orders were being followed; confirming that liaison between the two was not brought about through their own endeavours or through instructions from Lambert. The limited number of meetings between Lambert's two deputies confirms that they operated individually, despite Cromwell's expectations to the contrary, further highlighting the limits of central diktat in the localities.

²¹¹ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 35.

²¹² 'State Papers, 1655: December (4 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 318-332. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55425&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014.

²¹³ 'State Papers, 1655: December (5 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 333-343. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp333-343> [accessed 28 September 2017]. 'State Papers, 1655: December (4 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 318-332. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp318-332> [accessed 23 March 2016].

²¹⁴ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 14.

Howard used his office as major-general to appoint his supporters as local Commissioners for the Peace of the Commonwealth in Cumberland and Westmorland, showing how he exercised power at local level. Unlike most of the other major-generals, who were provided with a set of local commissioners for each county, arrangements for Cumberland and Westmorland operated through one combined commission.

Whilst this might have been due to the physical difficulties of maintaining two separate bodies, this does not appear to have been the case for the preceding county committee system operating up to 1648, which entailed a separate committee for each county.²¹⁵

According to Durston, local commissioners were selected through an ad hoc process, involving input from a subcommittee of the Council of State and decisions taken by the major-generals.²¹⁶ It is likely therefore that the arrangements for the Cumberland and Westmorland commission reflected Howard's choice of how to manage arrangements locally.

This assertion is supported by what we know about some of those appointed to the commission. Two individuals (Jeremiah Tolhurst and John Mason) were military men from outside the area, who had served in the Carlisle garrison or other forces with which Howard was associated.²¹⁷ Two others, namely Cuthbert Studholme and Thomas Langthorne were wealthy Carlisle

²¹⁵ Phillips, 'County Committees and Local Government', pp. 34-66.

²¹⁶ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 23.

²¹⁷ Firth and Davies, *Regimental History*, pp. 452, 456 – 459; 330, 367 – 368.

merchants, active in local politics; the latter had served as mayor of the city corporation.²¹⁸

All of these men would have been known to Howard, highlighting his close involvement in the process of selecting those who would support him as deputy major-general. Additionally, the operation of a combined commission suggests that Howard wished to run the local system in a directive and strategic manner, requiring less involvement from him in the nitty-gritty of the commissions' business.

Howard and his commissioners concentrated on taxation and security issues, rather than on godly reform, adding further weight to the proposition that his prime motivation as a state agent centred on securing his own interests within his area of local influence.

In February 1656, the Commissioners for Cumberland and Westmorland wrote to the Protector to report on progress regarding the application of the decimation tax in the two counties. The letter states that the commissioners had applied the tax as required, but that the amount levied "comes short of the summe necessary to pay the malitia troope rayseed in these counties."²¹⁹ Whilst they assured the Protector that efforts would be made to increase this sum, they still considered that the amounts raised would fall short of that required, meaning that the size of the militia would need to be reduced. Against this however the report highlighted positive progress achieved in

²¹⁸ Phillips, 'County Committees and Local Government', pp. 50, 58, 61.

²¹⁹ 'State Papers, 1656: February (6 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 559-569. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55443&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014

relation to royalist suspects, “most of whom we have secured in prison and the rest under very good bond.”²²⁰

Durston considers that with the possible exception of Howard all major-generals regarded godly reform as central to their mission.²²¹ As the decimation tax was used to fund the cost of the militia,²²² security and taxation issues were clearly intertwined. Howard clearly understood this link further demonstrating how he used his own interests to determine his operational priorities as major-general.

In his activities as major-general, Howard seems to have adopted a more moderate approach than most of his contemporaries, including Lilburne and Worsley, in his treatment of former royalists with whom he had association in local office.

After consulting with the godly aldermen of Carlisle Corporation, Howard was prepared to support a number of former royalist delinquents continuing in office as common councilmen of the city.²²³ Ronald Hutton suggests that Howard did this because “he thought them to be good men”.²²⁴ It is equally possible however that this was part of securing the loyalty of these individuals and increasing his personal power base within the corporation.

Indeed there were sound reasons for doing this, as in January 1656, Cuthbert Studholme, one of Howard’s commissioners and others, petitioned

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals*, p. 154.

²²² Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals*, pp. 20, 144 – 147.

²²³ 'Volume 126: April 1656', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6* (1882), pp. 245-304. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=53575> Date accessed: 20 September 2014.

²²⁴ Hutton, *The British Republic*, p. 86.

the Council of State to intervene in a local dispute whereby one Peter Norman, an undischarged delinquent, had been elected mayor of the corporation. The Council decided to refer the matter to a committee of several members to investigate, rather than directly to Howard.²²⁵

We do not know why Studholme, who knew Howard as one of his Commissioners for the Peace, would have decided to petition the Council about Norman, as opposed to seeking Howard's assistance in dealing with what was essentially a local matter. Equally, it is puzzling why the Council decided to refer this to a subcommittee rather than asking Howard for his assessment of the situation.

It is likely that Howard had some sympathy with Norman, not shared by other more godly members of the corporation, who eventually appealed to London seeking resolution. Evidence suggests Norman had connections with Howard, as in 1658 one 'Peter Norman' paid rent to Howard for properties in Carlisle.²²⁶

The experience of dealing with Studholme's petition, which brought with it the possibility of external involvement in his area of interest, no doubt influenced Howard to in future consult corporation aldermen directly before deciding to support the retention of former delinquents on the common council.²²⁷

²²⁵ 'Volume 123: January 1656', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 88-154. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp88-154> [accessed 2 July 2017].

²²⁶ Hudleston, *Naworth Estate and Household Accounts*, pp. 180 – 181.

²²⁷ 'Volume 126: April 1656', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6* (1882), pp. 245-304. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=53575> Date accessed: 20 September 2014.

Howard's local standing and position made him vulnerable to criticism from key stakeholders within his localities. This resulted in him taking extreme care to manage local relationships to ensure that these suited his overall objective of maintaining his local power base. This can be seen in Howard's handling of the consequences of the 1656 election process. Unlike other major-generals, in the aftermath of the 1656 election Howard decided not to exclude any of those elected to seats within his association; suggesting he valued the maintenance of good local relations more highly than the interests of government.

In September 1656 Howard was returned as MP for Cumberland in the elections to the Second Protectorate Parliament. During the election process, Howard was responsible for a total of 10 Parliamentary seats within his association. Like all major-generals, under the terms of the Instrument of Government,²²⁸ Howard was required to consider which of those elected should be excluded from Parliament, due to certain political, moral or religious criteria not being fulfilled. Little and Smith report that in total over 100 of those elected to the Second Protectorate Parliament were excluded, due to disqualification, while a further fifty or sixty withdrew in protest.²²⁹

Unlike other major-generals, Howard did not recommend any disqualifications; although his northern counterparts: Bridge (Worsley's successor) and Lilburne recommended the exclusion of 5 and 9 individuals respectively.²³⁰ Whilst this could imply that Howard was more effective at

²²⁸ S. R. Gardiner (ed), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 412

²²⁹ Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, p. 80.

²³⁰ Durston, *Cromwell's major-generals*, p. 200 - 201.

managing the election arrangements preventing those ill-disposed to the government from being returned, Durston suggests that this might be explained by Howard's disinclination "to send damning reports on those returned to the Council in London."²³¹ Such reports might be likely to lead to longer term problems locally. This suggests that Howard's political judgement and local knowledge made him keenly aware of the potential implications of decisions, making him more risk averse than some of his colleagues.

Howard used his position as an MP to further the interest of northern England. However Howard's support for godly causes within parliament was not reflected in his major-general role. During the Second Protectorate Parliament Howard was active in a number of committees including those relating to issues relating to northern England. These included a Bill for "Suppressing of Theft upon the Borders of England and Scotland"²³² and the second a Bill for the creation of "a Court of Law, and a Court of Equity, at the City of York",²³³ with clear echoes of the former Council in the North, abolished in 1641.²³⁴

Whilst in Parliament Howard actively supported causes relating to godly reformation, this certainly did not match his action as a major-general in the north, where he adopted a more laissez-faire approach. This shows that

²³¹ Ibid.

²³² House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 4 December 1656', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), p. 464. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/p464> [accessed 2 July 2017].

²³³ House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 20 November 1656', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), pp. 455-456. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/pp455-456> [accessed 2 July 2017].

²³⁴ R. R. Reid,, *The Kings Council in the North* (London: Longmans, Green, 1921), pp. 452 – 453.

Howard was adept at political manoeuvres, adopting different agendas at national and local levels respectively, balancing the two to secure his interest.

During his term as major-general Howard does not appear to have been particularly active on local godly reform. For example, whilst he was named to serve on county committees for the ejection of unsuitable clergy in Cumberland, Durham, Northumberland and Westmorland, we have no reports of his activities on these bodies.²³⁵ His letters to Thurloe and reports in other state papers provide scant testimony of his actions relating to moral reform. During this Parliament, Howard was however a member of several committees involved in moral reformation, including dealing with subjects such as alehouse abuses, conviction of Papists and the maintenance of godly ministers. He also appears to have developed links with the Independent divine Joseph Caryl;²³⁶ one of Cromwell's strong supporters.²³⁷ Howard also took part in the Parliamentary examination of the Quaker James Nayler, who was found guilty of blasphemy for impersonating Christ and claiming divine status.²³⁸ Howard took a moderate line in the deliberations about the fate of Nayler, closely aligned to that of Cromwell.²³⁹ However, he later brought forward a petition from some ministers in the north strongly

²³⁵ C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, eds. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum. 1642-1660* (London: H.M.S.O. 1911), pp. 856, 968 – 990; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 181

²³⁶ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 28 February 1657', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), p. 497. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/p497> [accessed 3 July 2017].

²³⁷ P. S. Seaver, 'Caryl, Joseph (1602–1673)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4846>, accessed 28 Sept 2017]

²³⁸ Leo Damrosch, 'Nayler, James (1618–1660)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19814>, accessed 3 July 2017]

²³⁹ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 15.

critical of Quakers.²⁴⁰ Howard's moderate position in the Nayler debates was therefore at odds with his actions supporting petitions against Quakers in the north of England; highlighting how he took steps to manage his political image to suit different audiences.

Strong bonds appear to have existed between Howard and Cromwell reflected not only in his progress within the regime but also in the toleration of certain 'ungodly' behaviours by Howard. Cromwell clearly held Howard in high regard, reflected in the conferment of the titles of Lord Gilsland and Viscount Howard of Morpeth on him in July 1657, one of only two such titles conferred by the Protector.²⁴¹ Furthermore, in December 1657 Howard was one of those named by Cromwell to serve in the 'other house', the upper chamber of Parliament.²⁴² Howard seems to have had a strong personal attachment to Cromwell, visible in a letter sent in June 1655 in which he stated "thatt besides the great tyes off conscience, honour, and gratitude, I have a particular one, which is due to your person".²⁴³

This strong bond of mutual respect perhaps explains why the Protector tolerated some of Howard's less than godly behaviour. For example, Howard took an active part in horse racing, a banned activity during the Protectorate

²⁴⁰ 'The Diary of Thomas Burton: 9 December 1656', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653 - April 1657*, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. 81-92. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol1/pp81-92> [accessed 2 June 2017].

²⁴¹ Derek Hirst, 'The Lord Protector 1653 – 1658', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by Morrill, p. 122; Gordon Goodwin, 'Howard, Charles, first earl of Carlisle (1628–1685)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13886>, accessed 3 Nov 2013]

²⁴² 'State Papers, 1657: December (2 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 6, January 1657 - March 1658, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 660-669. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol6/pp660-669> [accessed 10 August 2017].

²⁴³ 'State Papers, 1655: June (5 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 3: December 1654 - August 1655 (1742), pp. 560-572. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55391&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 20 May 2014.

and in 1658 became embroiled in a scandal connected with his wife's reputation.²⁴⁴

This issue arose following Howard's wife giving birth to a son two months prior to the expected date. Howard's younger brother Philip challenged the suspected father, Lord Belasyse to a duel to avenge family honour. After the duel, Philip Howard travelled to Scotland to challenge another suspected father, Lord Rothes. It is likely that Cromwell was aware of the issues surrounding Lady Howard, as the Council of State issued warrants for the arrest of Philip Howard.²⁴⁵ The issue was embarrassing as Belasyse was uncle to Cromwell's son-in-law Lord Falconberg, and also related to Charles Howard's nominal superior John Lambert.²⁴⁶ Whilst Howard was not responsible for the conduct of his relatives, the issue clearly raised concerns within the regime in which godly values were of significant importance. The fact that Howard survived these tribulations adds further weight to his importance to the regime and also to his bond with Cromwell.

Whilst it appears that Howard remained loyal to Cromwell, evidence suggests that he probably had contact with the court in exile. These contacts were directed through his wife and his brother in law. In 1656 Charles Stuart sent two letters to Howard through his wife, with the objective of obtaining his support.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁴ Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, pp. 170, 208.

²⁴⁵ 'Warrants of the Protector and Council', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1657-8* (1884), pp. 549-554. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=54554&strquery=howard> Date accessed: 17 May 2014

²⁴⁶ Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier*, pp. 73, 75.

²⁴⁷ Macray, *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, Vol 3, pp. 153, 173.

Howard's brother-in-law, William Howard a former parliamentary supporter, met Charles Stuart at Bruges in 1656 and was in correspondence with several figures at court.²⁴⁸ William Howard was watched by Thurloe and eventually imprisoned.²⁴⁹ Whilst there is little detail about the content of these exchanges, it is clear that Charles Stuart viewed Howard as a target for recruitment to his cause. Whilst this was in part no doubt due to Howard's aristocratic credentials and his moderate political position, it also highlights Howard's significant standing and importance at this time.

Howard used his family's wealth, which could have been a disadvantage, as the basis for his power in the Cromwellian government. Howard managed to use this to his advantage. From an early point in his career Howard recognised the importance of developing and maintaining the right contacts and of having the appropriate credentials for the groups with whom he wished to assimilate. This is illustrated through Howard's ability to cultivate contacts useful for the development and protection of his interests and through his ability to reinvent himself from a Catholic aristocrat to a committed religious Cromwellian Independent with military experience.

Howard's ability to make himself of importance to the regime is also a critical factor in understanding his advancement. In this regard Howard's achievements in the strategically important border zone made him indispensable to government. His ability to make important contacts such as

²⁴⁸ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 193 – 194; Helms and Cruikshanks, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/howard-charles-1628-85> Date accessed 31 May 2014; Richard L. Greaves, 'Howard, William, third Baron Howard of Escrick (c.1630–1694)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13949>, accessed 14 July 2014]

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

with Hesilrige also aided his progression in the northern counties and also subsequently paid dividends in relation to his military appointments at the heart of the regime. Howard's role in the north was however also always about maintaining and protecting his family interests, thus his activities were of mutual benefit to the state and to himself.

With the demise of Hesilrige, Howard's position as the most powerful individual in the far north of England became indisputable, founded as it was on his family's wealth and influence and embellished through his own natural military and political skills. Howard was however equally able and successful in the House of Commons where his alliance with Broghill made him part of a new wave of influential civilians within the Cromwellian administration. It is certain that Cromwell, often regarded as a good judge of character, observed these positive attributes in him and saw how these could be deployed to his own benefit as Protector.

Howard was probably an obvious choice as Lambert's deputy major-general, a role he appears to have undertaken in a strikingly moderate manner, with little evidence of the godly zeal visible in the correspondence of his other colleagues, such as Charles Worsley. Howard's approach to managing his role as major-general highlights his desire to operate in an independent manner and included placing his supporters in positions of influence locally and avoiding interference by central bureaucracy.

Whilst in his Parliamentary and other activities Howard supported causes of benefit to northern England, his central objective in this was furthering his own interest. Howard's standing with Cromwell and his importance to the

regime no doubt protected him from damage by his enemies. Howard's ability to reinvent himself is also apparent in his behaviour following the Restoration where he once again changed religious devotion in order to protect his interests and to prosper.

Some historians have suggested that Howard's approach demonstrates a lack of commitment to the Cromwellian regime.²⁵⁰ However, Howard was in many ways no different from other grandees of this period such as Lambert and Charles Fleetwood who used their offices to build vast wealth.²⁵¹ Unlike many of these people however Charles Howard was clearly successful in what he did.

As to his role as major-general, in many ways this seems to be a mere step in an illustrious career and a natural appointment for an individual whose contribution by this time was invaluable to the regime. Howard undertook this role in his own way, increasing his influence in areas of particular interest to him. As a northerner Howard did progress northern interests; clearly demonstrated in activities such as the pacification of the borders and in his support for causes such as a court at York.

However in his work Howard clearly adopted an approach which involved using his own interests as the locus through which he balanced any potential conflict between national and local priorities. Howard was therefore both a state agent and a northerner who used his offices, including that of major-

²⁵⁰ Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, p. 201; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 51 -52.

²⁵¹ Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier*, pp. 154 – 155; Toby Barnard, 'Fleetwood, Charles, appointed Lord Fleetwood under the protectorate (c.1618–1692)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9684>, accessed 4 Feb 2016]

general to pursue a local agenda congruent to his own and his family's interests. Given that Howard's power was based on his strength locally, it is however entirely understandable that he would take every step to protect his local connections.

Chapter 2 – Robert Lilburne

Robert Lilburne was driven by a desire for moral reform arising from his strong Baptist, and later Quaker beliefs. Additionally, Lilburne's background as an effective and reliable military commander during the civil war era made him attuned to the need for security in the north of England, where a number of royalist sympathisers planned to take control of important towns such as York.

Lilburne displayed a strong dislike for royalist conspirators, who he believed had breached the trust of their communities. Lilburne's friendship and loyalty to his nominal superior John Lambert made him different from many of his other colleagues such as Charles Howard and Charles Worsley, whose main connections and loyalty were with Cromwell. Whilst Lilburne demonstrated allegiance to Cromwell, his strong republican beliefs placed him at odds with some of the changes which took place within constitution of the Protectorate, which he viewed as reducing the influence of the army, to which he was heavily committed.

Lilburne also took steps to reform local administration, advancing his family and supporters, in the localities within which they had greatest local connection, and also supported the foundation of Durham College, a cause aimed at benefitting the people of northern England.²⁵²

The Lilburne family were the junior branch of a landed Northumberland family who settled near Bishop Auckland, County Durham in the fourteenth

²⁵² 'Cromwell's speech on founding of a college at Durham', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq*: Volume 2, April 1657 - February 1658, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. 531-543. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol2/pp531-543> [accessed 31 July 2017].

century.²⁵³ Lilburne's father was heir to a modest manorial estate, his mother was the daughter of a minor official at Greenwich Palace who served under Elizabeth I.²⁵⁴ John Lilburne claimed that his family was descended from nobility and involved at court.²⁵⁵

Several members of the Lilburne family rose to either national or local prominence during the Civil War and republican era, and the family became known for its radical puritanical outlook.²⁵⁶ Lilburne's younger brother John, leader of the Levellers, was well known for his radical views and regular political conflicts. Another younger brother, Henry became noted for changing sides and declaring for Charles I in 1648, when acting as deputy governor of Tynemouth Castle.

Whilst all puritans, family members appear to have supported different religious traditions, for example whilst Robert Lilburne's uncle, George Lilburne was a radical Presbyterian, Robert Lilburne was a Baptist. Although probably not deliberate, this diversity was an advantage in navigating the complex religious landscape of the 1650's.²⁵⁷

Other members of the Lilburne family played prominent roles in the government and politics of north east England during this period. For example, Lilburne's uncle, George Lilburne, a wealthy merchant and Parliamentarian, became mayor of Sunderland where he profited from the

²⁵³ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 4. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

²⁵⁴ Barry Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert (bap. 1614, d. 1665)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008.

²⁵⁵ John Lilburne, *The Prisoners Plea for a Habeas Corpus*, (London: 1648); John Lilburne, *Innocency and Truth Justified* (London: 1645), p. 8.

²⁵⁶ W. Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs in Durham during the Civil War and Interregnum' (University of Durham, unpublished master's thesis, 1978), pp. 236 - 237.

²⁵⁷ Rachel Foxley, 'Varieties of Parliamentarianism', in *The Oxford Handbook*, ed. by Braddick, pp. 426 - 427.

coal industry in the area, in which he achieved “a considerable pitch of local influence”.²⁵⁸ George Lilburne was also described as “the great factotum of Sunderland.”²⁵⁹ As Sunderland mayor, during the first civil war, George Lilburne also established highly profitable links with Scottish Covenanters, which benefitted himself and his supporters in the town, a highly novel arrangement in the north east at this time.²⁶⁰

George Lilburne became sheriff of Durham in the early 1650's and was returned as MP for the county in 1654.²⁶¹ Robert Lilburne's cousin, Captain Thomas Lilburne (son of George) was MP for the County of Durham (1656) and for Newcastle (1659)²⁶². In 1652 Thomas Lilburne was appointed a magistrate for Durham.²⁶³ This clearly demonstrates that the Lilburnes were an important and influential family, particularly in the Durham area.

The power and influence of the Lilburnes in Durham and its surrounding area increased in the aftermath of the civil war era, when many members of the local gentry withdrew from involvement in local government.²⁶⁴ The

²⁵⁸ Robert Surtess, *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, Sunderland and District Section* (Sunderland: Hills, 1908), pp. 8 – 9, note e; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 4.

²⁵⁹ 'Charles I - volume 447: March 1-14, 1640', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1639-40*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton (London, 1877), pp. 506-549. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/chas1/1639-40/pp506-549> [accessed 31 July 2016].

²⁶⁰ Maureen. M. Meikle, 'The Scottish Covenanters and the Borough of Sunderland, 1639–1647: A Hidden Axis of the British Civil Wars', *Northern History*, June (2017), pp. 3 – 6, 17 – 22.

²⁶¹ Mervyn James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society A Study of Society Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500 – 1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), pp. 89 – 91; Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', p. 283; William. Dumble, 'The Lilburnes and the English Revolution', in *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494 – 1660*, ed. by David Marcombe (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, Department of Adult Education, 1987), pp. 227 – 252.

²⁶² James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society*, pp. 89 - 91.

²⁶³ Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', p. 282.

²⁶⁴ Anthony Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces the Government of Stuart England* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 11 – 19; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester

ascendency of the Lilburnes' in the Durham area was only checked with the arrival of an even more avaricious Parliamentarian in the north, in the person of the Leicestershire Commonwealthman Sir Arthur Hesilrige, in 1648; who became their local adversary.²⁶⁵

William Dumble shows how the Lilburne family seized the opportunity presented during this period to increase their influence and standing.²⁶⁶ For example, during the mid-1640's, following the withdrawal of leading local gentry such as the Vanes, both George Lilburne and his brother Richard (Robert's father) played a major role on the Durham County Committee with significant sway over the committee's sequestration work, effectively controlling much of the county administration.²⁶⁷ One contemporaneous source, opposed to the family, described George Lilburne as a "petty monarch" and the family as a whole as "uncontrollable".²⁶⁸

The introduction of the Protectorate marked the high point of the Lilburne family's influence and power in the Durham area. The demise of Hesilrige's hegemony in the north east, following his break with Cromwell in 1653 and consequent withdrawal from public life provided further opportunity for the Lilburnes to increase their local power. Hesilrige's successors as rulers of northern England were Charles Howard and Robert Lilburne, as deputy

University Press, 2001), pp. 74 – 80; Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution 1625 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 514 – 515.

²⁶⁵ Christopher Durston, 'Hesilrige, Sir Arthur, second baronet (1601–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13123>, accessed 17 May 2014]

²⁶⁶ Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', pp. 132 – 175; Dumble, 'The Lilburnes and the English Revolution', pp. 231 – 232.

²⁶⁷ Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', pp. 150 – 151; Dumble, 'The Lilburnes and the English Revolution', pp. 231 – 232.

²⁶⁸ Sir Arthur Hesilrige, *Musgrave muzled: or The traducer gagg'd : Being a just vindication of the Right Honourable Sr. Arthur Haslerigg, and all other persons herein concerned. From the scandalous imputations, and forged articles exhibited by John Musgrave* (Newcastle: 1650).

major-generals to Lambert for the control of the northern provinces.²⁶⁹

Dumble describes the period during the regime of the major-generals as “the high point of the [Lilburne] family's prestige and influence in the county” and concludes that at this point: “The Lilburne’s, combined the military and civil ordering of the Protectorate's authority in the county”.²⁷⁰ This shows how the Lilburne family prestige and influence increased under the Protectorate and as a result of the demise of their local rival Sir Arthur Hesilrige.

Robert Lilburne entered the Civil War period on the Parliamentary side, raising a regiment from his native county of Durham to serve in the northern Parliamentary army under the command of Ferdinando Lord Fairfax.

A large part of Lilburne’s civil war activities at this time were spent in the north of England , particularly in Yorkshire, where he worked alongside notable Yorkshire Parliamentary army figures such as John Lambert, Sir William Constable and Captain Adam Baynes, with whom he formed important friendships.²⁷¹ Lilburne’s association with John Lambert would be particularly important for his future career both in the army and as a major-general.

Robert Lilburne’s radical religious beliefs meant that he was strongly opposed to Presbyterianism, which during the 1640’s was the dominant force within Parliament.²⁷² Lilburne’s religious radicalism was also combined with distinctive pro-army political views. These are visible in his behaviour during

²⁶⁹ Durston, ‘Hesilrige , Sir Arthur, second baronet’; Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals*, p.27.

²⁷⁰ Dumble, ‘Government, Religion and Military Affairs’, pp. 291 – 292.

²⁷¹ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 5.

²⁷² David Underdown, *Pride’s purge: politics in the Puritan revolution* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 208 – 256; Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), pp. 198 – 199.

the mid-1640's as part of his involvement in a dispute with the Presbyterian dominated Parliament, which proposed disbanding and dismembering the army without compensation.²⁷³ In this dispute Lilburne, worked closely with his northern colleague John Lambert and drafted at least one of the army petitions. Lilburne was summoned to Parliament to answer for his actions.²⁷⁴ Durston views this as an example through which we can observe an aspect of Lilburne's religious radicalism, within which he "displayed an extreme hostility to Presbyterianism".²⁷⁵

Robert Lilburne's connections with Lambert helped to mitigate negative effects on his career arising from his kinship with his radical brother John. In 1647, the New Model Army commander, Sir Thomas Fairfax appointed Lilburne governor of Newcastle. In December 1647, Lilburne was however replaced as Newcastle governor by Sir Arthur Hesilrige, a move probably linked to the imprisonment of his Leveller brother John, for publishing tracts criticising the Commonwealth authorities.²⁷⁶ The corporation's presentation to Lilburne of two silver flagons worth £20 at the conclusion of his appointment suggests they were satisfied with Lilburne's tenure.²⁷⁷

Additionally, Parliament was keen to provide reassurance that Lilburne's replacement did not imply doubt regarding his 'integrity, judgement or

²⁷³ Roger Howell, Jr, 'The Army and the Case of Robert Lilburne', in *Puritans and Radicals in North England: Essays on the English Revolution*, ed. by idem (London: University Press of America, 1984), pp. 183 – 184; Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert'.

²⁷⁴ Austin Woolrych, *Soldiers and Statesmen: The General Council of the Army and its Debates, 1647 – 1648* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 18, 32 – 36, 40, 45 – 46, 56 – 57; David Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major-General* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 47 – 49; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 6.

²⁷⁵ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 51.

²⁷⁶ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 6. Andrew Sharp, 'Lilburne, John (1615?–1657)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16654>, accessed 11 Feb 2016]

²⁷⁷ M. H. Dodds, *Extracts from the Newcastle upon Tyne Council Minute Book 1636 – 1656* (Newcastle, 1920), p. 85.

valour'.²⁷⁸ By 1648, Lilburne was deputy commander of the Northern Army under Lambert, where he played a prominent role against Northumberland royalists and subsequently at the battle of Preston.²⁷⁹

Lilburne's opposition to royalist rule is also visible in his role in the trial of Charles I. Lilburne was the only officer from the northern forces to be named to take part in the trial of Charles I in 1649. He attended the trial and signed the death warrant.²⁸⁰ The Whig historian Mark Noble suggests this was due to his brother John's treatment in the Court of Star Chamber during Charles' I Personal Rule;²⁸¹ however there is no evidence for this. Robert Lilburne's motives for signing the warrant are unknown.²⁸²

Robert Lilburne held radical Baptist beliefs, applied during his role as commander in chief in Scotland, which provide important insights into his policy and identity as a northern radical, and his later work as major-general. Historians have however failed to appreciate the importance of these factors in assessing Lilburne. In December 1652, Lilburne was made commander in Scotland, and two aspects of what occurred during his appointment are important indicators of how he operated during his later role as major-general.

²⁷⁸ John Rushworth, 'Proceedings in Parliament, December 6th 1647 - January 1st 1648', in *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: Volume 7, 1647-48* (London, 1721), pp. 923-952. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol7/pp923-952> [accessed 1 August 2017].

²⁷⁹ Sir Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army*, 2 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), volume 1, pp. 264 – 267; Sidney Lee (ed), *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1900, Volume 33 (London: Macmillan, 1893), pp. 250 – 251.

²⁸⁰ J. G. Muddiman, *The Trial of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh: William Hodge, 1928), pp. 201 – 206, 222 – 228; Howell, Jr, 'The Army and the Case of Robert Lilburne', p. 184; Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert'; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 7.

²⁸¹ Mark Noble, *The Lives of the English Regicides*, 2 Vols (London: John Stockdale, 1798), Vol 1, p. 378.

²⁸² History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, pp. 7 – 8.

These firstly, provide an insight into his religious beliefs and how he promoted these and, secondly show how these stemmed from Lilburne's northern origins. It is clear that Lilburne furthered and applied his Baptist beliefs within his work.²⁸³ For example, during Lilburne's brief tenure as governor of Newcastle, he worked with Major Paul Hobson,²⁸⁴ a noted Particular Baptist to establish Baptist congregations in Newcastle and the Tyne Valley, including at Hexham.²⁸⁵

As Scott Spurlock has argued, a major policy objective of Cromwell's Scottish campaign was to reduce the domination of the Presbyterian Kirk, considered misguided in its beliefs and largely responsible for the second and third civil wars.²⁸⁶ A principle means of achieving this objective was through the establishment in Scotland, of a religious 'open marketplace' of English traditions of independent gathered churches.²⁸⁷ This included the Baptist church, at that time prevalent in particular parts of the army.²⁸⁸

Lilburne's time as Scotland commander in chief was relatively unsuccessful, as he struggled to combat a guerrilla style royalist rising led by the earl of

²⁸³ Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena, or, A catalogue and discovery of many of the errours, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of this time* (London: 1646), pp. 88 – 99. 100 – 105; David Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England*, (London: 1846), pp. 33, 41 – 42; A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (London: Baptist Union Publications Dept, 1947), pp. 75 – 76, 85; Derek Hirst, 'Security and Reform in England's Other Nations, 1649 – 1658, in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 178.

²⁸⁴ Richard L. Greaves, 'Hobson, Paul (d. 1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37554>, accessed 15 May 2017].

²⁸⁵ Coward, 'Lilburne, Robert'; Howell, Jr, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, pp. 248 – 249; Howell, Jr, 'The Army and the Case of Robert Lilburne', p. 184.

²⁸⁶ R. Scott Spurlock, *Cromwell and Scotland Conquest and Religion, 1650 – 1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007), pp. 8 – 35; Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland*, pp. 2 – 12.

²⁸⁷ R. Scott, Spurlock, 'State, Politics and Society in Scotland 1637 – 1660', in *The Oxford Handbook* ed. by Braddick, p. 367.

²⁸⁸ Mark Bell, 'Freedom to form: the development of Baptist movements during the English Revolution', in *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. by Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 190 – 191; Spurlock, *Cromwell and Scotland*, pp. 39 – 71; Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England*, pp. 116 – 118.

Glencairn, when attention, resources and support from Whitehall were lacking.²⁸⁹ However, as an ardent Baptist himself, Lilburne did all he could to promote their cause in Scotland.²⁹⁰ The success of this mission is reflected in concerns within the Kirk about the emergence of “new Scots Dippers.”²⁹¹ Significantly however, Spurlock highlights Lilburne’s links with Hexham Baptists and the ends to which he went to enlist the support of this congregation for service in Scotland.²⁹² Spurlock suggests that Lilburne may have had correspondence with other English Baptist congregations with whom he had contact, regarding missionary work in Scotland. Lilburne’s links with Hexham Baptists were probably forged during his tenure as Newcastle governor, when he supported the establishment of these Baptist communities,²⁹³ amongst the earliest in northern England.²⁹⁴ This evidence therefore strongly suggests that Lilburne applied his own agenda of supporting the development of the Baptist denomination, and utilised northern religious communities he had helped establish as a network as part of this mission within Scotland. The fact that this policy was pursued up to his departure in early 1654 highlights the relevance of this approach for how Lilburne would later apply himself as major-general. This further adds to the argument that Lilburne pursued his own agenda in matters of religion

²⁸⁹ Aylmer, *The State’s Servants*, pp. 261 – 262.

²⁹⁰ Spurlock, *Cromwell and Scotland*, p. 163; Howell, Jr, ‘The Army and the Case of Robert Lilburne’, pp. 185 – 186; Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland*, p. 99.

²⁹¹ Bulstrode Whitelocke, *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: Oxford University Press, 1853), Vol 3, p. 481.

²⁹² Spurlock, *Cromwell and Scotland*, pp. 162 – 165; Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals*, p. 51.

²⁹³ Coward, ‘Lilburne, Robert’; Howell, Jr, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, pp. 248 – 249; Howell, Jr, ‘The Army and the Case of Robert Lilburne’, p. 184

²⁹⁴ Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches*, pp. 5 – 10.

using authority arising from his office to promote the interests of the English Baptist faith in which he believed.

Lilburne's willingness to use his office to support radical religious causes with which he sympathised is also seen in his role as governor of York, to which he was appointed following his departure from Scotland in April 1654. During his role as governor of York, Lilburne supported Yorkshire Quakers.²⁹⁵

Shortly after Lilburne's arrival in York, the Yorkshire Quaker Thomas Aldman wrote: "we have great friendship, and love from the governer of the Towne" Additionally, several of Lilburne's soldiers, including two troop commanders were actively involved in the Quaker movement.²⁹⁶

Lilburne's support for the Quakers is itself of particular relevance as by January 1654 Yorkshire was one of the northern counties in which Quakerism flourished, and is in marked contrast to the attitude of his colleague Charles Howard who, as we have seen earlier supported criticisms of Quakers from within his localities.²⁹⁷ This provides further evidence of Lilburne's willingness to tolerate radical forms of religion and the use of his office to support this in terms of policy; illustrating how he used discretion to favour groups and causes with which he was in broad agreement.

Lilburne's strenuous pursuit of local royalists in the immediate aftermath of the failed risings in March 1655 demonstrates his strong dislike of those who had abused their position and his local agenda, which involved punishing them for their disloyalty. In addition to showing his attitude towards local

²⁹⁵ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 51.

²⁹⁶ David Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York, 1640 – 1700' (University of York, unpublished doctoral thesis, 1990), pp. 29 – 30; Phil Withington, 'Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York', *Past & Present*, No. 170 (2001), p. 140.

²⁹⁷ William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan, 1912); Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985), p. 10.

royalists, Lilburne's arrest of Lord John Belasyse also provides insight into his relationship with his superior John Lambert, demonstrating the close bond which existed between the two men.

Lilburne's position as governor of York meant that he was well placed to begin the task of rounding up suspects immediately following the abortive royalist rising of 8th March 1655, which took place outside York.²⁹⁸ In late June 1655 Lilburne reported to Thurloe that he had arrested Lord John Belasyse and asked to "know his highness pleasure about him [...] and shall be glad to know what you doe in generall with such kind of cattle".²⁹⁹

Belasyse, one of the leading members of the 'Sealed Knot', a secret royalist organisation established to coordinate actions aimed at restoring the monarchy, was however related to John Lambert by marriage.³⁰⁰

It appears that the two maintained a reasonably cordial relationship, despite one party being a Catholic and a notorious royalist and the other, a Cromwellian grandee.³⁰¹ There is evidence that several months following his arrest by Lilburne, Lambert intervened on Belasyse's behalf to allow his escape to France.³⁰² Lilburne was aware of Lambert's sympathy for his royalist kin, as when writing to the latter in March 1655, he admonished

²⁹⁸ David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660* (Hamden, Conn: Archon Books 1971), pp. 139 – 141; Durston, *Cromwell's major-generals*, p. 17,

²⁹⁹ 'State Papers, 1655: June (7 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 3, December 1654 - August 1655, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 587-599. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol3/pp587-599> [accessed 19 March 2016].

³⁰⁰ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 75 – 78; Bennett, *The English Civil War*, p. 217

³⁰¹ Farr, *John Lambert Parliamentary Soldier*, p. 163.

³⁰² *Ibid*, pp. 164 – 167.

Lambert: "I hope the greate estates these blaides leave behinde them will pay for all the charge, if you forgive them not againe."³⁰³

The Bellasyse family were well known to Lilburne, because both had northern connections through their residency in Durham and north Yorkshire, as well as associations through the colliery business activities of George Lilburne, and Richard Lilburne's property links around the Bishop Auckland area.³⁰⁴ This plainly establishes the close friendship between Lilburne and Lambert, the latter a powerful northern Parliamentarian, who had assisted Lilburne's career, and who no doubt nominated him for appointment as one of his deputy major-generals.

The degree of contempt and vehemence apparent within Lilburne's comments about Belasyse confirm he reserved particular criticism for senior local royalists. The strength of Lilburne's comments regarding Belasyse are also indicative of a commitment to purge northern communities, where he had particular connections, of perfidious royalists; further confirming Lilburne's local agenda.

Lilburne as Major-General

Lilburne's experience and connections both in Durham and with leading parliamentarians within Yorkshire made him a logical choice as one of Lambert's deputies. In October 1655, the Council of State gave final approval

³⁰³ State Papers, 1655: March (3 of 8)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Volume 3, December 1654 - August 1655*, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 219-238. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol3/pp219-238> [accessed 27 May 2016].

³⁰⁴ James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society*, pp. 170 – 173; Christine M. Newman, 'Bellasis family (*per. c.1500–1653*)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/71863>, accessed 27 May 2017]; Pauline Gregg, *Free-born John: a biography of John Lilburne* (London: Dent, 1986), p. 26.

to the establishment of the scheme for the major-generals.³⁰⁵ In so doing, Lambert was made major-general with responsibility for Cumberland, Durham, Northumberland, Westmorland and Yorkshire³⁰⁶. Additionally it was decided that Robert Lilburne and Charles Howard would be appointed as Lambert's deputies in Durham and Yorkshire, and Cumberland, Northumberland and Westmorland respectively.

Whilst Lilburne and Howard were formally Lambert's deputies, they both exercised full executive authority under the Council, without any need to refer to Lambert for approval implying great trust.³⁰⁷ In Howard's case this might reflect his powerful position in the far north-west. However, Lilburne's position clearly reflected the close affiliation between Lambert and himself, adding further confirmation of the strength of this relationship. In addition to his close bond with Lambert, Lilburne had connections with other leading Yorkshire parliamentarians such as Adam Baynes and Sir William Constable.³⁰⁸ Furthermore, Lilburne's family standing and position within Durham, his outstanding military record and his experience of civil administration whilst in Newcastle, York and in Scotland made him a natural choice as one of Lambert's deputies.

From the start of his work as major-general, Lilburne took steps to secure his position through favouring those supportive of his cause. Additionally, Lilburne was closely involved in his association, showing his diligence and interest in local affairs. At an early stage Lilburne made recommendations

³⁰⁵ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 26.

³⁰⁶ Ibid, p. 27.

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

³⁰⁸ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 5.

regarding the application of the decimation tax, demonstrating his understanding of the local situation in his association and his willingness to communicate his recommendations to government.

Lilburne wrote to Cromwell on 7th December explaining how he intended to call the Yorkshire commissioners to meet him at York to “to put our business into some method of procedure, and intend, God willing, to prosecute it with all diligence”.³⁰⁹ Lilburne goes on to request the return of Alderman Thomas Dickinson, an important merchant of some standing supportive of the Cromwellian regime.³¹⁰ This shows that Lilburne was keen to place those he considered supportive of his role within the city corporation. Lilburne wrote to Cromwell again on 15th December. In this letter he reports positively that 30 of those identified to support him as commissioners for the county of York had attended when required and had begun to apply the decimation tax.

Even at this early stage in its application, Lilburne recommended that the threshold at which the tax became payable should be lowered otherwise “are a more considerable number then those that are taxt, escape, I may say, unpunished”.³¹¹ This demonstrates Lilburne’s diligence and commitment to his role as well as his knowledge of local circumstances, confirming the benefits of appointing those with local knowledge as major-general.

³⁰⁹ 'State Papers, 1655: December (2 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 287-301. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp287-301> [accessed 23 March 2016].

³¹⁰ Austin Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (London: Phoenix Press, 1982), p. 169; Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York', pp. 258 - 259.

³¹¹ 'State Papers, 1655: December (4 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 318-332. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp318-332> [accessed 23 March 2016].

Lilburne used his judgement in individual cases to make recommendations regarding those he considered had been not been treated appropriately. This shows that Lilburne was discerning in his judgement of former royalists who had not broken the peace. This can be seen in Lilburne's letter to Cromwell of 31st December 1655 on behalf of William Brasse, one of his 'neighbours' in Durham, declared a delinquent due to his civil war activity, and as such being within the scope of the decimation tax. Lilburne requested Brasse be discharged as he: "bee of a very sober, honest, and peaceable disposition, and a well-wisher to the peace of the common-wealth"³¹². Whilst the outcome of this petition is unknown, this further demonstrates that Lilburne did not automatically condemn all former royalists, and used discretion on behalf of those in his locality, where he considered this appropriate.

Lilburne's concern about the effect of central decisions on local matters for which he was responsible is seen in his communication of 22nd January 1656. Within this Lilburne complained to Thurloe that whilst he and his commissioners were active in applying the new tax, the government was not helping, in that "you clip our stocke too much with your suspensions". This was a reference to government action to reduce the tax of royalists who appealed local commissioners' decisions.³¹³

Durston estimates that approximately a quarter of royalists assessed to pay the tax attempted to avoid payment by petitioning government for an

³¹² 'State Papers, 1655: December (7 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 357-369. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp357-369> [accessed 9 June 2014].

³¹³ 'State Papers, 1656: January (6 of 9)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 440-453. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp440-453> [accessed 9 June 2016].

exemption.³¹⁴ This added to local financial pressures due to the inadequacy of the amount of tax collected to meet the costs of the local militia. Lilburne's comments therefore reflect not only his concern regarding decisions by central authorities, made without any reference to himself as major-general with local responsibility, but also the effect this would have on his ability to maintain security through his local militia. As seen earlier this was an area in which Lilburne had been particularly active. Accordingly, Lilburne's comments demonstrate his frustration with central intervention in local matters for which he was responsible, highlighting his expectation that the central authorities should support, rather than undermine this.

Lilburne's radical Baptist religious beliefs are visible in a number of letters sent to Cromwell in January 1656. These show how he carried out his religious values in his work as major-general by applying local policies to deal with local godly reformation within his association. In his letter to Cromwell dated 7th January, Lilburne cautioned against the appointment of Richard Robinson as High Sheriff of Yorkshire as he considered him "as one somewhat of a loose conversation, and one that is too much addicted to tippling, and that which is called good-fellowship"³¹⁵. Robinson's non-appointment suggests Lilburne's comments achieved their objective.

On 8th January 1656, Lilburne and the Yorkshire Commissioners wrote to Cromwell presenting a petition pressing for action against "many stewards of courts, solicitors, attornies, and other officers in these parts, who have been

³¹⁴ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 107 – 110.

³¹⁵ 'State Papers, 1656: January (2 of 9)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 385-397. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp385-397> [accessed 9 June 2014].

very stirring for the late king's party".³¹⁶ Finally, on 25th January Lilburne wrote to the Cromwell about a number of issues including, "with great and hainous complaint of the wicked carriage of many excisemen, (many of whom are desperate cavalleires) are thinking of representing some expedient to your highnes about the excise of ale and beere". Lilburne recommended the adoption of a scheme to regulate alehouses which he suggested would not only raise revenue but also "take away those great abuses in the present collectors thereof, and will not be a little satisfaction to thousands of people, and tend much to the knitting the hearts of abundance of people in affection to your highness, and great satisfaction to the people in generall in these counties".³¹⁷ This demonstrates how Lilburne actively pursued godly reformation within the localities for which he was responsible. This included addressing various local abuses which he considered existed. In response to these Lilburne put forward his own proposed local administrative scheme, demonstrating his commitment to localism.

Lilburne's concentration on matters within Yorkshire shows that he relied on his family's local power and connections within Durham to effectively administer the county on his behalf. Lilburne spent a considerable part of his time dealing with issues in Yorkshire, and it was only in February 1656 that he travelled to Durham to deal with business there.³¹⁸ He appears to have

³¹⁶ 'State Papers, 1656: January (3 of 9)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 398-412. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp488-501> [accessed 9 June 2014].

³¹⁷ 'State Papers, 1656: January (8 of 9)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 463-473. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp.463-473> [accessed 9 June 2016].

³¹⁸ 'State Papers, 1656: February (1 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 488-501.

left much of the work in his home county in the hands of his local commissioners.

As Lilburne's father, uncle and cousin were all local commissioners, it is likely that he would have had great confidence that the Durham commissioners would act in his interest.³¹⁹ This clearly demonstrates how the Lilburne family used their local position to dominate Durham administration at this time. Additionally, this shows how Lilburne made use of his family to support him in his role.

Lilburne's strong commitment to local godly reform is demonstrated in how he remodelled local arrangements for the scrutiny of local ministry and schooling within his association. This action formed Lilburne's local response to local apathy towards national policy for the ordinance for the ejection of scandalous ministers and schoolmasters, which formed part of his responsibilities as major-general.³²⁰

Lilburne's letter to Cromwell dated 22nd March advises of difficulty in appointing sufficient commissioners from applying this ordinance within the counties of Durham and York. Lilburne suggested merging the three separate commissions for each Yorkshire Riding into one and also called for the appointment of new commissioners.³²¹ This shows that not only that few

British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp488-501> [accessed 9 June 2014].

³¹⁹ Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', p. 282; 'State Papers, 1656: February (4 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 535-548. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp535-548> [accessed 9 June 2016].

³²⁰ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 154.

³²¹ 'State Papers, 1656: March (7 of 8)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 639-652. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp639-652> [accessed 9 June 2014].

local people were willing to step forward to carry out this work, considered an important part of Cromwell's reformation of manners, but also how Lilburne adapted administrative arrangements in the light of these shortcomings. This demonstrates Lilburne's strong commitment to radical godly reformation at local level and his commitment to remodel local arrangements to ensure that objectives could be realised at local level.

During his tenure as major-general, Lilburne maintained a close interest in matters relating to his centre of power in Durham, showing his commitment to this locality and his standing within this. In July 1656, Lilburne was in correspondence with Thurloe regarding complaints made by Sir Arthur Hesilrige against Christopher Mickleton a lawyer representing former tenants of the bishop of Durham.³²² These estates had been acquired by Hesilrige, who attempted to remove the customary tenure by which the tenants held their land.³²³ The tenants response labelled Hesilrige an 'oppressive landlord' and according to Lilburne had "given check to Sir Arthur's furious demands"; resulting in his complaint.³²⁴ Whilst Lilburne does not appear to have intervened in this matter involving his family's rival, his interest shows that during his tenure as major-general he maintained a close interest in the affairs of his locality, in which he was clearly viewed as an individual with great power and influence.

³²² Sheila Doyle, 'Mickleton, Christopher (bap. 1612, d. 1669)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70468>, accessed 9 June 2016].

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ 'State Papers, 1656: July (5 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 5, May 1656 - January 1657, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 228-243. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol5/pp228-243> [accessed 23 March 2016].

As major-general, Lilburne advocated support for the foundation of Durham college, an institution intended to benefit the entire north of England. This clearly demonstrates Lilburne's close connections with his local community together with his ambition to achieve social improvement along with godly reform. The Lilburne family played an important part in the foundation of the college, and Robert Lilburne's role within this is therefore material to the argument that as major-general he pursued a distinctive local agenda.

The idea of founding universities or colleges outside of Oxford and Cambridge emerged during the 1640's, with the submission of separate petitions for universities in Manchester, London and York.³²⁵ In 1649 George Lilburne proposed the formation of a university in Durham and, in 1650 a petition was submitted to the House of Commons by the inhabitants of the city seeking to create a "Colledge or Schoole of literature or Academy [...] for the future benefit of these Northern Counties that are so remote from the Universities".³²⁶

In May 1650 the House considered the petition and asked the House Committee for Obstructions to identify suitable property for the foundation. In June 1651, the Committee confirmed its support for the proposals which would "be a pious and laudable Work, and of very great Use for the Northern Parts."³²⁷ By January 1656, the project was being considered further. This is confirmed in Robert Lilburne's letter to Thurloe dated 22nd January 1656, in

³²⁵ C. H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England* (New York: Putnam, 1906), p. 355; Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Ninth report of the royal commission on historical manuscripts* (London: HMSO, 1883-4). Appendix 2, pp. 432 – 432.

³²⁶ Bodleian Library, Tanner MSS, 56, fol. 207, 24 April 1650, quoted in Howell, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, p. 331.

³²⁷ House of Commons Journal Volume 6: 18 June 1651', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 6, 1648-1651* (London, 1802), pp. 589-590. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol6/pp589-590> [accessed 10 June 2016].

which he states: "I hope you will alsoe be pleased to further our addresse about a colledge. I doubt not but it will turne to the greate renowne of his highnes, and very much affect the inhabitants of that poore county and citty to him and the government."³²⁸ This clearly shows that Lilburne was using his office as major-general to support a local cause to which he and his family were strongly committed.

Along with other members of his family and their supporters, Robert Lilburne was a leading advocate for the foundation of Durham college, demonstrating his commitment to this major local cause. Additionally the college received wider support from other northern English communities, demonstrating the strength and popularity of this proposition. Whilst the foundation of the college was eventually abandoned following Cromwell's death, this in no way undermines the commitment to local social improvement and reform demonstrated by Robert Lilburne. In March 1656 preparations for the college were agreed by the Council of State which approved statutes for its governance.³²⁹ By April 1656 a number of northern localities including Berwick, Newcastle and parts of Northumberland were showing support for the proposal and, inhabitants of Durham petitioned the Council for further action. At this point the Council authorised a named group "to receive the

³²⁸ 'State Papers, 1656: January (6 of 9)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 440-453. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp440-453> [accessed 9 June 2016].

³²⁹ 'Volume 125: March 1656', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 206-245. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp206-245> [accessed 10 June 2016].

free subscriptions, and return them to Council, who desire the work to be carried on so as to be most advantageous to the northern counties.”³³⁰

Along with other influential northerners such as John Lambert and Charles Howard, Robert Lilburne was included within the list of those responsible for the creation of the college, and later together with his father and cousin Thomas, were listed amongst its visitors.³³¹ Whilst letters patent were issued by Cromwell for the college’s creation, and the names of its provost and fellows were also published, the concept foundered after his death in 1658, following opposition from a number of sources including the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.³³²

During the summer of 1656 the government’s increasing financial difficulties coupled with what was effectively a state of war with Spain, led to Cromwell calling a Parliament in the hope that this would grant monies to alleviate the crisis. Coward suggests that this decision was heavily influenced by the prediction by some major-generals that the election would produce MP’s more supportive of the government than those elected in 1654.³³³ The major-generals’ confidence was however misplaced, as during the 1656 election process a number of incidents occurred displaying hostility to the repressive

³³⁰ 'Volume 126: April 1656', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 245-304. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp245-304> [accessed 10 June 2016].

³³¹ Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs', pp. 300 – 304.

³³² J. T. Fowler, *Durham University: Earlier Foundations and Present Colleges* (London: F. E. Robinson, 1904), pp. 15 – 21; Howell, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, p. 334; Blair Worden, *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 155- 156.

³³³ Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 74 – 76.

measures taken by government during 1655, including the major-generals' regime.³³⁴

On 9th August Lilburne reported to Thurloe that known government opponents "laide their designes there, how to drive on their worke, and to communicate councill and proceedings to each county" and that "the same spiritt is gott into the county of Durham and Northumberland, where the people [...] are perfect in their lesson, saying they will have noe swordmen, noe decimator, or any that receives sallary from the state to serve in parliament". Lilburne considered Hesilrige, an opponent of the Protectorate, was behind opposition in Newcastle, from where he had received compliments from the corporation.³³⁵

Lilburne's letter to Cromwell of 16th August 1656 however expressed greater confidence regarding the election outcome³³⁶. Whilst Lilburne was elected for the North Riding of Yorkshire, he was not successful in preventing those opposed to the government being elected. For example, Hesilrige was returned, although subsequently excluded on the basis of perceived opposition to the government.³³⁷ This shows the limitations of Lilburne's influence in a situation which provided those ill-disposed to the Protectorate with the opportunity to register their opposition. Lilburne's experience was

³³⁴ Durston, *Cromwell's major-generals*, pp. 189 – 190. 196.

³³⁵ 'State Papers, 1656: August (3 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 5, May 1656 - January 1657, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 287-300. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol5/pp287-300> [accessed 11 June 2014].

³³⁶ 'State Papers, 1656: August (5 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 5, May 1656 - January 1657, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 316-332. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol5/pp316-332> [accessed 11 June 2014].

³³⁷ Patrick Little and David. L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 90.

however no different to that of other major-generals who all failed to produce an election outcome favourable to the government.³³⁸

The above analysis provides compelling evidence of the existence of Robert Lilburne's radical Baptist beliefs and how he applied these in his role as major-general. Additionally, in both his work as commander in chief in Scotland and as major-general Lilburne actively used his office to further his own causes and policy initiatives, additional to those required by government. Whilst also reflecting Lilburne's strong religious convictions these also demonstrate his degree of identification with particular localities with which he had involvement.

In addition, in his work as major-general Lilburne utilised his family's power and influence within his native Durham to enable him to concentrate his efforts on security and reform in Yorkshire, which due to its size and degree of latent royalism represented his greatest priority. Whilst Lilburne showed loyalty to Cromwell and particularly welcomed the introduction of the Protectorate, his main bonds and linkages to the Cromwellian regime were through Lambert and his northern associates. This provided Lilburne with further strong identification with northern England, which formed his powerbase.

Lilburne's military background and his identification with the politics of the army made him strongly opposed to royalists who he considered had abused their position, both locally and nationally. However, Lilburne's military career and his experience in civil administration gained within the challenging

³³⁸ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 187 – 205.

context of Scotland and as governor of large northern English towns made him an excellent choice as Lambert's deputy, a role which he undertook with ease. As major-general Lilburne clearly promoted local causes and initiatives which accorded with his strong religious convictions, or which he believed to be to the benefit of the communities with which he identified. These clearly confirm his role as a local actor who pursued his own agenda rather than that dictated by central government.

Chapter 3 - Charles Worsley

Charles Worsley was both a state agent and a local actor with a clear local agenda. Worsley was however only able to achieve prominence and influence locally, following his appointment to a state agent role of national importance. Worsley's strong religious beliefs and how he attempted to apply these demonstrate his commitment to moral reform to achieve godly outcomes in the localities for which he was responsible, which formed part of a discernible local agenda.

Worsley utilised and exploited his role as a state agent to implement these objectives locally, which in marked contrast to his colleague Charles Howard, could not have been achieved without his position within the Cromwellian administration. Appreciating Worsley's identity as state agent and local actor therefore are integral to a meaningful assessment of his role as major-general for Cheshire, Lancashire and Staffordshire.

Without his role as a state agent, Charles Worsley would have most likely remained a relatively obscure minor gentry figure within Manchester, with little opportunity to apply his beliefs. It is therefore argued that Worsley's role as a moral reformer in the north west of England, with a distinctive local agenda was dependent upon his status and identity as a state agent, through his role as major-general. His appointment as major-general not only provided Worsley with power and influence over communities within Cheshire and Staffordshire, where he would have been little known, but also significantly enhanced his status in Lancashire, allowing him to improve his standing within his home county. The growth of Worsley's power resulted

from Cromwell's patronage and support; and that once Cromwell's interest in the major-generals wavered, Worsley's influence within the regime became less clear.

The Worsley family had strong connections with the parliamentary cause in Manchester during the civil war period. Furthermore, both Charles Worsley and his father Raphe held radical religious beliefs, marking them out from the mainstream Presbyterian community of the town. Charles Worsley (1622-56), was the eldest son of Raphe Worsley a prosperous woollen merchant who had built up an estate at Platt in the south of Manchester, and in his lifetime was able to describe himself as gentleman.³³⁹ Throughout the civil war period, Raphe Worsley was a strong supporter of Parliament and served on the Parliamentary Committee of Accounts sitting at Manchester in 1648, confirming his status as an important figure within the town.³⁴⁰

Along with several other figures within the town, Raphe Worsley purchased capitular land which had belonged to the Collegiate Church, prior to the abolition of the episcopacy during the 1640's.³⁴¹ Raphe Worsley was closely associated with the Manchester merchant, financier and philanthropist Humphrey Chetham who is described as a 'parliamentarian friend'.³⁴² The family is listed as being amongst the Manchester gentry by Richard Hollingworth, a Presbyterian minister at the Manchester Collegiate Church, in

³³⁹ Christopher Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29980, accessed 11 Oct 2012]

³⁴⁰ John Booker, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, (Manchester, Chetham Society, 1859), p. 28; B. G. Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Gentry and the Great Rebellion 1640 – 1660* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1978), p. 85

³⁴¹ Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry*, p. 89.

³⁴² S. J. Guscott, *Humphrey Chetham 1580 – 1653 Fortune, Politics and Mercantile Culture in Seventeenth Century England* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 2003), p. 245.

his history of the town published in 1656.³⁴³ It is therefore clear that during the civil war and republican periods Raphe and Charles Worsley were rising figures of minor gentry status, in their home town of Manchester, with connections with the parliamentary cause and leading local merchants. However, there is little evidence that at this stage, the Worsley family had influence beyond their home territorial base within south east Lancashire.

Unlike large parts of Lancashire, which during the 1640's were known for the deeply embedded nature of Catholicism and the poor quality of its local ministry, the south-east of the county including Manchester was a centre of puritanism. The Worsley's were part of a small group of religious radicals within this.³⁴⁴ The Collegiate Church was led by prominent Presbyterians including its Warden, Richard Heyricke, and his colleague Richard Hollingsworth, who both subsequently undertook important roles in the religious life of the town.³⁴⁵ Whilst having connections with Heyricke, Raphe Worsley is listed as one of the leading contributors to the endowment fund of Birch Chapel, Rusholme, established as a chapel for Independent worship.³⁴⁶ The commitment of Raphe and Charles Worsley to religious Independency in Manchester is evidenced by the baptism of Charles Worsley's sons by prominent local Independent ministers, and also by the involvement of both Worsley's in the cause of the Independency in the

³⁴³ Richard. Hollingworth, *Mancuniensis or a history of the towne of Manchester and what is most memorable concerning it* (Manchester: 1656), p. 75.

³⁴⁴ R C. Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England A regional study of the diocese of Chester to 1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972). , pp. 8 – 13.

³⁴⁵ Michael Mullett, 'Heyrick, Richard (1600–1667)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13175>, accessed 9 Feb 2016; C. W. Sutton, 'Hollinworth, Richard (bap. 1607, d. 1656)', rev. R. C. Richardson, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13565>, accessed 9 Feb 2016]

³⁴⁶ Booker, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, pp. 137 – 139.

town.³⁴⁷ Both Raphe and Charles Worsley were amongst a number of inhabitants of Manchester who in the mid-1640's signed petitions to Parliament seeking to improve the Independent chapelry. The petition sought the "planting of a godly and constant ministry" in the parishes' chapels; and that the inhabitants of each: "have liberty to elect their own ministers".³⁴⁸ The petition also called for the reallocation of tithes from the Collegiate Church to fund Independent ministry within the parish.³⁴⁹ This shows that within their home town of Manchester, already at that time a strong centre of puritanism in North-West England, both Charles Worsley and his father Raphe were part of a small group of radical activists who advocated the cause of religious Independence.

Worsley rose to prominence during the third civil war (1650-51) as a result of Cromwell's patronage. Worsley held the rank of captain during the first civil war where it is most likely that he served with local forces.³⁵⁰ John Morrill suggests that Worsley profiteered from the estates of sequestered royalists and acted as a state informer.³⁵¹ However it is uncertain whether all of Worsley's motives can be ascribed in this manner. B. G. Blackwood argues that whilst individuals such as Worsley had "an eye to the main chance"

³⁴⁷ Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)'; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Worsley, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 11. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

³⁴⁸ Manchester Archives, Assheton Papers, *The Humble Petition of the Gentlemen, Ministers and Freeholders and other inhabitants of the parish of Manchester in the County Palatine of Lancaster*, E7/28/5/8a-b.

³⁴⁹ Ibid.

³⁵⁰ J. E. Bailey, 'Major-General Charles Worsley, M.P. for Manchester 1654', *Reprinted from the Manchester Guardian*, 28th December 1885 (Manchester: 1886); R. N. Dore. *The Manchester Guardian*, 12 June 1956, pp. 6 – 7; C. H. Firth and Godfrey Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army*, 2 volumes (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), vol 2, pp. 481 – 486; Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)'; Henry Reece, *The Army in Cromwellian England 1649 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 41.

³⁵¹ John. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630 – 1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 276 – 277.

some acquisitions might have been in lieu of arrears of pay, a common practice at the time.³⁵² Whilst the reasons for this are not known, in July 1650 Cromwell himself appointed Worsley to command a new regiment of foot soldiers raised in Lancashire, granting him the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. These troops were mustered at Cheetham Hill, Manchester and later the same year became known as 'The Lord General's Regiment'.³⁵³ Worsley's appointment confirms that he must have made a strong impression on Cromwell, who had a reputation for "knowinge men better than any other man".³⁵⁴ David Scott acknowledges that as Cromwell's second in command, Worsley was a trusted subordinate.³⁵⁵ It is likely therefore that Worsley would have gained close access to Cromwell, a unique and important opportunity for an aspiring young man.

Worsley appointed his neighbours and associates to positions of importance within the regiment. For example, his neighbour, Oliver Edge was made captain and John Wigan; curate at Birch Chapel was made major.³⁵⁶ After serving in Scotland Worsley assisted in activities against the earl of Derby in Lancashire and the Isle of Man. Arising from this, in 1652 Worsley gave evidence against the countess of Derby regarding her defence of the

³⁵² Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry*, p. 92.

³⁵³ Booker, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, p. 37; J. M. Gratton, *The Parliamentary and Royalist War Effort in Lancashire 1642 – 1651* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 2010), p. 301.

³⁵⁴ 'State Papers, 1657: November (2 of 5)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 6, January 1657 - March 1658, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 600-613. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol6/pp600-613> [accessed 19 July 2017].

³⁵⁵ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Worsley for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 6. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

³⁵⁶ Booker, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, pp. 11, 138; Firth and Davies, *The Regimental History*, Vol 2, pp. 482 – 485.

island.³⁵⁷ This clearly demonstrates that whilst in the late 1640's Charles Worsley's career progressed relatively slowly at local level in the Lancashire area, his advancement increased significantly with Cromwell's support and patronage. Worsley's links with Cromwell increased his standing and influence within the regime nationally and strengthened his credentials within Lancashire; visible in the appointments he made to his regiment. Blair Worden's acute observation that Cromwell: "was an able spotter of efficient and politically malleable administrators", might also provide some insight into why Cromwell selected Worsley for such a senior military position.³⁵⁸

Worsley took action to challenge corrupt practice even where this involved challenging those in authority, and was prepared to do this to his advantage. In 1651 Worsley brought a case before the Committee for the Advance of Money alleging that, Sir William Brereton, a senior Parliamentary grandee and former commander in Cheshire, of illegally possessing an estate of the forfeited earl of Derby in Macclesfield Forest.³⁵⁹ The case dragged on until November 1654 when the Committee declared that Brereton had no case to answer and should be discharged.³⁶⁰ Paul Pinckney says that whilst Worsley was in essence a "transparently honest but ambitious man" his

³⁵⁷ 'Cases brought before the committee: January 1651', in *Calendar, Committee For the Advance of Money: Part 3, 1650-55*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1888), pp. 1295-1310 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/ezproxy.mmu.ac.uk/cttee-advance-money/pt3/pp1295-1310> [accessed 5 February 2016]; Sonja Kmec, *Across the Channel Noblewomen in Seventeenth-Century France and England* (Trier: Kliomedia, 2010), pp. 236 – 241.

³⁵⁸ Blair Worden, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Council', in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. by Patrick Little (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), p. 87.

³⁵⁹ 'Cases brought before the committee: July 1651', *Calendar, Committee for the Advance of Money: Part 3: 1650-55* (1888), pp. 1354-1361. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=59440> Date accessed: 01 November 2012.

³⁶⁰ 'Cases brought before the committee: July 1651', in *Calendar, Committee For the Advance of Money: Part 3, 1650-55*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1888), pp. 1354-1361 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/ezproxy.mmu.ac.uk/cttee-advance-money/pt3/pp1354-1361> [accessed 5 February 2016].

motivation for this action was to expose what he viewed as corrupt practices and also to gain the discoverers fee for which he would have been eligible.³⁶¹

During the first civil war, Brereton was a major figure in parliamentary forces in Cheshire and Staffordshire and had been well rewarded for his efforts.³⁶²

Worsley was one of a group of army officers closely associated with Cromwell, and who shared the latter's views about the corrupt and abusive behaviour of the Rump Parliament. Worsley's subsequent role in the expulsion of the Rump clearly demonstrates he had the Lord General's trust. In August 1652, Worsley was part of a group of army officers, led by Cromwell's cousin, Edward Whalley, who presented a petition to Parliament, calling for the Rump to set a fixed period to its sitting and to bring in qualifications for electing those "faithful to the interest of the commonwealth".³⁶³ This was part of the build-up to Cromwell's forced ending of the Rump in 1653 and Worsley's involvement shows that he was an active member of the army leadership in its dispute with Parliament. Furthermore, in April 1653, Cromwell selected Worsley to command the soldiers who cleared the chamber of the House of Commons, when he dissolved the Rump Parliament.³⁶⁴

³⁶¹ Paul. J. Pinckney 'The Cheshire Election of 1656', reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Volume 49, No. 2, Spring (1967), pp. 408 – 409.

³⁶² John Morrill, 'Brereton, Sir William, first baronet (1604–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2013 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3333, accessed 19 July 2017]

³⁶³ Commons Journal vii. 164b; 'To the Supreame Authoritie the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England' (1652), 669 f.16/62; 'House of Commons Journal Volume 7: 13 August 1652', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 7, 1651-1660* (London, 1802), pp. 163-165. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol7/pp163-165> [accessed 23 September 2015]. Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament 1648 – 1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 307-8.

³⁶⁴ Booker, *The History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, p. 40; Abbott, *Writings and Speeches*, Vol 2, pp. 642, 643, 646.

During the period prior to his appointment as major-general, Worsley resided in London where he undertook a number of important tasks central to the functioning of the republican government. This provided Worsley with access to important and influential figures in the administration enhancing his status. During this period Worsley was consulted on matters regarding Manchester, showing that he was increasingly regarded as government's 'man of business' in Lancashire enhancing his reputation especially with his neighbours and supporters in the north-west.

The State Papers for the period 1653 up to his appointment as major-general in late 1655 confirm Worsley was one of those frequently tasked to work on committees,³⁶⁵ investigating various matters considered by the Council of State, including the security of the capital.³⁶⁶ During this period Worsley was appointed as Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, and following this for the city of Westminster.³⁶⁷ In August 1653 the Council of State sought Worsley's advice on a petition submitted on behalf of Manchester citizens by one John Hartley.³⁶⁸ Hartley, a wealthy Manchester draper and former Lancashire

³⁶⁵ 'Volume 37: June 1653', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1652-3*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1878), pp. 369-458. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1652-3/pp369-458> [accessed 29 May 2016].

³⁶⁶ 'Volume 72: June 1654', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1654*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1880), pp. 194-232. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1654/pp194-232> [accessed 29 May 2016].

³⁶⁷ 'State Papers, 1654: May (4 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 2, 1654, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 302-314. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol2/pp302-314> [accessed 29 May 2016]; 'State Papers, 1655: April (2 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 3, December 1654 - August 1655, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 349-363. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol3/pp349-363> [accessed 29 May 2016].

³⁶⁸ 'Volume 39: August 1653', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1653-4*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1879), pp. 64-121. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1653-4/pp64-121> [accessed 29 May 2016].

sheriff, would have been well known to Worsley.³⁶⁹ This shows that by this stage Worsley was one of a number of trusted individuals employed to support the work of government.

Worsley was appealing to the influential religious Independent community within London when in 1653 he wrote the preface to a religious work by the puritan divine Christopher Goad.³⁷⁰ This preface provides an important insight into how he would later operate as major-general. Additionally, Goad's linkage with Cromwell and leading aristocratic Independents suggests that Worsley's preface was designed to impress this select influential group.

Goad was regarded as a religious radical who held office first in Cambridge,³⁷¹ from which he resigned after his views caused offence.³⁷² Appointed lecturer at St Pancras, Soper Lane, London in the early 1640's, Goad ousted the sitting incumbent in a 'vestry coup'.³⁷³ Following Goad's departure, his position was taken by George Cockayne, one of the founders of the Fifth Monarchy movement,³⁷⁴ further enhancing the radical credentials of this congregation.³⁷⁵ Additionally, evidence confirms that Goad had strong

³⁶⁹ Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry*, pp.18, 85.

³⁷⁰ Christopher Goad, *Refreshing drops and scorching vials severally distributed to their proper subjects* (London: 1653).

³⁷¹ Andrew Barclay, *Electing Cromwell: The Making of a Politician* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011), p. 71; Alec Ryrie, 'Scripture, the Spirit and the Meaning of Radicalism in the English Revolution', in Bridget Heal and Anorthe Kremers (eds), *Radicalism and Dissent in the World of Protestant Reform*, (Volkswagen Stiftung, German Historical Institute Library, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), p. 106.

³⁷² Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, p. 72

³⁷³ Keith Lindley, *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), p. 58, n. 99.

³⁷⁴ Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men A Study in Seventeenth Century Millenarianism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), pp.60, 204 – 207; Tai Liu, 'Cokayn , George (bap. 1620, d. 1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5820>, accessed 19 July 2017]

³⁷⁵ Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy*, p. 272.

connections with Viscount Saye and Sele.³⁷⁶ Lord Saye was an influential parliamentarian aristocrat and a religious Independent with links to Cromwell.³⁷⁷ Furthermore, it is most likely that during the early 1640's, Goad had associations with Cromwell, who admired his beliefs and attended his services.³⁷⁸ As Goad's work was published posthumously it was relatively easy for Worsley to associate himself with Goad's beliefs. Whilst we do not know of any connections between Worsley and Saye, it is possible that his preface was designed to reinforce his identity within the London religious Independent community. This clearly demonstrates that Worsley employed his beliefs to enhance his identity and status within the Cromwellian world, including with those from aristocratic backgrounds.

Worsley's strong religious beliefs were used as the basis for his approach to his work as a major-general in implementing godly reformation. An examination of Worsley's preface confirms that at this time he held strongly apocalyptic and providential views explaining why he considered the need for godly reform to be so urgent. For example, the preface opens with the statement that: "It is time for us to be looking out of this world which grows old and is ready to vanish away".³⁷⁹ Further in the text Worsley claims: "We are the children of the last times, and upon us are the ends of the world".³⁸⁰ Both of these statements align closely with views of a strongly millenarian

³⁷⁶ Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, pp. 72 - 73; Shaw, *A history of the English church*, vol 2, pp. 317, 335.

³⁷⁷ David L. Smith, 'Fiennes, William, first Viscount Saye and Sele (1582–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9415>, accessed 19 July 2017]

³⁷⁸ Barclay, *Electing Cromwell*, pp. 70 – 73, 112 – 113.

³⁷⁹ Charles Worsley, Preface to Goad, *Refreshing Drops*, p. 6

³⁸⁰ Ibid.

nature.³⁸¹ Within the preface Worsley outlines his belief in the need for godly reformation. Three selected quotations are put forward to illustrate how these views underline Worsley's approach to godly reformation. Firstly, Worsley suggests: "men and their traditions have been the unquestioned authority, the light and the teaching of the Spirit in the Scriptures has been forgotten"³⁸²; secondly he later asks: "Is it not necessary the man of sin should first be revealed before Christ can come in his brightness"³⁸³ and finally: "the redeemed of the Lord shall return; and being filled with the Spirit, and restored to their first state, shall shine in the perfection of beauty and holiness".³⁸⁴ It is argued that within this preface Worsley clearly shows his belief that the 'New Jerusalem' will only be achieved through the removal of ungodly practices, providing an insight into how he viewed his subsequent role as major-general. It is also clear that Worsley's views closely match those of his mentor Oliver Cromwell at this time.³⁸⁵ Worsley's association with Cromwell and other regime grandees would have significantly enhanced his position and status within puritan communities in north-west England.

Charles Worsley no doubt welcomed the establishment of the Protectorate in late 1653, as this provided him further opportunities to develop his career both nationally and locally and also to apply his belief in the need for moral reform in the north of England. The terms of the Instrument of Government, the constitutional document, which established the Protectorate in 1654 also

³⁸¹ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 48 – 49.

³⁸² Worsley, Preface to Goad, Refreshing Drops, p. 6.

³⁸³ Worsley, Preface to Goad, Refreshing Drops, p. 7.

³⁸⁴ Worsley, Preface to Goad, Refreshing Drops, p. 9.

³⁸⁵ J. C. Davis, 'Cromwell's religion', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (London: Longman, 1990), pp. 190 – 191; Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (Harlow: Pearson, 1991), pp. 90 – 116; Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 15 – 18; J. C. Davis, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder Headline, 2001), pp. 130 – 131.

brought about the enfranchisement of several towns including Manchester.³⁸⁶

In September 1654 Worsley was elected MP for Manchester in the first Protectorate Parliament.³⁸⁷ This was no doubt a logical choice given his standing and position in the town, and one which reflected his increasing importance within the Lancashire political structure.

Scott suggests that Worsley was likely to have been consulted by the regime regarding Manchester's enfranchisement, further underlining Worsley's influence both nationally and locally.³⁸⁸ Whilst evidence does not exist regarding the reasons for Manchester's enfranchisement under the Instrument of Government, the three towns previously lacking parliamentary representation which became enfranchised were: Manchester, Durham, Leeds and Halifax.³⁸⁹ It will be clear that all were in the north of England. Additionally, the latter two towns had strong associations with John Lambert; believed to be the Instrument of Government's main architect.³⁹⁰ It is likely that Manchester's staunchly parliamentary past and, more importantly, the town's strong association with Worsley explain why it was granted

³⁸⁶ Vernon, F, Snow, 'Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution', *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 74, No. 292 (1959), pp. 413, 423, 439; Patrick Little and David, L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 49 – 53.

³⁸⁷ Manchester Archives, Declaration of election of Member of Parliament, 19 July 1654, GB127.M71/4/3/1; Christopher Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29980>, accessed 27 May 2012].

³⁸⁸ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Worsley, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, p. 8.

³⁸⁹ Snow, 'Parliamentary Reapportionment', p. 423.

³⁹⁰ David Farr, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major General 1619 – 1684* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 8 - 30; D. N. Farr, 'Lambert, John (bap. 1619, d. 1684)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15939>, accessed 2 Nov 2013]

parliamentary representation during the Protectorate era.³⁹¹ This therefore provides a clear demonstration of Worsley's increasing importance within the Cromwellian regime and how this was central to his status and position locally.

Worsley only became a powerful figure locally due to his connections with Cromwell, which can be seen in his office holding which he used as a means to expand his local standing and wealth. Worsley's progress in his military and administrative career increased his prosperity, as in 1653 and 1654 he purchased estates in Bolton, Bury and Salford belonging to the forfeited earl of Derby.³⁹² Worsley used local office holding as part of his strategy to expand his local power base in Lancashire. For example, in 1654 he obtained the office of clerk of the peace for the county following the removal of the existing office holder, one Joseph Rigby. In February 1654 details of a case in the Palatinate Court of the Duchy of Lancaster were reported to the Council of State. The case concerned an action involving Joseph Rigby regarding the office of clerk of the peace for Lancashire. This office, which was traditionally held by this branch of the Rigby family, could not be confirmed due to a legal technicality, regarding the expiration of the Act for the jurisdiction of the Palatinate Court. It appears however that Rigby continued to receive the profits of the office despite not being entitled to this. On 21st February the Council ordered Worsley to sequester the profits of the

³⁹¹ For details of Manchester's Parliamentary past see: R. N. Dore, *The Great Civil War (1642-46) in the Manchester area* (Manchester: University of Manchester Department of Extra-Mural Studies, 1972).

³⁹² Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Gentry and the Great Rebellion*, p. 131.

office wrongly received by Rigby.³⁹³ Documents in the Lancashire archives indicate that in February 1654 Worsley was himself granted this office by Cromwell.³⁹⁴ The office of clerk of the peace had responsibility for the administration of the Quarter Sessions at which Justices of the Peace dispensed local justice, which could provide the holder with significant power and wealth.³⁹⁵ As such, the Lancashire clerkship had a pivotal role in the county's power structure, demonstrating further how Worsley used his connections within the regime to increase his influence locally.³⁹⁶ As in his earlier case against Brereton, Worsley probably viewed Rigby's apparent misconduct as grounds for appropriating the clerkship for himself. Worsley's acquisition of this office would have been an important step for him in terms of advancing his status and standing and wealth in the county community. However this was only made possible by a decision of the Council of State probably through Cromwell's intervention.

Worsley appears to have been in London in the spring of 1655 when the royalist risings were planned to take place. Despite not being within the locality Worsley took control of the examination of suspects from north-west England. Whilst his native Lancashire appeared relatively untroubled by the

³⁹³ 'Volume 66: February 1654', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1653-4* (1879), pp. 381-426. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=53500> Date accessed: 04 October 2014. 'Volume 72: June 1654', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1654* (1880), pp. 194-232. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=53451&strquery=worsley> Date accessed: 17 September 2014.

³⁹⁴ Lancashire Archives, DDKE - Kenyon Family of Peel Hall, DDKE/1/32, Deputation: Charles Worsley of Rushulme, esq., to William Shuttleworth of Asterleigh, gentleman - the office of clerk of the peace - Seal. 23 Feb 1654; DDKE/9/33/14, Letters addressed to Roger Kenyon II of Parkhead, Letter from Roger Kenyon [Roger II] to Mr Booth - asking for a blank deputation of the office of clerk of the peace; also a copy of Cromwell's order granting the office to Lt Col Charles Worsley, 22 February 1654.

³⁹⁵ Anthony Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces the Government of Stuart England* (New haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 110 – 111.

³⁹⁶ B. W. Quintrell, ed. *Proceedings of the Lancashire Justices of the Peace at the Sheriff's table during assizes week, 1578-1694* (Chester: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1981), p. 16.

disturbances, this was not the case in neighbouring Cheshire.³⁹⁷ Here, a group of royalist sympathisers had a plan to capture Chester, which was however foiled by the authorities.³⁹⁸

In the aftermath, the regime rounded up suspects for interrogation. One of those arrested was the Cheshire gentleman Peter Leycester, who left an account of his treatment.³⁹⁹ This shows that even prior to the major-generals being established Worsley was regarded as the individual to whom the regime turned regarding matters relating to north-west England.

According to Leycester's account, he and other suspects were first arrested in April 1655 and conveyed to London for examination by Worsley. After conducting interviews all suspects, Worsley agreed to their release, subject to the payment of sureties for good behaviour.⁴⁰⁰ However, Leycester's account confirms that shortly after his return to Cheshire in June 1655, he and others were again arrested, this time by Colonel Robert Lilburne.⁴⁰¹ This was part of a security sweep of the north of England carried out by Lilburne.⁴⁰² Leycester was then imprisoned until January 1656 when, on Worsley's instruction, he was released without charge.⁴⁰³

This evidence confirms that by this time Worsley was regarded as the government's key agent for the north-west of England and that even prior to the establishment of the major-generals' regime was in charge of security in

³⁹⁷ David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649 – 1660* (Hamden, Conn: Archon Books, 1971), p. 148

³⁹⁸ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 148 – 149.

³⁹⁹ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Civil War Materials, Leicester-Warren family of Tabley, records, Peter Leicester's Books, DLT/B38.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 22 – 24.

⁴⁰¹ John Morrill, *Cheshire 1630 – 1660*, pp. 277 – 278.

⁴⁰² 'State Papers, 1655: June (7 of 7)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 3, December 1654 - August 1655, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 587-599. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol3/pp587-599> [accessed 21 July 2013].

⁴⁰³ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Peter Leicester's Books, DLT/B38, pp. 16, 24.

an area at risk from royalist plots. Leycester's account provides an interesting insight into how the regime acted quickly to suppress any possibility of insurrection, suggesting that security at local level was a high priority, which could however also impact heavily on suspects.

Worsley as Major-General

During the summer of 1655 the government made progress on the design of the major-generals' regime, and as an initial step resolved how the new militia troops, which were to form security forces in localities, were to be allocated.⁴⁰⁴ As part of this Worsley was given responsibility for Derbyshire, Cheshire and Worcestershire;⁴⁰⁵ the first and last counties with which he had no known connection. Over the coming months, adjustments were however made to these allocations and in October 1655 the final scheme was announced, as part of which Worsley was made responsible for the counties of Cheshire, Lancashire and Staffordshire. This clearly shows that Worsley had important connections at the centre of the regime, and was able to use these to shape the design of key measures, to best suit his own position. Worsley's early letters to Thurloe as major-general display confidence in his role, which was recognised and supported by local community members. Worsley considered that he was now in a position to deliver on local godly reform, underlining his providential beliefs, and also confirming his agenda received acceptance and support locally, and was not simply a process of enacting central policies.

⁴⁰⁴ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 21 – 27.

⁴⁰⁵ 'Volume 100: August 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1881), pp. 267-312. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655/pp267-312> [accessed 21 February 2015].

In his first letter to Thurloe as major-general, written in Manchester,⁴⁰⁶ Worsley appears optimistic about his role and responsibilities. He reports of his meetings with officers commanding the county militia troops for Cheshire, Lancashire and Staffordshire, where he communicated the terms of his commission. Worsley says that he found in them “a spirret extraordinarily bent to the worke, and I plainly discerne the finger of God goeing alonge withit, which is indeed noe smale encouragement unto mee.”⁴⁰⁷ Worsley was keen to make progress on his duties, for example he advises Thurloe of his intention to meet with the commissioners for the peace of the Commonwealth in the three counties of his association over the next few weeks and also sought directions regarding a number of suspects within Cheshire.⁴⁰⁸

Worsley’s optimistic tone continued in his report to Thurloe of his meeting with the Lancashire Commissioners at Preston on 8th November 1655, which he said was attended by a considerable number of commissioners. He advised Thurloe that “. I have bene in divers tounes and corporations, and have acquainted them with somthing I have in chardg, and with the good people, who doth noe litle rejoyse, and seeme to be abundantly affected therewith, and promis to set hart and hand to this good worke.”⁴⁰⁹ Worsley also informed Thurloe that he had “taken care, that all papists, and

⁴⁰⁶ This letter is dated 3 November 1655 (State Papers, 1655: November (1 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 138-155. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55414&strquery=worsley>, Date accessed: 24 April 2013).

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid. The suspects referred to were Colonel John Booth, George Warburton, Peter Leycester, and Robert Werden.

⁴⁰⁹ 'State Papers, 1655: November (3 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 172-186. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55416> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

malignants, and evill-affected persons be disarmed; and that wee may not be in the least prevented, have taken care, that as much as possible it may be done in all parts of the county in one day." Worsley wished to add new impetus to the actions mayors and aldermen of towns and corporations and sought "to stir up and quicken to be puttinge in effectual execution the lawes against drunkennese, sweringe, profaininge the Lord's day, and other wickednesses."⁴¹⁰ .

Worsley's providential beliefs are clear from his letters. On 13th November 1655 Worsley was in Chester meeting with both the commissioners for the county and for the city, who he described as ready as those in other counties to support him in his work." I blese the lord I cannot but take nottis of the good hand of God leadinge and carriinge mee one hitherto in this great and good worke of his. To morrow the commissioners meet for this citty. I dare not doubt, but God will give good succese still. The commissioners every where are earnest for every one of those orders of his highnese and counsell."⁴¹¹ This letter clearly displays Worsley's belief in the providential nature of his role which he believes is supported at local level, clearly demonstrating how Worsley views himself as an instrument, sent to undertake godly reform in his association.

Comments made by Worsley's commissioners across his entire association regarding perceived shortcomings of the tax system suggest Worsley adopted a combined local strategy, designed to put pressure on government

⁴¹⁰ 'State Papers, 1655: November (4 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 187-202. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55417> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴¹¹ 'State Papers, 1655: November (4 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 187-202. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55417> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

to revise the operation of the tax regime. This is clearly evidence of a strong local agenda, developed into a wider standpoint across his entire association. Worsley's letter from Stafford dated 20th November 1655 reported that the eighteen commissioners of the peace appointed to support him were dissatisfied, particularly in relation to the decimation tax which they considered was "two little."⁴¹² Worsley's commissioners were supporting his view that the threshold for the nationally set tax did not suit local circumstances suggesting wider support for his policy of lowering the threshold for payment of the tax.

Worsley revisited these concerns in his letter to Thurloe dated 21st December 1655, reporting that he has undertaken the first session for the assessment of those liable for the decimation tax within Lancashire, and outlines further concern regarding the relatively high threshold at which liability to pay the tax has been set by government. He tells Thurloe that "Wee now find, that many in these countryes, that have been very active against the parliament, and were looked upon to be men of good estates, will hardly be brought within the compase; for one hundred pounds per ann. is a good estate in these parts."⁴¹³ Additionally, in his letter to Cromwell dated 24th December 1655 recommended changes to the national tax system.⁴¹⁴ Worsley confirmed that the tax he had imposed to date would collect around £1,300 - £1,400per annum from those within Staffordshire, £1,500 per annum from Lancashire

⁴¹² 'State Papers, 1655: November (6 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 218-234. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55419> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴¹³ 'State Papers, 1655: December (5 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 333-343. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55426> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴¹⁴ From: 'State Papers, 1655: December (5 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 333-343. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55426> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

and £1,100 per annum from Cheshire.⁴¹⁵ He again that advocated government should reduce the threshold at which an individual became liable to pay the tax, suggesting to Cromwell that: “if your highness shall please but to order us to descend to estates of fifty pounds per ann. in lands, and five hundred pounds in personal estate, we shall raise much more than else we can; for in these countryes one hundred pounds per ann. is a considerable estate, and many, that justly deserved to fall under the tax, might be fetched in at fifty pounds per ann. whose estates reach not one hundred.”⁴¹⁶

Whilst the government took no action to revise the level at which the tax became payable, this provides further evidence of Worsley’s awareness of local circumstances and of the action he would proposed in response.⁴¹⁷

Worsley had further concerns about the tax system, evident in his letter dated 10th May 1656. Here Worsley complains that many of those taxed appealed to government, with the result that their liabilities were reduced, affecting the level of income raised at local level.⁴¹⁸ Worsley’s letters to the central authorities regarding tax matters therefore constitute strong evidence of a local agenda aimed at revising national policy.

On 26th November 1655 Worsley wrote to Thurloe from Nantwich advising that measures against drunkenness and profanity were working well and that: “I cannot but admire at the freenesse of good people of severall

⁴¹⁵ Ibid.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid.

⁴¹⁷ Durston, *Cromwell’s major-generals*, pp. 116 – 118

⁴¹⁸ From: 'State Papers, 1656: May (1 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 5: May 1656 - January 1657 (1742), pp. 1-9. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55519> Date accessed: 29 April 2013.

judgments to promote this worke".⁴¹⁹ Nantwich had been the Parliamentary headquarters during the civil war era and it is likely therefore that many inhabitants supported Worsley's objectives of godly reform.⁴²⁰

A few days later, Worsley was in Preston from where he wrote updating Thurloe on the work he had undertaken with the Lancashire commissioners who assured the government of their willingness to act on their instructions.⁴²¹ Worsley informed Thurloe that warrants had been issued to most of the county's chief delinquents to appear before him for the purposes of taxation, and that the individuals concerned, "seeme to conforme to the particulars with much readiness."⁴²² This appears to suggest that by this point, many royalists were, on the face of it, resigned to submit to the regime.

Worsley's agenda for godly reform is visible in his attacks on local magistracy which he considered had failed to demonstrate sufficient commitment to the reformation of manners locally. Worsley's desire to replace existing justices with those he considered more committed to his agenda shows how he remodelled local administration in order to apply his religious beliefs. Worsley wrote to Thurloe on 14 December 1655 providing an update on his activities with other Cheshire commissioners.⁴²³ This letter criticised local justices who according to Worsley were providing little

⁴¹⁹ 'State Papers, 1655: November (7 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 235-250. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55420> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴²⁰ R. N. Dore, *The Civil Wars in Cheshire* (Chester: Cheshire Community Council, 1966), pp. 6, 18 - 19.

⁴²¹ 'State Papers, 1655: November (8 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 251-269. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55421> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴²² Ibid.

⁴²³ 'State Papers, 1655: December (3 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 302-317. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55424> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

encouragement to other local officials in efforts to punish sin. The result was as Worsley put it “The law is very darke”.⁴²⁴ Criticism of justices is a common theme in Worsley’s reports, which whilst reflecting wider concerns of this kind within government at this time, is also suggestive of Worsley’s own agenda to reform local administration.⁴²⁵

Worsley’s policy of using what he perceived to be corrupt behaviour of existing office holders as justification to reform local administration is visible in a matter regarding the Duchy and County Palatine Court of Lancaster. Additionally, this example provides further evidence of how Worsley used his office of major-general, to act as patron to his friends and supporters.

On 17th January 1656 Worsley wrote to Thurloe providing information regarding a matter being considered by the Council of State concerning the Duchy and County Palatine Court of Lancaster. In this respect, on 14 November 1655 the Council received petitions requesting the reinstatement of the Palatine Court.⁴²⁶ On 12th December 1655 the Council received a report into the issue prepared by a small committee of its members. The committee found that the “jurisdiction of the Duchy and County Palatine Court ended 10 Oct. 1653, but was revived till 1 Jan. 1653–4, and Thos. Fell was appointed chancellor and seal keeper; also that he and Serjeant Bradshaw were appointed commissioners for reviving the Duchy jurisdiction,

⁴²⁴ Ibid.

⁴²⁵ Anthony Fletcher, ‘Oliver Cromwell and the Localities: the problem of Consent’, in *Politics and People In Revolutionary England*, ed. by Colin Jones, Malyn Newitt and Stephen Roberts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 194; Durston, *Cromwell’s Major-Generals*, pp. 172 – 177.

⁴²⁶ ‘Volume 101: November 1655’, in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 1-45. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp1-45> [accessed 15 May 2016].

but have not sat".⁴²⁷ From the content of one of the petitions it was clear that one of the main motivations of the petitioners was to avoid the loss of crown lands they had purchased, which would occur if the Palatinate was not reinstated.⁴²⁸

Whilst Worsley supported the objective of the petition he was critical of Fell alleging that he did not conduct the role of chancellor of the court effectively. In his letter to Thurloe, Worsley says that the role of chancellor "is indeed a place of honour and profitt, and truely might bee much more worthily bestowed; it is executed with much ease, but with an unusuall irregularity, the seale beinge shuffled from hand to hand, seeinge by him delivered to the attorneys of the chancery there, who keepe the same by turnes, who make and seale their owne writts without any competent judge". Worsley went on to recommend Richard Haworth, a Manchester lawyer as a replacement for Fell. Haworth was well known to Worsley as a prominent Mancunian and as one of the Lancashire commissioners appointed to assist him.⁴²⁹ It appears that the government did not act on this recommendation as, whilst the

⁴²⁷ 'Volume 102: December 1655', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6* (1882), pp. 45-83. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=53570&strquery=worsley> Date accessed: 19 September 2014.

⁴²⁸ 'Volume 101: November 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 1-45. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp1-45> [accessed 15 May 2016].

⁴²⁹ 'State Papers, 1656: July (5 of 6)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 5, May 1656 - January 1657, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 228-243. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol5/pp228-243> [accessed 29 May 2016].

jurisdiction of the palatinate court was reinstated Fell remained court chancellor until his death in 1658.⁴³⁰

Worsley was active in the security elements of his role as major-general, in which he was keen to ensure that royalist suspects were prosecuted for their unlawful behaviour. Worsley's letter to Thurloe, dated 24th January 1656, reports on his investigations into a number of individuals suspected to have been involved in the planned rising in Cheshire in March 1655. The individuals named in this letter are Peter Leycester, George Warburton, John Booth and Robert Werden,

Leycester, Warburton and Booth had all previously been investigated by Worsley, who at this point informs Thurloe that: "I am perswaded, they were all of them guilty in that designe; but I am afraid wee shall not yet have much against them".⁴³¹ It seems that Werden may have been acting as an agent for Thurloe, which might explain why Worsley appears to have received little encouragement in his investigations.⁴³² It appears that Thurloe withheld information from Worsley meaning that he was probably unaware of Werden's role as a government informant. This shows that whilst in his role as major-general, Worsley was a key local agent. However, there were clear limitations to his influence with central bureaucrats like Thurloe who operated at the heart of the regime. It is also important to note that ambiguities in

⁴³⁰ Sean Kelsey, 'Fell, Thomas (bap. 1599, d. 1658)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29043, accessed 17 May 2016].

⁴³¹ 'State Papers, 1656: January (6 of 9)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 440-453. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55434> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴³² Ibid; Andrew Barclay, 'Werden, Robert (1621/2–1690)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29064, accessed 17 May 2016].

Cromwell's support for the major-generals; reflected both in his lack of interest in their activities in the field, and also in his failure to intervene to ensure their continuation after the failure of the militia bill in early 1657, means it is entirely possible that Cromwell was less able or inclined to intervene or support Worsley.⁴³³

In his letter of 24th January 1656, Worsley also informs Thurloe of his actions against alehouses as part of his agenda for godly reform, showing clearly how he viewed both security and reform as integral to his role as God's instrument. In his letter, Worsley described alehouses as: "the very wombe, that brings forth all manner of wickednese" and that in the Lancashire Blackburn Hundred he had "ordered at least 200 alehouses to be thrown down."⁴³⁴ Some of the documents relating to Worsley's plans for closing alehouses in the Blackburn Hundred survive, revealing a methodical approach, utilising the existing system of local government through High Constables and Petty Constables to identify alehouse premises.⁴³⁵ Whilst we cannot be certain about its exact meaning, notation on the returns from these officials suggests that alehouses were reviewed in order to determine which should be closed. It is possible that the "several quallifications" Worsley details in his letter to Thurloe dated 2nd February 1656 might

⁴³³ Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1972), pp. 169, 172 – 173; Ronald Hutton, *The British Republic 1649 – 1660* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 69 – 70; Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (Harlow: Pearson, 1991), pp. 137 – 138, 146 – 147; Christopher Durston, 'The Fall of Cromwell's Major-Generals', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 450 (1998), pp. 29 – 32; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 206 – 227; Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution 1625 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 629 – 630.

⁴³⁴ 'State Papers, 1656: January (6 of 9)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 440-453. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55434> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴³⁵ Lancashire Archives, Lancashire Courts of Quarter Sessions, QDV/29, Return of Alehousekeepers in Blackburn Hundred, 1655 – 1656.

suggest the factors considered within his review. This letter lists five qualifications which confirm the interrelatedness of Worsley's policy of security and moral reform. The qualifications include factors relating to whether: the alehouse is run by supporter of parliament, is a genuine local business, is not operating improperly, does not support disorderly conduct, and is not used for illicit purposes.⁴³⁶

Other evidence confirms that Worsley operated a concentrated campaign of alehouse closures across his entire association, which he did more energetically than other major-generals, further confirming the distinctive nature of his local agenda to promote godliness in his communities. In addition to evidence from the Blackburn Hundred we find that in the Salford Hundred plans were in place to close several hundred alehouses.⁴³⁷ The Cheshire Quarter Sessions papers for 1656 contain over 20 appeals from alehouse keepers against decisions to force closure.⁴³⁸ In January 1656 Worsley attended the Epiphany quarter sessions meeting in Staffordshire where an order calling for alehouse suppression was approved.⁴³⁹ In the light of the above it is clear that Worsley's approach to the closure of alehouses was undertaken on a planned and coordinated basis across the three counties for which he was responsible. Whilst other major-generals did undertake alehouse closures in their associations none pursued this agenda

⁴³⁶ 'State Papers, 1656: February (3 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 518-534. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55440> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴³⁷ Lancashire Archives, Lancashire Courts of Quarter Sessions. QSP/140/28 Reform of "severall things amisse" in Salford Hundred. Epiphany, 1656/57.

⁴³⁸ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, ZQ - Chester Quarter Sessions, Quarter Sessions Files, ZQSF, QSF, 1656, no 2, ff, 259, 261.

⁴³⁹ Staffordshire Archives and Local Studies, Quarter Sessions Order Books, Q/SO/6, 1656.

as forcefully as Worsley.⁴⁴⁰ This provides strong evidence of a distinctive local agenda; the fact that this was coordinated across Worsley's entire association confirms this as constituting a wider policy to apply beliefs about godly reform at regional level.

Other contemporaneous evidence exists showing a different side of Worsley's approach to the sale of alcohol. This confirms that similar to many of his other Cromwellian colleagues Worsley operated with self-interest, leading to questions about the extent of his commitment to godly values.

In December 1655 certain Lancashire 'vintners, innkeepers and alehouse keepers' petitioned the Quarter Sessions regarding the excise on ale and wine farmed by Charles Worsley, seeking "that the said may be continued in the hands for the next oncoming year and for the further too".⁴⁴¹ This shows that Worsley had been farming excise on beer and wine prior to his appointment as major-general, providing further evidence of his control of public office and of his influence within Lancashire. However, this also raises questions about Worsley's ethics in receiving excise from sources which he had previously labelled as the "very bane of the countys".⁴⁴² Furthermore, the timing of this petition raises further questions: the petition was dated just a month prior to Worsley's campaign of alehouse closures in the Blackburn and Salford areas, and whilst we cannot be certain, it is possible that those

⁴⁴⁰ Morrill, *Cheshire 1630 – 1660*, p. 245; Fletcher 'Oliver Cromwell and the Localities', p. 195; Hirst, *England in Conflict*, p. 298; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 175 – 177.

⁴⁴¹ Lancashire Archives, DDKE - Kenyon Family of Peel Hall, 2 - The Court of Quarter Sessions, DDKE/2/13/2, Petition from the vintners, innkeepers and alehousekeepers of Lancashire, 5 Dec 1655.

⁴⁴² 'State Papers, 1656: January (6 of 9)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 440-453. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp440-453> [accessed 29 May 2016].

who petitioned the Quarter Sessions had prior knowledge of the coming purge, and might have submitted this on the basis that Worsley would look favourably on their continuing operation. This perhaps suggests that Worsley's behaviour did not always match his apparent strong puritan beliefs. This also shows how Worsley was in a position to make important decisions with major implications for local communities. This clearly adds weight to the argument that Worsley used his authority as a government agent as part of a local agenda within his association.

Like other major-generals, Worsley experienced difficulty in achieving local support for the national policy of scrutinising religious ministry and schooling, contained in the Parliamentary ordinance for the ejection of scandalous ministers and schoolmasters of 1654, which formed part of his responsibilities as major-general. This shows that despite the best efforts of godly agents like Worsley, without the broad support of local communities national policy was unlikely to succeed within localities highlighting the limitations of central government.

In his letter to Thurloe, dated 28th January 1656 Worsley further highlights the difficulties in recruiting commissioners for dealing with scandalous ministers within Cheshire; where he informs Thurloe that "in these countyes wee can hardly get a coram, there is soe few named in it, and some that are dead, and some that will not act. I shal be at a straight how to gett fitt and active men in these countyes".⁴⁴³ This particular issue appears in several letters written by Worsley from all counties within his association, indicating a

⁴⁴³ 'State Papers, 1656: January (8 of 9)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 463-473. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55436> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

wider problem of commitment within localities, which would impact on the process of godly reform.⁴⁴⁴ Durston reports that similar issues were experienced by other major-generals.⁴⁴⁵ Whilst reforming local ministry was viewed as crucial by Cromwell, the experience of Worsley and his other major-general colleagues suggests that the legislation was not popular, even amongst puritan activists.⁴⁴⁶

Worsley's letter of 1st February 1656 provides a good illustration of the extent of his concentrated travelling around his association, confirming his strong personal commitment to his role. For example he tells Thurloe that "Tuesday next wee meet for the cittie of Chester to receive an account of our orders. I hope to give a very good account of that The monday following wee meet att Midlewich for the county; on wednesday after at Knutsford to take securitie of the county, and on fryday att Boulton, where I intend to muster the troopes, and make a purge, for it needs it: then within 3 or 4 dayes towards Stafford."⁴⁴⁷ Additionally, Worsley's attendance in person might also suggest that he felt it necessary to regularly reinforce his authority at local level, a reminder that his authority emanated from his role in the regime and not his social standing.

⁴⁴⁴ 'State Papers, 1655: December (2 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 287-301. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55423> Date accessed: 11 October 2012; 'State Papers, 1656: January (9 of 9)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 474-488. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55437> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁴⁵ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, pp. 162 – 163.

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 158 – 166.

⁴⁴⁷ 'State Papers, 1656: February (1 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 488-501. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55438> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

Whilst Worsley targeted known royalists within his association, many aspects of the quasi-judicial process of prosecuting suspects were unclear highlighting the limits of Worsley's local authority when facing determined defendants capable of arguing their case and raising complex legal questions. Additionally this confirms that as a state agent Worsley attempted to operate within the law.

The case of Sir George Middleton of Leighton, a Lancashire royalist, illustrates some of the difficulties faced by Worsley in prosecuting suspects. Middleton, a Lancashire gentleman was alleged to have been in arms for the King. In his letter dated 10th March 1656 Worsley says "wee have also examined the witnesses in the behalse of the commonwelth against mr. George Midleton, [...] And I am much of opinion, that his defence wil be of little use to hime."⁴⁴⁸ Middleton and other associates were tried in Preston in April 1656. Middleton had previously been sequestered for recusancy and for royalist activities,⁴⁴⁹ so was well versed in defence tactics; with the result that Worsley's case did not go smoothly. In his letter of 26th April 1656 Worsley reported that the Lancashire commissioners had tried Middleton "and had passed sentence upon hime, only hee pleaded much to have his witnesses examined upon oathe against the commonwelth, and to have counsel" which "begate a longe debate, and the sentence was put of, till wee had sent to know his highnese and counsells oppinion concerninge the same"⁴⁵⁰.

⁴⁴⁸ 'State Papers, 1656: March (3 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 594-603. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55446> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁴⁹ Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion*, pp. 20, 114

⁴⁵⁰ 'State Papers, 1656: April (7 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 737-751. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55458> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

The issue in question raised legal questions fundamental to Middleton's defence, relating to whether Middleton, as a 'serious miscreant', had the right to counsel or to call witnesses. It appears that the debate between Worsley's commissioners was inconclusive and the matter was referred to London for guidance on how to proceed.

One of the others associated with this case was Middleton's son-in-law Somerford Oldfield of Somerford, Cheshire. Based on information from Worsley's informants, both Middleton and Oldfield were charged "to have been in armes in Lancashire between February 1654 and the latter end of March 1655"⁴⁵¹. Both denied the charge claiming the informant's evidence was malicious.⁴⁵² Middleton's wife, Lady Anne, travelled to London in an attempt to influence Lord Chief Justice John Bradshaw, his brother Henry Bradshaw, General Charles Fleetwood, and other prominent Parliamentarians with local connections.⁴⁵³ Additionally, both petitioned the Lord Protector claiming innocence of the charges levelled against them.⁴⁵⁴

Oldfield went to additional lengths to establish his innocence, claiming "I made a book in which I putt downe every month distinctly what times I was absent, also what friends I had with me within the same time."⁴⁵⁵ Oldfield also claimed that separate records held by his tenant farmer, verified his presence in Cheshire on the dates concerned. Finally, Oldfield cited an issue

⁴⁵¹ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Shakerley family of Hulme and Somerford, MSS, DSS 1/7/66, Correspondence, petitions, interrogatories, depositions, and other papers relating to the arrest and examination, at Preston, by the Commissioners of the Peace of Lancashire & Cheshire, of Somerford Oldfield and Sir George Middleton of Leighton, Lancs. 1654 - 1657.

⁴⁵² Ibid.

⁴⁵³ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁵ Ibid.

with his relatives arising from his minority which, during February 1655, had been subject to mediation, through several Cheshire gentlemen, one of whom was Thomas Mainwaring, a Justice of the Peace and also one of Worsley's Commissioners.⁴⁵⁶ There was very little which could be done against this kind of evidence and both Middleton and Oldfield were eventually discharged.⁴⁵⁷

The appointment of sheriff for Cheshire also illustrates that without government support Worsley's local influence was limited. This is clearly in contrast to his colleague Charles Howard who used his social standing and influence to effect change. On 30 November 1655 Worsley informed Thurloe that: "I have advised with the best men, and find it a difficult busines to find fitt men rightly quallified for the employment; but declare it as my oppinion upon the whole, that for the county of Chester John Leigh of Booths esq".⁴⁵⁸ However, government had sought advice on the appointment elsewhere, as on 8th November Lord Chief Justice Glynne wrote to Thurloe providing a list of possible candidates.⁴⁵⁹ Worsley was horrified when he later learned that Philip Egerton, the son of a royalist had been appointed sheriff.⁴⁶⁰ In his letter

⁴⁵⁶ Cheshire Archives and Local Studies, Shakerley family of Hulme and Somerford, MSS, DSS 1/7/66/1 – 25.

⁴⁵⁷ 'Volume 153: February 1657', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1656-7*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1883), pp. 258-297. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1656-7/pp.258-324> [accessed 20 May 2016].

⁴⁵⁸ 'State Papers, 1655: November (8 of 8)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 251-269. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55421> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁵⁹ 'State Papers, 1655: November (2 of 8)', in *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, Volume 4, Sept 1655 - May 1656, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), pp. 156-171. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/thurloe-papers/vol4/pp156-171> [accessed 22 May 2016].

⁴⁶⁰ John H. Rains, III, 'Egerton, Sir Philip (d. 1698)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40799>, accessed 22 May 2016]; Morrill, *Cheshire 1630 - 1660*, p. 286.

to Thurloe dated 8th April 1656 Worsley wrote “I am affraid, that hee that's now sheriffe is not a persone, that may be justly suspected for his integritie to the present government. I have alreadie found him to be a person, whose plesure and delight is onely in those, who I verilie believe are the most dangerous enemyes wee have in these countyes.”⁴⁶¹ Worsley's dissatisfaction with Egerton's appointment is further confirmed in his letter of 5th May, which states “The sheriff of this county of Chester is a man not so qualified, as I could wish. I have some ground to beleive he is one, that was privy to the last designe.”⁴⁶² However, despite Worsley's objections Egerton remained sheriff, confirming that the government accepted the advice of judge Glynne over its local agent in the field.

As Egerton and Glynne both held large property interests in Flintshire, it is possible that Glynne was doing his wealthy neighbour a service in recommending him as Cheshire sheriff. Whilst indicative of Worsley's policy of supporting the appointment of those favourable to his regime in positions of influence, adding further weight to the existence of Worsley's local agenda, this example also further reminds us that Worsley's power was derived from his role as a state agent. There would be little Worsley could do should the state decide to ignore his advice.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶¹ 'State Papers, 1656: April (2 of 7)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 675-685. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55453> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁶² 'State Papers, 1656: May (2 of 2)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 4: Sept 1655 - May 1656 (1742), pp. 764-775. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55460> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁶³ For Egerton and Flintshire, see: Pinckney 'The Cheshire Election of 1656', p. 393; John H. Rains, III, 'Egerton, Sir Philip (d. 1698)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40799>, accessed 24 July 2017]. Reference to Glynne's interest in Flintshire can be found in: Keith Lindley, 'Glynne, Sir John (1603–1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford

On 13th May 1656 Worsley reported to Thurloe that he was unwell and intended to rest.⁴⁶⁴ However in response to Cromwell's summons to meet with all major-generals, Worsley travelled to London, where his condition worsened, and where on 12th June he died.⁴⁶⁵ Worsley's commitment to the Commonwealth is visible in his deathbed stipulation that estates he had acquired from Sir Cecil Trafford, a Lancashire recusant, should be returned to the exchequer so they might become taxed.⁴⁶⁶

Worsley was replaced by Tobias Bridge a parliamentary army officer.⁴⁶⁷ Bridge had experience as a deputy major-general in Buckinghamshire, but appears to have no links to north-west England.⁴⁶⁸ Bridge only arrived in the north-west during August 1656, in time to take an interest in the elections which took place the next month.⁴⁶⁹ Bridge was active in the election process

University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10843>, accessed 24 July 2017].

⁴⁶⁴ From: 'State Papers, 1656: May (2 of 6)', *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, volume 5: May 1656 - January 1657 (1742), pp. 10-26. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55520> Date accessed: 11 October 2012.

⁴⁶⁵ Christopher Durston, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29980>, accessed 11 Oct 2012]

⁴⁶⁶ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 49; SP18/130/129, ff. 201-2 (quoted in History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Worsley, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, pp. 11 – 12).

⁴⁶⁷ 'The Diary of Thomas Burton: 8 January 1656-7', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653 - April 1657*, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. 322-334. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol1/pp322-334> [accessed 25 July 2013]. Firth and Davies, *The Regimental History*, Vol 1, pp. 294, 296, 298, 300 David Scott, 'Bridge, Sir Tobias (d. after 1672)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, May 2015 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66563>, accessed 27 Jan 2016].

⁴⁶⁸ 'Volume 101: November 1655', in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1655-6*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1882), pp. 1-45. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1655-6/pp1-45> [accessed 25 July 2013]; Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 27; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott, pp. 7 - 8. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

⁴⁶⁹ Pinckney 'The Cheshire Election of 1656', p. 396;

in Staffordshire and also in Cheshire.⁴⁷⁰ In the latter county he followed government policy supporting particular candidates to ensure that John Bradshaw, a leading anti-Protectorate republican was not returned.⁴⁷¹ Bridge's lack of experience in the north of England might explain his comparative low level of exclusions of those elected to serve as MP's. In this regard Bridge excluded five MP's due to their unsuitability making him the major-general with the third lowest level of exclusions in England, still contrasting sharply with his colleague Charles Howard's nil exclusions in the far north-west.⁴⁷² Bridge was himself elected MP for a seat in Buckinghamshire, where he had spent time as deputy major-general.⁴⁷³ Whilst Bridge generally appears to have adopted a moderate line during the Second Protectorate Parliament (1656-58) he appears to have made little impact within his association locally.⁴⁷⁴

The above analysis provides clear evidence that Charles Worsley held strong religious beliefs which he applied as part of a radical programme of reform undertaken during his role as major-general. Whilst Worsley was of modest status he was able to progress through the Cromwellian regime directly as a result of patronage from Oliver Cromwell. In office, Worsley took many steps to improve his social standing within the Cromwellian cohort,

⁴⁷⁰ Pinckney 'The Cheshire Election of 1656', pp. 396 – 406; Frances Parthenothorpe Verney and Margaret M. Verney (eds), *Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Commonwealth 1656 - 1660* (4 Volumes, London: Longman Green, 1894), Vol III, pp. 283 – 284.

⁴⁷¹ Scott, Bridge, Sir Tobias (d. after 1672); History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, pp. 7 - 9.

⁴⁷² Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 200; Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, p. 89; Scott, Bridge, Sir Tobias (d. after 1672); History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, pp. 8 - 9.

⁴⁷³ Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 204, fn, 43; Scott, Bridge, Sir Tobias (d. after 1672); History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, p. 9.

⁴⁷⁴ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by Scott, pp 9 - 10.

which also increased his power and influence in north-west England, especially within his home county of Lancashire. Whilst Worsley progressed through the Cromwellian administration, effectively becoming the government's 'man of business' in north-west England, his power and influence was however tenuous, derived as it was, solely from his position within the regime. Following on from this, it is concluded that as Cromwell's interest in the major-generals expedient diminished, so did Worsley's support base. Evidence demonstrates therefore that without the status afforded to him from his role as a state agent, Worsley would have had little ability to apply his beliefs. Furthermore, Worsley's reform agenda and the significance of his identity all therefore rely upon his credentials as a state agent.

Worsley's local agenda for godly reform went far beyond his base remit as major-general and also exceeded similar measures pursued by his other northern major-general colleagues, particularly contrasting with the approach adopted by Howard. This local agenda includes Worsley's attempts to reform local administration by replacing existing incumbents with those considered more suitable, his relentless prosecution of suspected royalists, his scheme to reform alehouses across the north-west, and his attempts to use the views of commissioners across his entire association to force government to revise the decimation tax to better suit local circumstances, all amount to a clear and distinctive agenda of reform in the provinces for which he was responsible. These all have strong linkage to his belief that godly reform was essential to improve the condition of communities with which he identified most, especially those within his native Lancashire, showing his distinctive local agenda in practice.

Conclusion

This thesis has provided compelling evidence for the existence of northern local agendas in the work of the three major-generals who are the focus of this study. Furthermore, it is considered this evidence goes far beyond what might be regarded as simply exceeding their formal written instructions, or pursuing narrow self-interest. Finally, these findings demonstrate how local factors impacted on the implementation of national policy, modifying this to suit local circumstances and local agendas and ultimately modifying and moderating its effects within localities.

This study concludes that this was not a single coordinated approach across the work of all three individuals; but consists of separate programmes with distinctive northern local elements, visible within the different activities and approaches of the three men who carried out these roles, reflecting the basis of their power. The distinctive northern local elements are found in particular aspects of the programmes of each major-general, which are themselves the product of the background and make-up of the individuals, as well as the different challenges they faced, and in their responses to these.

Charles Howard's northern agenda arose from his aristocratic background and position in the north of England, which at the time of this study resulted in him being the most powerful individual with influence over the volatile Scottish border region. This region with its distinctive history and past had become of increased importance during the Interregnum given Scots recognition of Charles Stuart as their king, and Cromwell's subsequent conquest of Scotland in 1650-51. Within this context Howard was essential to

the Cromwellian regime, becoming its 'man of business in the north', a position enabling him to promote and protect his interests and those of his clients and tenants. Additionally, Howard used his position to promote northern causes such as the proposed court at York, similar in function to the disbanded Council in the North; and was a member of Cromwell's Scottish Council, which he used to further his influence in the border region.

Howard built alliances within influential figures necessary to progress within the Cromwellian regime, which he did with some success. Central to Howard's motivation for these actions was the protection and promotion of his interests in the north. Howard's role as major-general was part of this political management process, where using his power and influence both locally and with the regime in London he operated in a manner best suited to furthering his interests, and avoiding interference by government bureaucrats such as John Thurloe. Additionally, Howard used his office to remodel local government within his localities, providing opportunities for his supporters even if they were former royalists. Howard was sensitive to the need to maintain stability in his local powerbase, visible in his decision not to exclude any of those within his association elected to the Second Protectorate Parliament in 1656; a decision no doubt motivated by a desire to avoid local conflict.

As major-general Howard prioritised security and taxation over godly reformation, again reflecting his local interests. In so doing Howard pursued a programme fundamentally different to that set out within his instructions as major-general, demonstrating how his local agenda modified and limited the implementation of Cromwellian government policy within his localities.

Robert Lilburne's strong northern identity is seen in his position as a leading member of an established Durham family, and as an experienced northern military figure with strong bonds to other influential northerners, such as John Lambert.

As governor of Newcastle, Lilburne used his office to support the establishment of radical Baptist ministry in Newcastle and the Tyne valley. Later as Commander in Chief in Scotland, Lilburne employed the northern Baptists he had helped to found, in a strategic mission to reduce the influence of the Scottish Kirk to which he and other Cromwellians were strongly opposed. Lilburne's use of his northern Baptist networks in this way, demonstrates both his strong religious beliefs and his identification with northern English communities, who he used as trusted instruments in his campaign of religious reform, aimed at freeing the Scots from what he saw as the oppression of the Presbyterian Kirk.

Lilburne's local northern agenda can also be seen in how as major-general he expressed his strong dislike of local royalists, who he considered had breached the trust of their communities. As major-general Lilburne used his family and supporters to manage Durham demonstrating how he used his local connections to assist him in his role.

Finally, as major-general Lilburne used his office to advance the case for the foundation of Durham college, an institution designed to benefit inhabitants of all northern counties. The college would promote education and learning throughout the north of England, an area generally less well provided than other parts of the country at this time; as well as offering further potential to

develop into a northern university providing an alternative to Oxford or Cambridge. Robert Lilburne's support for the college both as an influential individual within his locality, and as a major-general provides a further demonstration of his willingness to use his office to advance local causes he supported. Whilst not prohibited by his instructions as major-general supporting causes of this kind was certainly not an expected part of his role as major-general. This further shows how Lilburne adapted and extended his brief as major-general as part of a local programme which differed from that expected by government.

Charles Worsley's local programme was critically dependent on the standing and status he achieved from his role as a state agent, a central part of which was reliant upon Cromwell's support. Worsley was no doubt sincerely committed to his strongly millenarian and providential religious beliefs which brought with them the conviction that moral reform was urgently needed within his county association.

However the only way for Worsley to carry out the godly reformation in which he believed was through state agency, and by using this as a means of increasing his standing and influence, through the acquisition of national and local office, and the reform of local administration within his association. To achieve this however Worsley heavily depended on the support of Cromwell. However, given the Protector's other large responsibilities and his increasingly ambivalent attitude towards the major-generals, this support was not secure. Worsley's efforts at improving his own standing and his attempts at placing his supporters in positions of influence were all concerned with enabling him to put his beliefs into practice. Worsley's objective was

therefore to increase his standing both locally and nationally in order to carry out a thorough programme of local godly reform within his northern counties. The scale and magnitude of Worsley's programme exceeded the expectations of his formal instructions demonstrating his local agenda in practice.

It is also important to highlight that these different programmes were produced with the aim of addressing issues within what in effect were three different northern environments. In this respect, the needs of Howard's northern environment centred on the control and management of the contentious border area, and his need to have prominence nationally to maintain the relationships required to secure this. Similarly, Lilburne's environment within Durham centred on his radical religious beliefs and those of his family as well as his strong disapproval of northern royalists within his local community. Lilburne's close relationship with army grandee and northern statesman, John Lambert, together with his own identity as a Baptist all acted to shape him and to drive him towards his agenda of consolidation of his family interest and, also using his office to support the cause for the foundation of Durham college. Worsley's environment and programme of godly reform were products of the situation in the north-west, where recusancy and irreligion were perceived to be common and where Worsley believed his intervention as a radical Manchester puritan to be essential to deliver cultural and religious change to achieve the New Jerusalem in which he believed.

Historians have demonstrated how the distinctive nature and characteristics of northern England have helped to shape its identity in terms of culture and

place. It is considered that the finding that the northern three major-generals each pursued programmes containing differing but distinctive northern local elements is entirely consistent with these conclusions.

What all three northern major-generals have in common is the distinctiveness of their local agendas, which in part at least were shaped by their different northern background and situations. It is considered that these arguments demonstrate that the three northern major-generals each pursued local agendas; separate from and in addition to their responsibilities as Cromwellian major-generals. These had the effect of limiting and modifying the impact of central government policy, demonstrating the vital importance of localism during this period.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources – Manuscript:

Cheshire Archives, Chester

Leicester-Warren family of Tabley, MSS, Peter Leicester's Books, DLT/B38.

Diaries of Thomas Mainwaring of Over Peover, DDX 384.

Chester Quarter Sessions, Quarter Sessions Files, ZQSF, QSF, 1656.

Shakerley family of Hulme and Somerford, MSS, DSS 1/7/66.

Manchester Archives, Central Reference Library, Manchester

Assheton MSS, *The Humble Petition of the Gentlemen, Ministers and Freeholders and other inhabitants of the parish of Manchester in the County Palatine of Lancaster*, E7/28/5/8a-b.

Carill Worsley family of Platt, Rusholme MSS, GB127.M35.

Declaration of election of Member of Parliament, 19 July 1654, GB127.M71/4/3/1.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Tanner MSS, 56

Lancashire Archives, Preston

Kenyon Family of Peel Hall MSS, DDKE

Lancashire Courts of Quarter Sessions, QDV/29, Return of
Alehousekeepers in Blackburn Hundred, 1655 – 1656.

Lancashire Courts of Quarter Sessions. QSP/140/28 Reform of
"severall things amisse" in Salford Hundred. Epiphany, 1656 - 1657.

Stafford, Staffordshire Archives

Quarter Sessions Order Books, Q/SO/6, 1656.

Primary Sources – Printed:

Abbott, Wilbur C., ed, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*
4 vols (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1937 – 1947).

Bedoyere Guy de la., ed, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Woodbridge:
Boydell and Brewer, 1995).

Birch, Thomas., ed, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*,
7 vols (London: F. Gyles, 1742).

Carlyle, Thomas. ed, *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* 5 vols,
London: Chapman and Hall 1888).

T. C., *Strange Newes from the North*, (London: J. Clowes, 1650).

Coke, R., *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the
last Four Reigns and Interregnum*, 2 vols, (London: 1694).

Cradock, Walter., *Gospel-libertie, in the extensions, limitations, of it.
Whereunto is added good newes from Heaven; to the worst of sinners
on earth, sermons* (London: 1648).

Dodds, M H., ed, *Extracts from the Newcastle upon Tyne Council Minute Book 1636 – 1656* (Newcastle: Newcastle upon Tyne City Council, 1920).

Edwards, Thomas., *Gangraena, or, A catalogue and discovery of many of the errours, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of this time* (London: 1646).

Firth, Sir Charles, ed, *Scotland and the Protectorate: letters and papers relating to the military government of Scotland from January 1654 to June 1659* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1899).

Firth C H, and Rait R S., eds, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642 -1660* (London: H.M.S.O. 1911).

Gardiner, Samuel, Rawson., ed, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899).

Gaunt, Peter., ed, *The Correspondence of Henry Cromwell 1655 – 1659*, Camden Fifth Series, volume 31 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, for the Royal Historical Society, 2007).

Goad, Christopher., *Refreshing drops and scorching vials severally distributed to their proper subjects* (London: 1653).

Green, Mary A E., ed, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum*, 13 vols (London: Longman & Co. Trübner & Co., 1875).

Green, Mary A E., ed, *Calendar, Committee For the Advance of Money*, 3 vols, (London: Public Record Office, 1888),

Hamilton, William D., ed, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I*, 23 vols (London: Longman & Co. Trübner & Co., 1877).

Heath, James., *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine War in the three Kingdoms of England Scotland and Ireland*, 2nd edn (London: William Lee, 1675).

Hesilrige, Sir Arthur., *Musgrave muzled: or The traducer gagg'd : Being a just vindication of the Right Honourable Sr. Arthur Haslerigg, and all other persons herein concerned. From the scandalous imputations, and forged articles exhibited by John Musgrave* (Newcastle: 1650).

Hinds,, Allen B., ed, *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, 38 vols (London: HMSO, 1930).

Hollingworth, Richard., *Mancuniensis or a history of the towne of Manchester and what is most memorable concerning it* (Manchester: 1656),

Hudleston, C R., ed, *Naworth Estate and Household Accounts 1648 – 1660* (Durham: Surtees Society, 1958).

Hutchinson, Lucy., *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*, James Sutherland, ed (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England*, W. Dunn. Macray., ed, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888).

Journal of the House of Commons: (13 Volumes, London, 1802).

Journal of the House of Lords (42 Volumes, London, 1767-1830).

Kenyon, J B., ed, *The Stuart Constitution – Documents and Commentary 1603 – 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

Lilburne, John, *Innocency and Truth Justified* (London: 1645).

Lilburne, John, *The Prisoners Plea for a Habeas Corpus*, (London: 1648).

Lilburne, John, *A Just Reproof to Haberdashers Hall*, (August 2, 1651).

Macray. W D., ed, *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, 5 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876).

Musgrave, John, *A true and exact relation of the ... pressures and grievences the well-affected of the northern bordering counties lye under by sir Arthur Haslerigs misgovernment, set forth in the petition [&c.] presented to the Councel of State* (London: 1650).

Musgrave, John and Muncaster, Randal *A true representation of the state of the bordering customary tenants in the north, under an oppressing landlord* (London: 1654).

Musgrave, John, *A Cry of Bloud of an innocent Abel against two bloody Cains* (London: 1654).

Prynne, William, *The Quakers Unmasked and clearly detected to be but the spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites and Franciscan Fryers, sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated giddy-headed English Nation. By an information newly taken upon oath in the City of Bristol, Jan. 22, 1654 and some evident demonstrations* (London: Calvert Giles, 1655).

Prynne, William, *A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Human Rights, Liberties, Properties of all Englishmen* (London: 1656).

Quintrell, B W., ed, *Proceedings of the Lancashire Justices of the Peace at the Sheriff's table during assizes week, 1578-1694* (Chester: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1981).

Robinson Edward, *A Discourse of the Warr in Lancashire*, ed, William Beaumont (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1864).

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Ninth report of the royal commission on historical manuscripts* (London: HMSO, 1883-4).

Rushworth, John, *Private Passages of State Beginning the sixteenth year of King James ... And ending the fifth year of King Charles*, 8 vols, (London: D, Browne, 1721 - 22).

Rutt, John T., ed, *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq*, 4 vols (London: Henry Colbourn, 1828).

Verney, Frances Parthenthorne and. Verney, Margaret M (eds), *Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Commonwealth 1656 – 1660*, 4 vols (London: Longman Green, 1894).

Wharton, George., *A Narrative of the late Parliament*, (London: 1657).

Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *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: Oxford University Press, 1853).

Wolfe, D M., *Leveller manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution* (New York and London: T. Nelson and sons, 1944).

Secondary Sources – Articles, Books and Pamphlets:

Adamson, J.S.A. 'Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (Harlow: Longman, 1990), pp. 49 – 92.

Ashley, Maurice, *Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate* (London: Frank Cass, 1962).

Ashton, Robert., *Reformation and Revolution 1558 – 1660* (London: Paladin, 1985).

Aubrey, Philip, *Mr Secretary Thurloe Cromwell's Secretary of State 1652 – 1660* (London: The Athlone Press, 1990).

Aylmer, G E., *The State's Servants: The Civil Service of the English Republic 1649 – 1660* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973).

Aylmer, G E., *Rebellion or Revolution? England from Civil War to Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986

Barber, Sarah, 'The People of Northern England and Attitudes Towards the Scots, 1639-1651: 'The Lamb and the Dragon Cannot Be Reconciled', *Northern History*, Volume: 35 (1999), Issue: 1, pp. 93 – 118.

Barbour, Hugh, *Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964).

Barclay, Andrew, 'Werden, Robert (1621/2–1690)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29064>, accessed 17 May 2016].

Barclay, Andrew, *Electing Cromwell: The Making of a Politician* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011).

Barnard, Toby, 'Boyle, Roger, first earl of Orrery (1621–1679)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3138>, accessed 30 June 2017].

Barnard, Toby, 'Fleetwood, Charles, appointed Lord Fleetwood under the protectorate (c.1618–1692)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9684>, accessed 4 Feb 2016]

Bell, Mark, 'Freedom to form: the development of Baptist movements during the English Revolution', in *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. by Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 181 – 201.

Bennett, Martyn, *The English Civil War – A Historical Companion* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 2000).

Blackwood, B G, *The Lancashire gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Chetham Society, 1978).

Booker, John, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch*, (Manchester, Chetham Society, 1859).

Braithwaite, William C, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan, 1912).

Broxap, Ernest, *The Great Civil War in Lancashire, 1642-1651* (Manchester: Victoria University of Manchester, Historical Series, Volume X, 1910).

- Buchan, John, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934).
- Bull, Stephen, *'A general plague of madness': the civil wars in Lancashire, 1640-1660* (Lancaster: Carnegie, 2009).
- Capp, Bernard, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972).
- Capp, Bernard, *England's culture wars: Puritan reformation and its enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012).
- Christianson, Paul, 'The Causes of the English Revolution: a Reappraisal', *Journal of British Studies*, 15 (1976), pp 40 – 75.
- Cliffe, J. T, *The Yorkshire gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: Athlone Press, 1969).
- Cliffe J. T, 'The Cromwellian Decimation Tax of 1655: the Assessment Lists', in *Camden miscellany. Vol.33, Seventeenth-century political and financial papers*, Royal Historical Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1996), pp. 403 – 492.
- Cole, Alan, 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', *Past and Present* , No. 10 (1956), pp. 39 – 54.
- Coleby, Andrew, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649 – 1689* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Coward, Barry, *Oliver Cromwell* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 1991).

Coward, Barry, 'The Experience of the Gentry 1640 – 1660', in *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution*, ed. by R. C. Richardson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), pp. 198 – 223.

Coward, Barry, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Coward, Barry 'Lilburne, Robert (bap. 1614, d. 1665)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16655>, accessed 31 Oct 2013].

Craven, Alex, 'Ministers of State: The Established Church in Lancashire during the English Revolution, 1642 – 1660', *Northern History*, XLV: 1(2008), pp. 51 – 69.

Damrosch, Leo, 'Nayler, James (1618–1660)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19814>, accessed 3 July 2017]

Davies, Godfrey, *The Early Stuarts 1603 – 1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).

Davis, J. C, 'Cromwell's Religion', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (Harlow: Longman, 1990), pp. 181 – 208.

Davis, J. C, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder Headline, 2001).

Davis, J. C, 'Oliver Cromwell', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 223 – 242.

Dore R. N, *The Civil Wars in Cheshire* (Chester: Cheshire Community Council, 1966).

Dore, R. N., *The Great Civil War (1642-46) in the Manchester area* (Manchester: University of Manchester Department of Extra-Mural Studies, 1972).

Douglas, David, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England*, (London: 1846).

Dow, Frances ,*Cromwellian Scotland 1651 – 1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979).

Doyle, Sheila, 'Mickleton, Christopher (bap. 1612, d. 1669)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70468>, accessed 9 June 2016]

Dumble, William, 'The Lilburnes and the English Revolution', in *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494 – 1660*, ed. by David Marcombe (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, Department of Adult Education, 1987), pp. 227 – 252.

Durston, Christopher, 'Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution 1645 – 1660', in *The Culture of English Puritanism 1560 – 1700*, ed. by Christopher Durston and Jaqueline Eales (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 210 – 233.

Durston, Christopher, 'The Fall of Cromwell's Major-Generals', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 450 (Feb., 1998), pp. 18-37.

Durston, Christopher., 'Settling the Hearts and Quieting the Minds of All Good People': The Major-Generals and the Puritan Minorities of Interregnum England', *History*, 85 (2000), pp. 247 – 267.

Durston, Christopher, *Cromwell's Major-Generals Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press: 2001).

Durston, Christopher, 'Hesilrige , Sir Arthur, second baronet (1601–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13123>, accessed 17 May 2014

Durston, Christopher, 'Worsley, Charles (1622–1656)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29980>, accessed 11 Oct 2012].

Durston, Christopher and Maltby, Judith, Introduction: religion and revolution in seventeenth-century England', in *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. by idem (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 1 – 16.

Egloff, Carol S., 'The Search for a Cromwellian Settlement: Exclusions from the Second Protectorate Parliament. Part 1: The Process and its Architects', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 17, pt. 2 (1998), pp. 178 – 197.

Everitt, Alan., ed. *Suffolk and the Great Rebellion* (Ipswich: Suffolk Records Society, 1960).

Everitt, Alan., *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Leicester: Leicester University Press 1966).

Farr, David, *John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and Cromwellian Major-General, 1619 – 1684* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003),

Farr, D N., 'Lambert, John (bap. 1619, d. 1684)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15939>, accessed 2 Nov 2013].

Firth, C H, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England* (New York: Putnam, 1906).

Firth, Sir Charles and Davies, Godfrey, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army*, 2 Volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).

Fletcher, Anthony. *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600 – 1660* (London: Longmans, 1975).

Fletcher, Anthony, 'The Religious Motivation of Cromwell's Major-Generals', in *Religious motivation: biographical and sociological problems for the Church historian Studies in Church History*(15), ed. by D. Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), pp.259 – 266.

Fletcher, Anthony, 'National and local awareness in the county communities, in *Before the English Civil War: essays on early Stuart politics and government*, ed. by Howard Tomlinson (Basingstoke : Macmillan 1983), 151 – 174.

Fletcher, Anthony, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Localities: the problem of Consent', in *Politics and People In Revolutionary England*, ed. by

Colin Jones, Malyn Newitt and Stephen Roberts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 187 – 204.

Fletcher, Anthony, *Reform in the Provinces the Government of Stuart England* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

Foster, Andrew W, 'The Struggle for Parliamentary Representation for Durham, c. 1600 – 1641', in *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494 – 1660*, ed. by David Marcombe (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, Department of Adult Education, 1987), pp. 176 – 201.

Fowler, J. T, *Durham University: Earlier Foundations and Present Colleges* (London: F. E. Robinson, 1904).

Foxley, Rachel, 'Varieties of Parliamentarianism', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 414, - 429.

Gardina Pestana, Carla, 'Imperial Designs: Cromwell's move on Jamaica transformed Britain's early empire' *History Today* Vol 67, Issue 6 (2017), pp. 8 – 11.

Gardiner, Samuel, Rawson, *History of the commonwealth and Protectorate*, 4 Volumes, (London: Longmans Green and Co, 1903).

Gaunt, Peter, 'Oliver Cromwell and his Protectorate Parliaments: Cooperation, Conflict and Control', in Ivan Roots (ed), *'Into Another Mould' Aspects of the Interregnum*, New edn, (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1998), pp. 70 – 100.

Gentles, Ian, 'The Sales of Bishops' Lands in the English Revolution, 1646-1660', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 95, No. 376 (1980), pp. 573 – 596.

Godwin, William, *The History of the Commonwealth of England*, 4 Vols, (London: H. Colburn, 1828).

Goodwin, Gordon, 'Howard, Charles, first earl of Carlisle (1628–1685)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13886, accessed 3 Nov 2013].

Gratton, J M., *The Parliamentarian and Royalist War Effort in Lancashire 1642 – 1651* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 2010).

Greaves, Richard L, 'Hobson, Paul (d. 1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37554, accessed 15 May 2017].

Greaves, Richard L, 'Howard, William, third Baron Howard of Escrick (c.1630–1694)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13949, accessed 14 July 2014].

Green, Adrian, 'Houses in north – eastern England: regionality and the British beyond, c. 1600 – 1750, in *Archaeologies of the British: Explorations of identity in Great Britain and its colonies 1600 – 1945*, ed. by Susan Lawrence (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 55 – 75.

Green, Adrian and Pollard, A. J, 'Introduction: Identifying Regions' in *Regional Identities in North East England, 1300 – 2000*, ed. by idem (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 1 – 25.

Green, Adrian and Pollard, A. J, 'Conclusion: Finding North-East England', *Regional Identities in North East England, 1300 – 2000*, ed. by idem (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 209 – 226.

Gregg, Pauline, *Free-born John: a biography of John Lilburne* (London: Dent, 1986)

Guizot, Francois M., *The History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, trans. A. R. Scoble, 2 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1854).

Guscott, S J., *Humphrey Chetham 1580 – 1653 Fortune, Politics and Mercantile Culture in Seventeenth Century England* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 2003).

Halliday, Paul D., *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns* (Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 1998).

Hallam, Henry, *The Constitutional History of England* (London: John Murray, 1827).

Helms, M. W. and Cruickshanks, Eveline, 'HOWARD, Charles (1628-85), of Naworth Castle, Cumb. and Hinderskelfe', *Yorks* [<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/howard-charles-1628-85>, accessed 17 May 2015].

Hill, Christopher, 'Parliament and People in seventeenth-century England', *Past and Present*, No. 92 (1981), pp. 100-124.

Hill, Christopher, *God's Englishman – Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1990).

Hirst, Derek, 'The Lord Protector 1653 – 1658', in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. by John Morrill (Harlow: Longman, 1990), pp. 119 – 148

Hirst, Derek, *England in Conflict 1603 – 1660* (London: Hodder Headline, 1999).

Hirst, Derek, 'Security and Reform in England's Other Nations, 1649 – 1658, in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 170 – 185.

Holmes, Clive, *Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln: History of Lincolnshire Committee, Society for Lincolnshire History & Archaeology, 1980).

Holmes, Clive, 'The County Community in Early Stuart Historiography', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1980), pp. 54 - 73.

Hopper, Andrew, 'Introduction: The Impact of the county community hypothesis', in *The County Community in Seventeenth- Century England and Wales*, ed. by Jaqueline Eales and Andrew Hopper (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2012), pp. 1 – 13.

Howell, Jr, Roger, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

Howell, Jr, Roger, 'The Army and the English Revolution: The Case of Robert Lilbune', in *Puritans and Radicals in North England*, ed. by idem (London: University of America Press, 1984), pp. 178 – 205.

Hughes, Ann, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-60* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Hughes, Ann, 'Coventry and the English Revolution', in R. C. Richardson (ed) *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), pp. 69 – 99.

Hume, David., *History of Great Britain from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688*, 4 Vols (Montrose: 1766).

Huntington, Jr, Frank C, 'Quakerism during the Commonwealth: The Experience of the Light', *Quaker History*, Volume: 71, Issue: 2 (1982), pp. 69 – 88.

Hutton, Ronald., *The British Republic 1649 – 1660*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

James, Mervyn, *Family, lineage and civil society: a study of society, politics and mentality in the Durham region, 1500-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

Kelsey, Sean, 'Fell, Thomas (bap. 1599, d. 1658)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29043>, accessed 17 May 2016].

Kidson, Ruth M., *The gentry of Staffordshire, 1662-1663* (Stafford: Staffordshire Record Society, Collections for a history of Staffordshire. 4th series; 2, 1958).

Kishlansky, Mark, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Kmec, Sonja., *Across the Channel Noblewomen in Seventeenth-Century France and England* (Trier: Kliomedia, 2010).

Knights, Mark, 'The Long Term Consequences of the English Revolution: State Formation, Political Culture and Ideology', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 518 – 534.

Lindley, Keith., *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997).

Lindley, Keith, 'Glynne, Sir John (1603–1666)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10843>, accessed 24 July 2017].

Little, Patrick and Smith, David L., *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate 1654 – 1659* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Liu, Tai, 'Cokayn , George (bap. 1620, d. 1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5820>, accessed 28 March 2017].

Maier, Wendy A, 'Heath, James (1629?–1664)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12836>, accessed 19 August 2015].

Marshall, Alan., 'Musgrave, Sir Philip, second baronet (1607–1678)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19662>, accessed 2 January 2015].

Meikle, Maureen. M., 'The Scottish Covenanters and the Borough of Sunderland, 1639–1647: A Hidden Axis of the British Civil Wars', *Northern History*, June (2017), pp. 1 – 22.

Morrill, John., *Cheshire 1630 – 1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).

Morrill, John., 'Brereton, Sir William, first baronet (1604–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2013. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3333>, accessed 19 July 2017]

Morrill, John., 'The English Revolution in British and Irish Context', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 555 – 576.

Muddiman, J G., *The Trial of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh: William Hodge, 1928).

Mullett, Michael, 'Heyrick, Richard (1600–1667)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13175>, accessed 9 Feb 2016].

Newman, Christine M. 'Bellasis family (per. c.1500–1653)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/71863>, accessed 27 May 2017]

Newton, Diana, *North East England, 1569 – 1625 Governance, Culture and Identity* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006).

Newton, Diana., 'A Crisis of Regional Identity in North Eastern England? Thomas Chaytor, 1554 – 1617, *Northern History*, LII: 2 (2015), pp. 200 – 216.

Noble, Mark, *The Lives of the English Regicides*, 2 Vols (London: John Stockdale, 1798).

Ovenden, Richard and Handley, Stuart, 'Howard, Lord William (1563–1640)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13947>, accessed 26 June 2017].

Phillips, C. B, 'County Committees and Local government in Cumberland and Westmorland 1642 – 1660', *Northern History*, Volume 5, Issue 1, January 1970, pp. 34 – 66.

Phillips, C. B, 'The Royalist North: the Cumberland and Westmorland Gentry 1642 – 1660', *Northern History*, Volume 14 (1978), Issue 1, pp. 169 – 192.

Phillips, C. B, 'Curwen family (per. c.1500–c.1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/71862>, accessed 8 January 2017].

Phythian-Adams, Charles, 'Introduction: an Agenda for Local History', in *Societies, Culture and Kinship, 1580 – 1850: Cultural Provinces and English Local History*, ed. by idem (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993), pp. 1 - 24.

Phythian-Adams, Charles, 'Differentiating Provincial Societies in English History', in *An Agenda for Regional History*, ed. by Bill Lancaster, Diana Newton and Natasha Vall (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Northumbria University Press, 2007), pp. 4 – 22.

Pinckney, Paul. J, 'The Cheshire Election of 1656', reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Volume 49, No. 2, Spring (1967).

Rains, III, John H, 'Egerton, Sir Philip (d. 1698)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40799>, accessed 22 May 2016].

Ranke, Leopold von, *The History of England Principally in the Seventeen Century*, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875).

Rannie, David, Watson, "Cromwell's Major Generals", *English Historical Review*, 10 (1895), pp. 471 – 506.

Reay, Barry, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985).

Reece, Henry, *The Army in Cromwellian England 1649 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Reid, R. R, *The Kings Council in the North* (London: Longmans, Green, 1921).

Richardson, R. C, *Puritanism in North-West England A regional study of the diocese of Chester to 1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972).

Richardson, R. C, *The Debate on the English Revolution*, 3rd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

Roberts, Stephen, 'Local Government Reform in England and Wales during the Interregnum', in *'Into Another Mould': Aspects of the Interregnum*, ed. by Ivan Roots, new edn (Exeter, University of Exeter Press, 1998), pp. 47 – 69.

Roberts, Stephen K, 'Cradock, Walter (c.1606–1659)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6564>, accessed 28 March 2017]

Roberts, Stephen K, 'Conclusion County counsels: some concluding remarks', in *The County Community in Seventeenth- Century England and Wales*, ed. by Jaqueline Eales and Andrew Hopper (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2012), pp. 125 – 136.

Roberts, Stephen K, 'State and Society in the English Revolution', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 294 – 311.

Robertson, James, 'Re-Writing the English Conquest of Jamaica in the Late Seventeenth Century', *English Historical Review* Vol. 117, No. 473 (2002), pp. 813 – 839.

Roots, Ivan, 'Swordsmen and Decimators – Cromwell's Major-Generals, in *The English Civil War and After 1642 – 1658*, ed. by R. H. Parry (London: Macmillan, 1970), pp. 78 – 92.

Roy, Ian, 'The English Republic, 1649 – 1660: the view from the Town Hall', in *Republiken und Republikanismus im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Helmut G. Koenigsberger and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1988), pp. 213 – 237.

Ryrie, Alec, 'Scripture the Spirit and the Meaning of Radicalism in the English Revolution', in *Radicalism and Dissent in the World of Protestant Reform*, ed. by Bridget Heal and Anorthe Kremers (Volkswagen Stiftung, German Historical Institute Library, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), pp 100 – 117.

Saunders Webb, Stephen, *The Governors-General: The English Army and the Definition of the Empire, 1659 – 1681* (Chapel Hill: Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

Schwoerer, Lois. G. *"No Standing Armies" The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth Century England* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).

Scott, David., 'Politics and Government in York 1642 – 1660', in *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution*, ed. by R. C. Richardson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), pp. 46 – 68.

Scott, David., 'Bridge, Sir Tobias (d. after 1672)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, May 2015

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66563>, accessed 27 Jan 2016].

Seaver, P S., 'Caryl, Joseph (1602–1673)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4846>, accessed 28 Sept 2017].

Sharp, Andrew., 'Lilburne, John (1615?–1657)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16654>, accessed 11 Feb 2016

Smith, David L, 'Fiennes, William, first Viscount Saye and Sele (1582–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9415>, accessed 19 July 2017].

Smith, David L, 'Musgrave, John (fl. 1642–1654)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19661>, accessed 27 January 2017].

Smith, David L., 'English Politics in the 1650s', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 243 – 259.

Snow, Vernon F, 'Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 74, No. 292 (1959), pp. 409 – 442.

Spence, R. T., 'The Pacification of the Cumberland Borders 1593 – 1628', *Northern History*, Volume 13, (1977), Issue: 1, pp. 59 – 160.

Spurlock, R. Scott, *Cromwell and Scotland: Conquest and Religion, 1650 – 1660* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007).

Spurlock, R. Scott, 'State, Politics and Society in Scotland 1637 – 1660', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 363 – 378.

Stater, Victor, 'Howard, Edward, first Baron Howard of Escrick (d. 1675)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13893>, accessed 27 June 2017].

Styles, Philip, The City of Worcester during the Civil Wars, 1640 – 1660, in *The English Civil Wars Local Aspects*, ed. by R. C. Richardson (Stroud: Sutton, 1997), pp. 187 – 238.

Surtess, Robert, *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, Sunderland and District Section* (Sunderland: Hills, 1908).

Sutton, C. W, 'Hollinworth, Richard (bap. 1607, d. 1656)', rev. R. C. Richardson, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13565>, accessed 9 Feb 2016].

Sutton, John, 'Cromwell's commissioners for preserving the peace of the Commonwealth: a Staffordshire case study', in *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution*, ed. by Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 151 – 182.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay, *History of England* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1926).

Underdown, David, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649 - 1660* (London: Archon Books, 1971).

Underdown, David, *Pride's purge: politics in the Puritan revolution* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).

Underwood, A. C, *A History of the English Baptists* (London: Baptist Union Publications Dept, 1947).

Vaughan, Robert, *The history of England under the House of Stuart, including the commonwealth 1603-88* (London: Baldwin and Craddock, 1840).

Venning, Timothy, 'Thurloe, John (bap. 1616, d. 1668)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004;

online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27405>, accessed 27 April 2014]

Watts, S. J, *From Border to Middle Shire Northumberland 1586 – 1625* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1975).

Whitehead, Julian, *Cavalier and Roundhead Spies Intelligence in the Civil War and Commonwealth* (Barnsley, Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2009).

Withington, Phil., 'Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York', *Past & Present*, No. 170 (2001), pp. 121 – 151.

Woolrych, A H., *Penruddock's Rising, 1655* (London: published for The Historical Association by G. Philip, 1955),

Woolrych, Austin., 'Penruddock's Rising 1655', in *The Historical Association Book of the Stuarts*, ed. by K. H. D. Haley (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973),

Woolrych, Austin., *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Woolrych, Austin., *Soldiers and Statesmen: The General Council of the Army and its Debates, 1647 – 1648* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

Woolrych, Austin., "The Cromwellian Protectorate – A Military Dictatorship?" *History* 75 (1990), pp. 207 – 231.

Woolrych, Austin., *Britain in Revolution 1625 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002),

Worden, Blair., *The Rump Parliament 1648 – 1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

Worden, Blair., 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan', in *Cromwell and the Interregnum*, ed. by David L. Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 39 – 59.

Worden, Blair., 'Oliver Cromwell and the Council', in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. by Patrick Little (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), pp. 82 – 104.

Worden, Blair., *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Wrightson, Keith., 'Elements of Identity: the re-making of the North East 1500 – 1760', in *Northumbria History and Identity 547 – 2000*, ed. by Robert Colls (Chichester: Phillimore and Co Ltd, 2007).

Secondary Sources – Articles in Newspapers:

Bailey, J. E, 'Major-General Charles Worsley, M.P. for Manchester 1654', *Manchester Guardian*, 28 December 1885.

Dore, R. N, 'Major-General Worsley: Cromwell's Favourite, *The Manchester Guardian*, 12 June 1956.

Secondary Sources – Unpublished Articles:

History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Tobias Bridge, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott.

History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Howard, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott.

History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on John Lambert, for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott.

History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Robert Lilburne for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott.

History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Charles Worsley for 1640 - 1660 section by David Scott. .

Secondary Sources – Unpublished Theses:

Beats, Lynn, 'Politics and government in Derbyshire, 1640-1660' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield, 1978).

Craven, Alex 'Coercion and Compromise: Lancashire Provincial Politics and the Creation of the English Republic, c. 1648-1653' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Manchester, 2004).

Dumble, W, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs in Durham during the Civil War and Interregnum' (unpublished master's thesis, University of Durham, 1978).

Little, Patrick, 'The political career of Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill 1638 – 1660' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 2000).

Phillips, C. B, 'The Gentry in Cumberland and Westmorland, 1600 – 1665' (unpublished doctoral thesis University of Lancaster, 1973).

Reece, H. M, 'The Military Presence in England 1649 – 1660' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1981).

Schilling, William A. H, 'The Central Government and the Municipal Corporations in England 1642 – 1663' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Vanderbilt, 1970).

Scott, David, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York, 1640 – 1700'
(unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 1990).

