

Sarah Louise Ward
St. Catherine's College

**Royalism, Religion, and
Revolution:
The Gentry of North-East
Wales, 1640-1688**

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of
the University of Oxford
November 2016

Short Abstract

This thesis focuses specifically on the gentry of North-East Wales. It addresses the question of the uniqueness of the region's gentry in relation to societal organisation, authority, identity, religion, and political culture. The thesis examines the impact of the events of 1640 to 1688 on the conservative culture of the region. It assesses the extent to which the seventeenth-century crises changed that culture. Additionally, it discusses the distinctiveness of the Welsh response to those events.

This thesis offers new arguments, or breaks new ground, in relation to three principal areas of historiography: the questions of Welsh identity, religion, and political culture. Within Welsh historiography this thesis argues for a continuation of Welsh identity and ideals. It uncovers a royalist, loyalist, and Anglican culture that operated using ancient ideals of territorial power and patronage to achieve its ends. In doing so it overturns a lingering idea that the Welsh gentry were anglicised and alienated from the populace. The thesis also interacts with English debates on the same themes. In exploring the unique aspects of the culture of North-East Wales, the assertion of an anglicised monoculture across England and Wales can be disproven. This allows for a more complex picture of British identity, religion, and politics to emerge.

This thesis musters correspondence, material objects, diaries, notebooks, accounts, official documents, and architectural features to aid in its analysis. This breadth of evidence allows for a broad analysis of regional patterns while allowing for depth when required. The first three chapters of the thesis examine the North-East Welsh gentry in relation to the themes of Welsh society and identity; religion; and finally political culture. The final chapter comprises three case studies that explore aspects of the aforementioned themes in further depth.

Long Abstract

This thesis focuses specifically on the gentry of North-East Wales. It addresses the question of the uniqueness of the region's gentry in relation to societal organisation, authority, identity, religion, and political culture. The thesis examines the impact of the events of 1640 to 1688 on the conservative culture of the region. It assesses the extent to which the seventeenth-century crises changed that culture. Additionally, it discusses the distinctiveness of the Welsh response to those events. These issues matter not only within Welsh historiography. In exploring the unique aspects of the culture of North-East Wales, the assertion of an anglicised monoculture across England and Wales can be disproven. This allows for a more complex picture of British identity, religion, and politics to emerge. It explores the extent of central government's authority within the 'dark corners' of its territory, and complicates narratives of marginalisation. It furthermore provides a case study of an unusually unified conservative society to serve as a counterpoint to the more divided counties of England. Conservative groups or societies have remained relatively underexplored within the historiography of early modern England and Wales. Additionally, within more politically and religiously diverse regions it can be difficult to locate the range of evidence needed to uncover patterns of behaviour or belief like those within North-East Wales. Within Welsh historiography this thesis argues for a continuation of Welsh identity and ideals. It uncovers a royalist, loyalist, and Anglican culture that operated using ancient ideals of territorial power and patronage to achieve its ends. In doing so it overturns a lingering idea that the Welsh gentry were anglicised and alienated from the populace, and that the seventeenth century essentially nurtured an incipient Puritan culture from which eighteenth-century Methodism and nonconformity sprang.

The archives of the North-East Welsh gentry include a great breadth of evidence. This thesis has mustered correspondence, material objects, diaries, notebooks, accounts, official documents, and

architectural features to aid in its analysis. Objects were an extremely powerful way for people to express opinions. While correspondence, diaries, and commonplace books may have explained royalist or conservative culture in words, objects demonstrated how royalism was expressed more broadly in gesture, emotion, or display. Material objects, funerary monuments, and the built environment proudly portrayed the North-East Welsh gentry as they wished to be seen and remembered: as loyal supporters of the Stuarts; personally allied to the Crown; and prepared to fight for their king and Church. This breadth of evidence allows for a broad analysis of regional patterns while allowing for depth when required. The evidence mirrors the multiple ways the gentry communicated with each other and those outside the region, recorded their ideas and attitudes, their spending and priorities. It covers the many ways in which they represented themselves, and allows the historian to piece together the social, religious, and political culture of the North-East Welsh gentry.

This thesis offers new arguments, or breaks new ground, in relation to three principal areas of historiography: the questions of Welsh identity, religion, and political culture. In speaking to Welsh historiographical questions, however, the thesis also interacts with English debates on the same themes. North-East Welsh gentry identity was strongly influenced by ideals of a hierarchical and ordered patriarchal society; loyalty; and continuity. These ideals had persisted in importance since the medieval period, alongside a strongly historicised culture that prioritised lineage and heritage over more recent religious or economic concerns. The major contributions of this thesis are threefold. The North-East Welsh gentry are reassessed in the light of their commitment to Welsh culture, language, history, and identity. North-East Welsh Anglicanism are explored in a new depth, and the level of its importance to Welsh identity and political behaviour discovered. Finally, the Welsh approach to politics is understood in terms of the language the gentry used themselves, and its interaction with concepts of Welsh gentility newly

understood. The lives of three individual gentlemen, two of whom have received minimal scholarly attention, provide detailed examples of each of these strands.

This thesis integrates North-East Welsh cultures of memory within the broader historicised culture of Wales. It argues that contemporary crises, for example the First Civil War, became integrated within national self-representations and narratives of Welsh history. The importance of history within Welsh culture post-1640 has never been sufficiently examined. This thesis provides ground-breaking analysis of the importance of history within the Welsh national self-perception and image from 1640 to 1688. Within that it examines the changing emphasis in Welsh historical writing, from bardic poetry as the preserver of Welsh identity and history to the writing of narrative history and manuscript collection.

The popularity of the Church of England did not sit easily with the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century view of Wales as a stronghold of nonconformity, with a tradition stretching back generations. Furthermore, it did not conform to the picture of a tyrannical and anglicised Church, in league with the similarly anglicised and repressive gentry. This was an image beloved of mid-nineteenth-century polemical nonconformist historians, but one that was remarkably persistent. Although this thesis recognises the importance of Puritan governments, people, and policies within Welsh historical development, it concentrates on the Anglican reaction to them, attempting to correct the neglect of conservative groups within the region and period. This thesis engages with English historiography by providing a regional case study of the response to religious change. The Welsh experience could act as a useful counterpoint to the more heterogeneous English regions, and may hopefully prompt further studies of the local operation of the Church.

The Welsh have been seen as proverbially royalist during the Civil Wars. They were depicted as such in contemporary pamphlets by parliamentarians and in narratives by proud royalists.

Generations of historians have commented on the royalism of the Welsh gentry, in varying levels of detail. Yet while some view Welsh royalism as a commonplace, there has been no detailed exploration of where Welsh royalism came from, historically or intellectually, what Welsh royalists believed, or its impact on events in Wales in the seventeenth century. Accepting Welsh royalism as a given means that its features and complexities have remained unexamined. The vast majority of work on Welsh royalists has focused on the period of the First Civil War and (to a lesser degree) the Interregnum, and there has been minimal attention paid to the Restoration or the later-seventeenth century. Most studies have concerned themselves with the question of allegiance. As with other aspects and regions of royalist interest, literary scholars have frequently taken the lead. This means there is still significant ground to be covered in terms of Welsh political culture, of which royalism and loyalism form an important part.

The thesis is arranged thematically rather than chronologically. The first three chapters explore interlocking themes that focus on Welsh historicised culture, religion, and politics. While largely discussed separately, these themes are evidently closely interrelated. Religion and politics taken together were central forces within the mid- and late-seventeenth-century crises, and their separation here is artificial. For the sake of coherence and analysis, however, they have been examined separately, with recognition being made of their symbiosis at key points. The Welsh historicised culture was the basis from which many of aspects of Welsh religious attitudes and political activity were founded, but again is most easily explained initially on its own. The three case studies in chapter four exemplify aspects of the themes in the previous chapters. Taken together, the themes examined within the thesis provide a well-rounded picture of the culture of the North-East Welsh gentry from 1640 to 1688.

Chapter one discusses the continued importance of the medieval Welsh concepts of kinship and lineage in seventeenth-century North-East Wales. It considers their impact on power structures

in the region and explores its significance for gentry ideals and behaviour. The chapter goes on to examine the connections between these concepts and the historicised culture and image of the principality as fostered by Welsh elites. The second section of the chapter considers the nature of this historicised culture in greater depth. It explores the ways in which it manifested itself and the impact it had on society and politics in Wales. Finally, the chapter investigates the importance of the Welsh language, arts, and music to the identity of the North-East Welsh gentry. North-East Welsh gentry society was underpinned by an historical and lineage-based identity, which buttressed the authority of gentry leaders and formed the basis of highly influential kinship networks. This underpinning differentiates the North-East Welsh gentry from their English counterparts.

Chapter two discusses the manner in which the North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated their support for the Church of England, and posits reasons for the constancy of that support. It considers the written and material evidence of Welsh religious preferences, and demonstrates that there were some demonstrably Welsh tendencies within Church of England worship. The second section explores relationships between the North-East Welsh Protestant gentry and their Catholic counterparts. It connects kinship relations and regional ties in determining relations between adherents of the two faiths. It examines how the Protestant gentry of the region responded to national crises involving Catholics. Finally, the chapter explores the more fractious interactions between the predominantly Prayer Book protestant gentry and the Puritans of North-East Wales. It proposes reasons why radical Puritans were seen as a more urgent or dangerous threat locally than Catholics, and considers the importance of historical memory and Welsh identity within that assessment of religious nonconformity.

In chapter three the thesis examines the political actions, ideas, and material culture of Welsh politics. It explores North-East Welsh electoral practices, and their actions and reactions in the

period 1640 to 1688. In examining political ideas and material culture, the chapter also considers the expression of North-East Welsh politics. One aspect of this is the relative absence of party politics in the region throughout the period. One of the principal foci of the chapter is the persistence of royalism and loyalism as a component of North-East Welsh gentry identity. This chapter explores the language by which loyalism was expressed, and its relationship to political actions in North-East Wales. The chapter provides insights into a strongly conservative and conformist localist political culture and considers reasons why such a political culture survived throughout the upheavals of the seventeenth century.

The three case studies in chapter four engage with themes within the three previous chapters. They discuss significant aspects of the thesis with a depth of detail that is impossible within the broad thematic chapters, by focussing on three individuals. This makes possible a more thorough exploration of the archives of a few regionally-important families, and the revelation of the range and breath of information within Welsh collections. The chosen individuals span the whole period from 1640 to 1688, and are examined in the light of one specific theme each. The first case study concerns Thomas Mostyn (1651-92), eldest son of Sir Roger Mostyn of Mostyn. It focuses on Mostyn's manuscripts and books, and discusses their significance in terms of Welsh historicised culture and history writing. Sir Thomas Hanmer (1612-78) of Hanmer and Bettisfield is the subject of the second case study. His religious affiliation is investigated in the light of evidence which could reveal him as either a typical North-East Welsh Anglican squire or as a 'church papist'. This debate uncovers some of the central features both of Welsh Anglicanism and of attitudes to Catholicism in the region. Finally, Robert Davies (1616-66) of Gwysaney is investigated on the theme of North-East Welsh royalism and loyalism.

Acknowledgements

If I could have only one acknowledgement, it would be to my superlative supervisor, Grant Tapsell. His encouragement, help, kindness, and support throughout the research and writing of this thesis have been truly heroic.

Those who say academia is entirely an unkind environment to those beginning their research clearly did not have the good fortune to encounter the many friendly, inspiring, reassuring (and sometimes consoling) people who I have talked and met with over the last four years. Amongst many others my thanks go to Stephen Roberts, Alex Gajda, Steve Gunn, Jon Healey, Clive Holmes, Thomas Charles Edwards, Gabriel Glickman, Bethan Jenkins, and Sarah Mortimer. My profound gratitude goes especially to Bob Evans, who so kindly gave his time and persuaded me to attempt the part-time route. My thanks to the archivists and librarians at record offices, libraries, archives, and heritage sites in Wales, England, and the USA. Thanks also to Richard Davies-Cooke, Miranda Dechazal, and Lord Mostyn for allowing me into their homes and libraries to investigate the deeds of their ancestors, and to Elizabeth Sass for kindly permitting me to view the Hanmer snuffbox.

Part-time study comes with many joys, but also with the pressing need to earn money to support oneself. The IHR's Royal Historical Society Centenary Fellowship allowed me to concentrate solely on research and writing in my final year. Fellowships and grants from the Huntington Library, Cambrian Archaeological Society, Royal Historical Society, Gladstone's Library, St. Catherine's College; and the Theodora Bosanquet Fund allowed me to write, travel to archives and conferences, and made research expenses manageable. To those who have employed me in non-academic jobs over the last four years, I thank you for your patience with my occasional preoccupations with long-dead Welsh people.

They say that it takes a whole village to raise a child. In its infancy, therefore, this thesis has been the product of a virtual city of support, encouragement, and love. During the final months of gestation there have been so many individuals who have kept it on track, and kept me going. To list all of them without missing anyone would be impossible, so apologies to those who played their part and have been left out. Special thanks, for the OALL wonders of the last few months go to Katie McKeogh. Without her, progress would have been precipitous and the process absent of the laughter of the last few months. To George Artley, Mary Chadwick, Joan Redmond, Chris Knaack, Tim Marlow, Catherine Vallejo Veiga, Erik Spindler, Judith Hayes, Tracy Gudgeon, Jackie D'Arcy, John Sullivan, Hazel Orrock, Alex Robinson, Ted Smyth, Ioanna Tsakiropoulou and Emma Turnbull, thanks for the conversation, fun, support, and motivation to keep going. Huge thanks to Chris Gausden for proof-reading. To John Nelson, my best friend of Siena, whose love and friendship means the world.

Last but not least, to my family, who have put up with my obsessive research and conversation about Welsh gentlemen, religion, and royalism. My father, Roland Ward, remains my inspiration in all things – I can only aspire to his wondrous gentleness, kindness and concern, and passion for his region and heritage. My mum has kept me going through the tough times, and made me laugh in the good ones. Peter Brown has perpetually encouraged and cared for me, and Alice Ward has offered wise words and counsel. To Cuthbert, Hobbes, Molly and Pip, your warmth, listening ears and active legs were essential. Finally, to my man and his dog: whose love truly keeps my world spinning, my heart in Oxford, and my head (generally speaking) on my shoulders. Thank you all.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Ruth Canham (1920-2016): a wise, loving, and caring lady who accompanied my life up to literally the final words of this thesis.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Conventions.....	1
Introduction	3
I. Methodology	8
II. Royalism, religion, and revolution in Welsh and English historiography.....	14
III. Themes and structure	29
Chapter 1: Welsh society: kinship, history, and identity	33
I: The Continuing Significance of Medieval Welsh Concepts of Gentility.....	35
II: Wales and the Historicised Nation	54
III: Welsh Self-Identification, Language, and Culture	67
IV: Conclusion	76
Chapter 2: Religion in North-East Wales.....	79
I: The Welshness of the Church of England.....	80
II. Catholicism and the North-East Welsh Gentry	99
III. Puritanism and the North-East Welsh Gentry 1640-88	113
IV: Conclusion.....	133
Chapter 3: Political life, culture, and good governance in North-East Wales	136
I. Elections, partisans, and professions of loyalty.....	137
II. Political actions and reactions in North-East Wales	150
IV. North-East Welsh material culture: Memory, hope, and preservation.....	184
V: Conclusion	192
Chapter 4: Case Studies	194
I. Thomas Mostyn: Collections, historical writing, and Welsh identity	197
II. Sir Thomas Hanmer: Anglican squire or ‘church papist’?	219
III. Robert Davies III: Royalism and loyalism in North-East Wales, c.1640-1668	240
Conclusion	258
Bibliography	268

Abbreviations and Conventions

BL: British Library

Bodl.: Bodleian Library

DHST: Denbighshire Historical Society Transactions

DIB: Dictionary of Irish Biography

DRO: Denbighshire Record Office

DWB: Dictionary of Welsh Biography

EHR: English Historical Review

FHSP: Flintshire Historical Society Publications

FRO: Flintshire Record Office

HJ: Historical Journal

HL: Huntington Library

HLQ: Huntington Library Quarterly

HOP 1640-1660: S.K. Roberts (ed.), *The House of Commons 1640-1660* (forthcoming).

HOP 1660-1690: B.D. Henning (ed.), *The House of Commons 1660-1690* (3 vols, 1983).

JBS: Journal of British Studies

JEH: Journal of Ecclesiastical History

JWEH: Journal of Welsh Ecclesiastical History

JWRH: Journal of Welsh Religious History

LPL: Lambeth Palace Library

MC: Mostyn Correspondence

MH: Mostyn Hall

MN: Mostyn Newsletters

NLW: National Library of Wales

NLWJ: The National Library of Wales Journal

ODNB: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

P&P: Past & Present

THSC: Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion

TNA: The National Archives

TRHS: Transactions of the Royal Historical Society

WHR: Welsh History Review

All books were printed in London unless otherwise stated.

Introduction

Picture the early modern North-East Welsh gentleman. Confident of his lineage and dynastic authority, his medieval hall was adorned with heraldic devices, portraits, and signs of his connections to other gentle families. In his hall or his library, a number of Welsh or Irish harps rested ready for an evening of music and poetry. On these evenings, the bards and musicians would perform for the household and guests, drawn from regionally important families who reciprocated his hospitality in their own residences. The Welsh language could be heard throughout the estate spoken by the family, their tenants, and servants. In his library there were Welsh medieval manuscripts and contemporary verse; the latest tracts, pamphlets, and controversial books; and histories of Wales or of the ancient Britons alongside material popular across Britain on travel, religion, and European history. Alongside the portraits of kin, ancestors, and connections hung those of monarchs. After 1649 the visitor would notice the persistent presence of miniature and full-size paintings of Charles I and his son. If known to be a fellow sympathiser, royalist artefacts may also have been displayed. A number of Prayer Books in Welsh and English sat within the library, and in his private chapel stained glass, a crucifix, a beautifully carved font, and a railed altar lay ready for a Prayer Book service. This gentleman was a strong supporter of his parish church, providing financial support, concluding bargains over the font stone, owning pews, and burying his dead there as his ancestors had done for generations. Particularly in difficult times, however, his private chapel meant that his own religious preferences could more openly and consistently be observed. This image depicts the wealthier North-East Welshman at home in his conservative social, religious, and political world. This was a world recognisable in some important aspects to his medieval forebears. It demonstrates a continuity of ideals and practices that would be unusual in England within a whole region or community.

To seventeenth-century Englishmen the Welsh were a distinct ‘race’. Stage Welshmen were figures of fun. With their comical English, bravery and hot temper, old-fashioned dress, love of cheese and goats, and their obsession with pedigrees, they were regarded fondly as characters in the pre-1640 theatre.¹ To the parliamentarian propagandists of the 1640s, the Welsh were dangerous ‘pagan-politicians’, ignorant knee-jerk royalists, Laudians or crypto-papists in religion, and cowardly fighters in battle.² *The Un-Deceiver*, for example, made clear that the Welsh were the ‘other’, wondering how ‘the Cavaliers, Negro’s, Welsh & Irish’ thought themselves able to deliver the kingdom’s peace.³ To contemporaries, early modern Welsh gentlemen were different in how they lived, thought, and worshipped. The stereotype was clearly exaggerated and pejorative, and in some aspects simply inaccurate. Yet, as with many stereotypes, it contained a grain of truth. First, it would have seemed ridiculous to early modern contemporaries to question whether the Welsh were different to their neighbours, even if the medium through which they pictured that difference was often negative or humorous. While there were many points of similarity with their English neighbours, and while English trends were often taken up enthusiastically within Wales, fundamental differences remained. Secondly, if the pejorative angle is stripped away from a few central aspects of the stereotype it does broadly accurately identify principal areas of difference between the gentlemen of Wales and England. Kinship and territorial authority retained a practical force missing from the English counties, rooted as it was in Welsh medieval culture and law. The Welsh gentry were particularly fascinated with the history and lineage of their regions. In many regions they were ardent royalists. Support for a

¹ W. Maley and P. Schwyzer, ‘Introduction: A Welsh Correction’, in *idem.* (eds), *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 2, 4; P. Lord, *Words with pictures: Welsh Images and Images of Wales in the Popular Press, 1640-1860* (Aberystwyth, 1995), pp. 34, 37-8; W.J. Hughes, *Wales and the Welsh in English Literature: From Shakespeare to Scott* (1924), p. 35.

² For example, Anon., *The Recantation of Mercurius Aulicus, or Berkinheads complaint* (1644), p. 2.

³ Anon., *The Un-Deceiver* (1643), p. 4.

strongly ceremonial, sacramental, and visual form of worship within the Church of England remained robust in North-East Wales throughout the seventeenth century.

This thesis focuses specifically on the gentry of North-East Wales. It addresses the question of the uniqueness of the region's gentry in relation to societal organisation, authority, identity, religion, and political culture. The thesis examines the impact of the events of 1640 to 1688 on the conservative culture of the region. It assesses the extent to which the seventeenth-century crises changed that culture. Additionally, it discusses the distinctiveness of the Welsh response to those events. These issues matter not only within Welsh historiography. By exploring the unique aspects of the culture of North-East Wales, the assertion of an anglicised monoculture across England and Wales can be disproven. This allows for a more complex picture of British identity, religion, and politics to emerge. It explores the extent of central government's authority within the 'dark corners' of its territory, and complicates narratives of marginalisation. The thesis furthermore provides a case study of an unusually unified conservative society to serve as a counterpoint to the more divided counties of England. Conservative groups or societies have remained relatively underexplored within the historiography of early modern England and Wales. Additionally, within more politically and religiously diverse regions it can be difficult to locate the range of evidence needed to uncover patterns of behaviour or belief like those within North-East Wales. This thesis diverges from Welsh historiography in arguing that Welsh identity and ideals persisted. It uncovers a royalist, loyalist, and Anglican culture that operated using ancient ideals of territorial power and patronage to achieve its ends. In doing so it overturns a lingering idea that the Welsh gentry were anglicised and alienated from the populace, and that the seventeenth century essentially nurtured an incipient Puritan culture from which eighteenth-century Methodism and nonconformity sprang.

Geographically, the thesis focuses on North-East Wales. For the purposes of this thesis, North-East Wales will mean the counties of Denbighshire and Flintshire as defined by the pre-1974 boundaries. Flintshire, therefore, includes the enclave of Maelor Saesneg. It is one of the oldest of the thirteen historic counties of Wales, formed in 1284 under the Statute of Rhuddlan. Denbighshire was formed under mid-sixteenth-century legislation that made up the so-called Acts of Union. The current county of that name covers a substantially different geographical area. All of the families discussed in detail within the thesis had either their main estate or a significant smaller landholding in either of these two counties. The Wynn family's Gwydir estate, for example, was based less than a mile away from the Denbighshire county boundary but they were significantly involved with Denbighshire and Flintshire politics and society. They had landholdings and held offices in both counties.⁴ Another example, Thomas Mostyn, is generally styled 'of Gloddaith' in Caernarfonshire. He lived at Gloddaith for most of his adult life, while his father inhabited the family's principal seat at Mostyn in Flintshire. Despite this, he was the eldest son of the Mostyn family and was frequently at Mostyn. He was connected socially and by kinship to most of the gentry families of Flintshire and Denbighshire.

Since the revisionist turn of the 1960s historians of the gentry and the English counties have prefaced their work with a definition of the gentry themselves – their status, wealth, and kin relationships; their landholdings; the size of the group; and the question of a group identity.⁵ It was vital to consider such questions because the potential size and variation within even those who termed themselves 'gentleman' was significant. Furthermore,

⁴ J.G. Jones, 'The Wynn Family', *ODNB*.

⁵ For example, B.G. Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Manchester, 1978), pp. 4-28; A. Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Leicester, 1966), pp. 33-45; A. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (1975), pp. 22-57; F. Heal and C. Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales 1500-1700* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 6-19. R.W. Ketton-Cremer, *Norfolk in the Civil War: A Portrait of a Society in Conflict* (1969), pp. 34-43; J. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society During the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974), pp. 1-21.

though the gentry had frequently been discussed in historical works prior to this point, definitions were left unwritten or vague. This thesis will not attempt to define the North-East Welsh gentry in such specific terms. Historians such as John Gwynfor Jones have analysed the economic status and resources, landholdings, and education of the Welsh gentry.⁶ By contrast, this study considers the Welsh gentry as a self-defined group. Their status was determined principally by lineage and pedigree rather than economic standing. The poorer Welsh families would not be considered gentry in many English studies or by their English contemporaries, with their emphasis on size of landholdings and wealth. Although Heal and Holmes define the gentry ultimately as ‘that group of men and women whose gentility was acknowledged by others’, there was a strong correlation between wealth and status in England.⁷ This emphasis was not entirely missing in Wales, particularly in the practical exercise of power. In terms of ideals, self-representation, culture, and the acknowledgement of gentility, however, the Welsh approached gentility differently. To consider the Welsh gentry without including those families of excellent pedigree but minimal financial power would risk misunderstanding it. It would entail the use of a definition of the English gentry to discuss a group with a different understanding of the fundamental source of gentility. Although lineage was one source of English gentle status, it lacked the authority that the concept occupied within Welsh gentry identity.⁸ Many of the archival sources and examples within this thesis are drawn from wealthier families, because their collections have more frequently survived the passage of time. Where possible, however, less prominent families feature. Their histories have survived within the archives of those who absorbed their lands, either through marriage or purchase.

⁶ J.G. Jones, *Early Modern Wales, c.1525-1640* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 8-14, 21-30.

⁷ Heal and Holmes, *Gentry in England and Wales*, pp. 15, 19.

⁸ See chapter one, p. 38.

I. Methodology

The archives of the North-East Welsh gentry include a great breadth of evidence. This thesis has mustered correspondence, material objects, diaries, notebooks, accounts, official documents, and architectural features to aid in its analysis. This range allows for a broad analysis of regional patterns while allowing for depth when required. The evidence mirrors the multiple ways the gentry communicated with each other and those outside the region, recorded their ideas and attitudes, their spending and priorities. It covers the many ways in which they represented themselves, and allows the historian to piece together the social, religious, and political culture of the North-East Welsh gentry.

This thesis has at its heart the correspondence of the gentry families of North-East Wales. It rests on an archival base of thousands of letters drawn from major and minor collections. The large letter collection of the Wynns numbered some 2,891 documents when calendared in 1926, covering the years 1515-1690.⁹ The Mostyn newsletters alone total several thousand items dated from 1673-92, even without the correspondence collection that commences a year earlier.¹⁰ Meanwhile the correspondence in the Chirk, Gwysaney, Hanmer, Ellesmere, and Trevor collections number conservatively several hundred more sources. Minor collections can be crucial, including the Rhual, Lleweni, Henry, and Lloyd of Llanforda archives. Furthermore, major English collections such as the Evelyn papers and Tanner manuscripts are useful in further contextualising the Welsh papers.

James Daybell argues that letter-writing had crucial functions: maintaining communication with family members; keeping abreast of local, national, and international news; oiling the

⁹ J.F. Rees, 'The Wynn of Gwydir papers', *Welsh Outlook*, 14 (1927), p. 212.

¹⁰ G. Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 92.

wheels of kinship and patronage networks; and conducting business and estate affairs.¹¹ North-East Welsh male and female letter-writers made use of all of these functions. They wrote to a wide range of social and economic contacts across the region and further afield.¹² Correspondents discussed matters of individual personal interest, such as legal cases, debts, and purchases from London and Chester. They also communicated about topics of national interest such as the status of the Church; policies in relation to Catholicism; and events in parliament. This makes correspondence a particularly rich source for a thesis that explores social, political, and religious attitudes. As Jason Scott-Warren argues in relation to book-buying, letters supplement, contextualise, and explain in ways that other sources do not. Scott-Warren gives the example of Sir Thomas Knyvett's library catalogue, which has formed the basis of the traditional scholarly account of his collecting. This gives only a narrow sense of what Knyvett was interested in and what he obtained, leaving an impression that his collecting was an easy or unproblematic venture. Upon reading his letters it becomes clear that Knyvett's collecting was not only part of broader 'commerce', but that obtaining books was at times difficult, requiring agents and representatives to act on Knyvett's part.¹³ Thomas Mostyn's letters regarding book-buying demonstrate a similar truth, but the wider point regarding the value of correspondence is also relevant to (for example) Sir Thomas Myddelton and Sir Thomas Hanmer's religious attitudes, or the political activities of Sir Thomas Salusbury.

There are clearly methodological considerations when using letter collections. First, as Gary Schneider has pointed out, early modern letters were not always designed only for a single sender and recipient. They were frequently shared and circulated amongst epistolary

¹¹ J. Daybell, *Women Letter-writers in Tudor England* (Oxford, 2006), p. 1.

¹² In seventeenth-century North-East Wales this is as evident as it was for Daybell in his examination of the countess of Shrewsbury's letters in the sixteenth century. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹³ J. Scott-Warren, 'News, Sociability, and Bookbuying in Early Modern England: The Letters of Sir Thomas Cornwallis', *The Library*, 1 (2000), p. 385.

circles, whether familial or much wider. Some were copied into letter-books by their authors or other parties, and others were copied and circulated for their political, social, or religious interest value. The final letter of the seventh earl of Derby, written just prior to his execution in 1651, is a good example of this phenomenon. During this process letters could be amended or edited by their authors or collectors.¹⁴ A range of people had access to the process of letter-writing and receiving: secretaries, family members, carriers, and (as was the cause of much anxiety) those who intercepted or otherwise purloined letters.¹⁵ Letters were frequently not private texts, therefore, and so must be read carefully when considering them as evidence of an individual's private opinions. Recipients sometimes crossed out particularly salacious information (in Thomas Mostyn's letters of news, for example) or removed evidence of the sender's name, possibly in preparation for circulation.¹⁶ A letter from Mutton Davies to Mostyn, and the presence of stray newsletters addressed to Robert Coytmore in Mostyn's collection, indicate that his letters were not just read by him.¹⁷ Correspondents also concealed their identity either under a pseudonym, (for example John Castle, a correspondent of the earl of Bridgewater, who signed himself *De Sacro Bosco*) or simply by not signing their names to letters, as with many of Mostyn's correspondents.¹⁸ It must be assumed that those involved in epistolary exchange were aware that there was a possibility of their words being shared, leading to a certain level of self-consciousness regarding controversial opinions or attitudes that diverged from the norm. If considered with caution these issues can be useful in themselves, however, as they

¹⁴ NLW, MS 1595E fo. 17: Copy of a letter from James, seventh earl of Derby, to his wife, 12 Oct. 1652; G. Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark, Del., 2005), pp. 22-3, 25-7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁶ For example, MH, MN MS 9088, fos 38r-v: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 28 Oct. 1673; fos 18-19: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 29 July 1673.

¹⁷ MH, MC vol. 2, no. 5: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Apr. 1677; MN MS 9089 fos 88-89: Anon. to Robert Coytmore, n.p., 26 Feb. 1677.

¹⁸ For example, MH, MN 9088 fos 1-2: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 8 Apr. 1673.

can give evidence of the very regional or national norms and patterns under examination in this thesis.

Second, most letter collections, no matter how large, are incomplete. Surviving correspondence demonstrates that some letters did not arrive at their destination, causing significant anxiety. Others were not deemed worthy of preservation and were not bound into volumes or copied into letter-books, but have left traces in those that did survive. Some letters were lost or significantly damaged over time, via accident, poor conservation, or simply the materiality of the letter. This means that information about an event or the formation of an opinion is missing, and the picture received by the historian incomplete. What survives is, to a great extent, arbitrary. Historians very rarely have a sense of why some letters were preserved rather than others and, indeed, if most individuals had a rationale. Finally, the purpose for which historians require letters as evidence is obviously very different to that of their creators or readers. Seeking information, often on specific and pre-determined themes, it is possible for historians to misinterpret or to over-analyse the words of the past. Despite these considerations, the evidence provided by correspondence collections outweighs the difficulties of using them. Even if attitudes displayed within letters could only reveal patterns of public sensibilities they would still be useful in informing historians of the acceptable positions of the time. That such standpoints are also evident in notebooks, diaries, and marginalia (for example) gives more weight to their adoption as personal as well as private attitudes. Letters are too rich a source to reject, and the ability to cross-check and consider them with caution and with reference to context minimises some of their problems.

It is important to consider regional cultures beyond traditional archive sources. As Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello have argued, to move beyond archival manuscript sources

would, a few years ago, have been the cause of much scepticism amongst historians. This is no longer the case. Increasingly historians are considering material and visual culture and literary sources as an integral part of the historical discipline.¹⁹ If objects are indeed ‘tools through which people shape their lives’, rather than ‘simple props of history’, then the material culture of seventeenth-century North-East Wales is extremely important. Material objects give insights into people’s desires and preferences, while literary sources are vital in understanding political opinions and the adaptation within a locality of a wider national or transregional political culture.²⁰ This methodology has been largely missing from studies of early modern Welsh history. Shaun Evans’s thesis on the Mostyns of Mostyn Hall has been the only work to use effectively a range of material objects and architectural features to illuminate the lives, beliefs, and culture of North-East Wales, although Lloyd Bowen has considered the materiality of church worship.²¹ Historians such as Stephen Brogan and Robert Tittler have demonstrated that it is both possible and useful to integrate a much broader methodological range into historical monographs, providing an additional and extremely enlightening dimension to the study of their periods and topics.²² Literary scholars have been more consistently open to this approach, producing fascinating work entwining literary sources with objects and historical or political context.²³

As studies such as Neil Guthrie’s *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* have shown, objects were an extremely powerful way for people to express opinions.²⁴ While correspondence,

¹⁹ A. Gerritsen and G. Riello (eds), *Writing Material Culture History* (2015), p. 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 8.

²¹ S. Evans, ‘“To contynue in my bloud and name”: Reproducing the Mostyn Dynasty, c.1540-1692’ (Univ. of Aberystwyth PhD thesis, 2013); L. Bowen, *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c.1603-42* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 213-32.

²² S. Brogan, *The Royal Touch in Early Modern England: Politics, Medicine and Sin* (2015); R. Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, and Publics in Provincial England 1540-1640* (Oxford, 2012).

²³ For example, J. de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004); R. Willie, ‘Sacrificial Kings and Martyred Rebels: Charles and Rainborowe Beatified’, *Etudes Episteme*, 20 (2011); J. Loxley, *The Writing of Royalism 1628-1660* (Cambridge, 2001).

²⁴ N. Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge, 2013).

diaries, and commonplace books may have communicated royalist or conservative culture in words, objects demonstrated how royalism was expressed more broadly in gesture, emotion, or display. Material objects, funerary monuments, and the built environment proudly portrayed the North-East Welsh gentry as they wished to be seen and remembered: as loyal supporters of the Stuarts; personally allied to the Crown; and prepared to fight for their king and Church. It memorialised them and demonstrated the importance of particular events and allegiances within their lives. They provided continuity, whether in life or in death.²⁵ There are some obvious methodological problems with using objects and the built environment. First, as Murray Pittock has demonstrated in relation to Jacobite artefacts, their survival is ‘fragmentary but widespread’.²⁶ Second, it is often difficult to ascertain when an artefact or architectural element came into a gentry household. In the case of some Mostyn portraits, for example, their nature (being created specifically for the space they inhabited) meant that for inventory purposes they were considered as part of the house rather than as portable items suitable for inclusion. The vast majority of commissions for portraits or furniture do not survive, and clearly the provenance of royalist relics cannot be firmly established. Third, as some of them are ‘treacherous objects’, their nature is to conceal their message and to appear innocuous or at least maintain a level of plausible deniability. The purpose of funerary monuments was to portray the individual as they or their family wished, creating continuity and securing ‘a better future by rewriting the past, not merely preserving it’. In this way they, too, aimed to conceal. Additionally, through their inscriptions monuments told future generations what to value and how to live – and in relation to royalism and Anglicanism this was important in North-East Wales.²⁷ While historians may be able to decode their messages effectively, it

²⁵ P. Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Farnham, 2008), pp. 2-3.

²⁶ M. Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1720: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013), p. 13.

²⁷ Pittock uses the term ‘treacherous objects’ in relation to those ‘things’ which held treasonous messages, decodable only by partisans or being sufficiently ambiguous to avoid prosecution. Pittock, *Material Culture*, pp. 14-15; Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory*, pp. 3-4.

is possible either to over-interpret, seeing secret messages everywhere, or incorrectly interpret a message due to lack of contextual understanding or obliqueness.

It is difficult to provide solutions to these problems. In terms of the first objection, the fragmentary survival of artefacts can still lead to the establishment of a pattern of ownership. This is possible in relation to seventeenth-century North-East Welsh royalist artefacts. The composite picture provided by the surviving evidence is one of widespread ownership of portraits, miniatures, and other signs of Stuart allegiance. The second objection is harder to overcome. In some cases the makers or artists can be traced, and later evidence used to demonstrate an object was in possession of a family before later periods of collection. Some documentary evidence or inventories exist to substantiate the arrival of other artefacts. The final problem can only be prevented by a cautious and methodical approach to the objects under consideration, and an awareness of the possible pitfalls involved in interpreting 'secret', potentially seditious, or value-laden objects.

II. Royalism, religion, and revolution in Welsh and English historiography

This thesis offers new arguments, or breaks new ground, in relation to three principal areas of historiography: the questions of Welsh identity, religion, and political culture. In speaking to Welsh historiographical questions, however, the thesis also interacts with English debates on the same themes. North-East Welsh gentry identity was strongly influenced by ideals of a hierarchical and ordered patriarchal society; loyalty; and continuity. These ideals had persisted in importance since the medieval period, alongside a strongly historicised culture that prioritised lineage and heritage over more recent religious or economic concerns. The continuity of these ideals was first identified by John Gwynfor Jones. Their importance has since been traced in detail by Shaun Evans in relation to the Mostyn family. This prioritisation of continuity and heritage was fundamental to the development of a conservative political, social, and religious culture. This was not,

however, a ‘petrified medieval hierarchy’.²⁸ North-East Welsh society, dominated by gentry elites politically and economically, was not frozen in time. It responded to new developments in national politics and religion via a flourishing news culture, but adapted the requirements of the government to fit the needs of the region rather than the reverse. Families had risen to prominence and fallen from power over the centuries, and the way in which kinship functioned in a legal and political context had changed. As Bowen indicates, there was a patriarchal social structure, and a widespread commitment to a hierarchical society that led to a greater homogeneity of opinion across Welsh social groups. Whereas he argues that this was a function of the ‘social geography of language’ in Wales and the degree of control of information by the gentry and clergy, this thesis contends that conservative stability and order were prized throughout the social hierarchy.²⁹ Although the thesis does not, for want of space and a desire to maintain an analytical focus, discuss the conservative culture on a broader social level, the evidence suggests that the populace was committed to the Church and the Crown. To deny them their own agency in this matter commits the historian to the argument that the masses could acquire their own information about contemporary affairs but denies them the ability to make their own decisions about it. It also implies a rather Whiggish view of religious change and progress in the principality.

Cultures of memory have formed an important current in early modern historical thinking over the last fifteen years. Historians have examined social, civic, political, public, and religious memory.³⁰ They have explored material, literary, intellectual, testamentary and

²⁸ Bowen argues that elite groups such as the gentry and clergy helped to inhibit the arrival of ‘oppositional discourses’ such as Puritanism and Whiggery, but contends that the existence of ‘bilingual brokers’ and ‘non-elite interlocutors’ meant that information still reached the people. L. Bowen, ‘Information, Language, and Political Culture in Early Modern Wales’, *P&P*, 228, (2015), p. 127.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

³⁰ For example, A. Ford, ‘Martyrdom, History and Memory in Early Modern Ireland’, in I. McBride (ed.), *History and Memory in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 43-66; J. Gibney, ‘The Memory of 1641 and

geographical sources and uses of memory.³¹ Only one of these studies relates specifically to Wales, and that focuses on the sixteenth century.³² While Philip Schwyzer and Alexandra Walsham are adept at handling the Welsh context and using Welsh examples, the sheer breadth of the English work demonstrates that the Welsh historiography has far to go in terms of investigating the significance of memory in early modern Wales.³³ This thesis integrates North-East Welsh cultures of memory within the broader historicised culture of Wales. It argues that contemporary crises, for example the First Civil War, became integrated within national self-representations and narratives of Welsh history. The importance of history within Welsh culture post-1640 has never been sufficiently examined. Literary scholars and historians of most historical periods have explored aspects of Welsh history-writing and historicised culture, but the topic has never particularly caught the imagination of historians of the seventeenth century to the extent it deserves.³⁴ This

Protestant Identity in Restoration and Jacobite Ireland', in M.A. Busted, F. Neal and J. Tonge (eds), *Irish Protestant Identities* (Manchester, 2008), pp. 13-27; A.J. Hopper, 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire', *HJ*, 45 (2002), pp. 281-303; V. Morgan, 'The Construction of Civic Memory in Early Modern Norwich', in M. Kwint, C. Breward, and J. Aynsley (eds), *Material Memories* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 183-97; M. Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013); M. Stoye, 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', in P. Gray and K. Oliver (eds), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester, 2004), pp. 19-30; A. Walsham, 'History, Memory, and the English Reformation', *HJ*, 55 (2012), pp. 899-938; A. Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2013); B. Worden, 'The Levellers in History and Memory, c.1660-1960', in M.J. Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 256-82.

³¹ For example, A. Gordon, *Writing Early Modern London: Memory, Text and Community* (Basingstoke, 2013); M. Lambert, 'Death and Memory: Clothing Bequests in English Wills 1650-1830', *Costume*, 48 (2014), pp. 46-59; R.L. Sanford, *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2002); Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory*; W.N. West, "'No Endlesse Monument": Artificial Memory and Memorial Artifact in Early Modern England', in S. Radstone and K. Hodgkin (eds), *Regimes of Memory* (2003), pp. 61-75; N. Whyte, *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory, 1500-1800* (Oxford, 2009).

³² M. Gray, 'Reforming Memory: Commemoration of the Dead in Sixteenth-Century Wales', *WHR*, 26 (2012), pp. 186-214.

³³ P. Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2004); A. Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2011); *idem.*, 'Holywell: Contesting Sacred Space in Post-Reformation Wales', in W. Coster and A. Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 211-36.

³⁴ J. Aaron, 'Haunted by History: Welsh Gothic 1780-1800', in S. Mottram and S. Prescott (eds), *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 183-200; J. Beverley Smith, 'Historical Writing in Medieval Wales: The Composition of *Brenhinedd y Saesson*', *Studia Celtica*, 42 (2008), pp. 55-86; L. Bowen, 'The Battle of Britain: History and Reformation in Early Modern Wales', in T. Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 135-50; M. Constantine and D. Johnston, 'Introduction: Writing the Revolution in Wales', in *idem.* (eds), *Footsteps of Liberty and Revolt: Essays on Wales and the French Revolution* (Cardiff, 2013), pp. 1-10; P. Schwyzer, 'British History and "British History": The Same Old Story?', in D.J. Baker and W. Maley (eds), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 11-23.

thesis provides ground-breaking analysis of the importance of history within the Welsh national self-perception and image from 1640 to 1688. It examines the changing emphasis in Welsh historical writing, from bardic poetry as the preserver of Welsh identity and history to the writing of narrative history and manuscript collection.

Peter Roberts identified the beginning of this change as taking place after the 1550s. Propaganda linked the benevolence of the Tudors to the Welsh with the British inheritance in the established Church, tying the Church into Welsh culture. These propagandistic efforts were no doubt important as the Acts of Union aimed to change the relationship between Wales and England. Yet this thesis argues that they succeeded because they fitted perfectly within a pre-existing framework of respect for the Crown or prince, the Church, and a territorial authority sited in the gentry. This framework was strong enough to maintain currency throughout the seventeenth century, yet flexible enough to respond to challenges such as the execution of the king and the changed status of the Church of England. The Welsh cultures of memory and history operated with an eye to the future and the past, while operating practically in the present. Thus, North-East Welsh gentlemen remembered their family's lineage, history, and values, comprehending them within their reasoning for contemporary actions and with an eye to their continuance in the future. Historians such as W.J. Hughes, Hugh Kearney, and Glanmor Williams have consistently argued that the comparative waning of bardic culture meant an increase in Anglicisation amongst the gentry.³⁵ This thesis disputes that argument, contending instead that the way in which Welshness was expressed had changed. Many of the North-East Welsh gentry travelled to London, and wrote in English. This did not mean that they did not speak

³⁵ G. Evans, *Land of my Fathers: 2000 Years of Welsh History* (Swansea, 1974), p. 316; Hughes, *Wales and the Welsh in English Literature*, p. 11; W. Llewelyn Williams, *The Making of Modern Wales: Studies in the Tudor Settlement of Wales* (1919), p. 296; H. Kearney, *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 173; D. Williams, *A History of Modern Wales* (1950), pp. 87, 89; G. Williams, *Renewal and Reformation in Wales, c.1415-1642* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 461-2.

Welsh, or value Welsh culture. There were a significant number of North-East Welsh gentry families who continued to support the bards in the later seventeenth century, although it is indisputable that the bardic order was on the decline. Welsh history, music, and traditions continued to be championed in the houses of North-East Wales, however, and the ways that Welshness was expressed ranged widely across doggerel, satire, and narrative history as well as strict metre poetry and heraldry.

The Church of England sustained the loyalty of the great majority of North-East Welsh people, of high and low estate, for the entire period of 1640 to 1688. Welsh historians have struggled for generations to explain this fidelity. First, the popularity of the Church of England did not sit easily with the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century view of Wales as a stronghold of nonconformity, with a tradition stretching back generations. Furthermore, it did not conform to the picture of a tyrannical and anglicised Church, in league with the similarly anglicised and repressive gentry. This was an image beloved of mid-nineteenth-century polemical nonconformist historians, but one that was remarkably persistent.³⁶ Second, the reasons for the Church's popularity are not easy to confirm with documentary evidence. The historian is required to draw together impressions from a wide range of varied sources – some hostile, others seemingly implausible. There is also a scarcity of ecclesiastical and parish records that has made the study of the Welsh Church as an institution in the seventeenth century a relatively daunting task. As a result, the existing body of knowledge relating to the institution and operation of the Church of England is limited largely to Victorian diocesan histories or work on individual parishes.³⁷

³⁶ P. Morgan, 'A Nation of Nonconformists: Thomas Rees (1815-88) and Nonconformist History', in N. Evans and H. Pryce (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past: Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850-1950* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 106-8.

³⁷ For example: D.R. Thomas, *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, general, cathedral, and parochial* (1874); R. Willett, *A Memoir of Hawarden Parish, Flintshire, Containing Notices of the Princes of North Wales* (Chester, 1822); Sir T.H.G. Puleston, *The Story of a Quiet Country Parish, Gleanings of the History of Worthenbury, Flintshire* (1895); Sir J.

Unlike the English Church, interest in which has been revived by recent scholarly work, the Welsh Church has remained underexplored. This is a shame. There is sufficient evidence from gentry collections, correspondence, material culture, architecture, and the remaining parish and ecclesiastical records to draw some useful conclusions in relation to the place of the Church in the community, preferences for worship and visual culture, and opposition to change in the period 1640 to 1688. Madeleine Gray has made excellent use of remaining ecclesiastical material and architectural evidence in her work on the religious preferences of the Welsh up to the sixteenth century. Lloyd Bowen's work on early Stuart Wales draws on aspects of Gray's work but considers the Church in a wider evidential context. In doing so, he has revealed the principality's response to the Caroline church reforms and a preference for ceremonial worship.³⁸ Yet aside from Philip Jenkins' survey articles on the Church of England there is a dearth of research on the crucial period from the beginning of the Long Parliament to the Glorious Revolution.³⁹ The exception to this is the Welsh response to religious policies in the Interregnum, which has attracted the interest of Philip Jenkins, Newton Key, Stephen Roberts, and Lloyd Bowen.⁴⁰ The majority of this work, while hugely informative about the Puritan approach to the evangelising of

Hanmer, *A Memorial of the Parish and Family of Hanmer in Flintshire* (1876); A.N. Palmer, *The History of the Parish Church of Wrexham* (Wrexham, 1886); C.N. Hurdsman, *A History of the Parish of Chirk* (Wrexham, 1996).

³⁸ M. Gray, "The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time": The Reformation Church in Wales' in T.Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014); *idem.*, *Images of Piety: The Iconography of Traditional Religion in Late Medieval Wales* (Oxford, 2000); Bowen, *Politics of the Principality*, pp. 212-32.

³⁹ P. Jenkins, 'Church, Nation and Language: The Welsh Church, 1660-1800', in J. Gregory and J.S. Chamberlain (eds), *The National Church in Local Perspective: The Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 265-84; *idem.*, 'The Anglican Church and the Unity of Britain: The Welsh Experience, 1560-1714', in S.G. Ellis and S. Barber (eds), *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* (1995), pp. 115-38.

⁴⁰ L. Bowen, "'This Murmuring and Unthankful Peevish Land": Wales and the Protectorate', in P. Little (ed.), *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 144-164; N. Key and J.P. Ward, 'Metropolitan Puritans and the Varieties of Godly Reform in Interregnum Monmouth', *WHR*, 22 (2006), pp. 646-72; S.K. Roberts, 'Propagating the Gospel in Wales: the Making of the 1650 Act', *THSC*, new ser., 10 (2004 for 2003), pp. 57-75; *idem.*, 'Godliness and Government in Glamorgan, 1647-1660', in C. Jones, M. Newitt, and S.K. Roberts (eds), *Politics and People in Revolutionary England* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 225-52; S.K. Roberts, 'The Sermon in Early Modern Wales: Context and Content', in H. Adlington, P. McCullough, and E. Rhatigan (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 308-18.

Wales, does not examine the Anglican response to the newly exiled status of the Church of England – either by the clergy, the gentry, or the populace more widely.⁴¹ Philip Jenkins was moved to comment that examining the Welsh gentry in the seventeenth century was deeply unfashionable due to their reputation as Anglicised oppressors.⁴² This is even truer in relation to the experiences and behaviour of the Anglican clergy. In Wales they still await a comprehensive study.

Although this thesis recognises the importance of the Puritan governments and policies within Welsh historical development, it concentrates on the Anglican reaction to them, attempting to correct the neglect of conservative groups within the region and period. It argues that North-East Welsh supporters of the Church of England continued to ensure that Prayer Book services and traditions were upheld in the Interregnum, making Wales a refuge for ejected clergy and for those seeking a non-Puritan religious approach. The Welsh Church, therefore, operated as Catholic recusant circles had for generations. Covert networks and supportive gentry families maintained it during its darkest days, making its protection at the Restoration even more crucial and significant to the Welsh gentry. The Welsh reaction to, and involvement with, post-1660 politico-religious controversies has been even more sparsely investigated.⁴³ There have been no recent studies of the Welsh Protestant response to the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis of 1678-81, or the Rye House Plot of 1683.⁴⁴ The early years of the Restoration featured in Thomas Richards' work,

⁴¹ Notable exceptions include Philip Jenkins' series of articles on the Church in Glamorgan. P. Jenkins, "The Sufferings of the Clergy": The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, Part 1', *JWEH*, 3 (1986), pp. 1-17; *idem.*, "The Sufferings of the Clergy": The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, 2: The Account of Francis Davies', *JWEH*, 4 (1987), pp. 9-41; *idem.*, "The Sufferings of the Clergy": The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, 3: The Account of Edward Mansell', *JWEH*, 5 (1988), pp. 73-80.

⁴² P. Jenkins, 'Seventeenth-century Wales: definition and identity', p. 218.

⁴³ Aside from survey chapters in wider volumes, for example: W. Jacob, 'Part II: 1660-1780', in G. Williams *et al.*, *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603-1920* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 65-206.

⁴⁴ The only secondary materials located relate to a contemporary manuscript on the topic, or specifically to the Plot in Monmouthshire. There are a few more studies of the Catholic experience following the 'discovery' of the Plot and in the seventeenth century more widely. W.L. Davies, "Y Gwir er Gwaethed yw... 1684". A Welsh Story of the Popish Plot', *Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1935), pp. 243-52; E.T. Davies,

focusing often on Anglican persecution of nonconformists.⁴⁵ Richards, arguing from a nonconformist standpoint, depicted a national and regional ‘atrophy of toleration’, ‘the desires of a triumphant party bent on showing no mercy to the conquered’, the restored Anglicans demonstrating an ‘almost unsatiated greed’.⁴⁶ Richards was a pioneering and conscientious archival historian who did much to reveal the wealth of seventeenth-century Welsh material still extant. He was, however, far from objective in terms of his stance towards early modern Welsh society and religion. Writing in the early twentieth century, he aimed to trace the roots of what he saw as the popular culture of Wales. In doing so, he and others of his generation made assumptions about elite culture, language, and religion. These assumptions proved extremely persistent, and this work seeks to readdress the topic afresh.

The religious aspects of the Glorious Revolution or James II’s attempts at religious toleration have excited little more interest.⁴⁷ These events did have an impact on Wales, its gentry and politics. The consistency evident in the reaction of the North-East Welsh gentry is particularly interesting when examining the whole period from 1640 to 1688. An attitude motivated by conservatism and competing ideals of stability, loyalty, and religion is as conspicuous in 1678 as it was in 1642, in 1688 as in 1649. This is not to argue that the events themselves were similar or the reactions uniform or unchanging, but that the

‘The “Popish Plot” in Monmouthshire’, *Publications of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, 25 (1976), pp. 32-45; J.R. Evans, ‘The Popish Plot’, *NLWJ*, 6 (1949), pp. 43-50; P. Jenkins, ‘Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches in the Seventeenth Century’, *HJ*, 23 (1980), pp. 275-93; H. Thomas, ‘Missioners on the Margins? The Territorial Headquarters of the Welsh Jesuit College of St Francis Xavier at The Cwm, c. 1600-1679’, *Recusant History*, 32 (2014), pp. 173-93.

⁴⁵ T. Richards, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales*, (1920); *idem.*, *Religious Developments in Wales (1654-1662)* (1923).

⁴⁶ Richards, *Religious Developments*, pp. 476, 474, 462.

⁴⁷ As above, publications on this topic are few, and tend to either summarise the contents of a manuscript or take the form of local studies. D.L. Jones, ‘The Glorious Revolution in Wales’, *NLWJ*, 26 (1989), pp. 27-31; C.D. Wood, ‘The Welsh Response to the Glorious Revolution of 1688’, *JWRH*, new ser., 1 (2001), pp. 15-33; E.D. Davies, ‘The Revolution of 1688 and its aftermath in Merioneth’, *Journal of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society*, 14 (2003), pp. 118-25.

language used when responding to the seventeenth-century crises was strikingly similar. This thesis provides a starting point for discussions of Welsh politico-religious culture in this period, and will hopefully prove that there is fertile ground for future studies. The thesis does not discuss the liturgical or ceremonial practices of the Church in Wales. Not only would this be extremely difficult given the available evidence, but it would also stray from the focal point of gentry religious and political culture. Similarly, the clergy are considered in relation to the gentry's relationship with the Church, but they are not the principal focus of the work. Both of these aspects would generate an interesting study in their own right, as would the episcopal and parochial operation of the Church in Wales. In the interests of coherence, however, this is not the place for them.

It is not solely the Church of England whose persistence and practice in Wales have been neglected. North-East Wales was a regional centre of Catholicism, where for the majority of the seventeenth century Catholics outnumbered Puritans or nonconformists. The central authorities faced immense, if quietly expressed, resistance to the consistent implementation of the recusancy laws. Prominent Welsh gentlemen protected their Catholic relatives, seeing little contradiction in decrying the political implications of popery while allowing recusants or poorly concealed church papists to practise their faith in relative peace and quiet. Again, there is simply very little existing historical work on this topic. As John Bossy commented, the North-East Welsh region 'remains something of a blank' even compared to South Wales.⁴⁸ The literature on the relationships between the North-East Welsh Protestant gentry and their Catholic family, neighbours, and dependents in the later seventeenth century is virtually non-existent. Considering the concentration of Catholics in the region, particularly in Flintshire, this is perhaps surprising. The majority of

⁴⁸ J. Bossy, *The English Catholic Community* (1975), pp. 97-8.

work on Catholics in Wales concentrates on Monmouthshire, an area better known for its significant Catholic community, and significantly one that experienced much more conflict in the seventeenth century.⁴⁹ It is tempting to question whether the relatively harmonious relations in Flintshire have proved less interesting to historians than the violence and bitterness in Monmouthshire in the same period.

The Puritans and nonconformists of the region have certainly not suffered from neglect in the same way as the Church of England loyalists or Catholics. If anything, the concentration on this aspect of religious life in Wales has led to an exaggeration or distortion of their numbers and significance within the region. Their identification by later generations of nonconformists as the ancestors of their movement, and as the true people of Wales, has made it difficult to assess their importance in the seventeenth century.⁵⁰ Only relatively recently has a more objective evaluation of Welsh puritanism and nonconformity been attempted, and it has yielded some fascinating insights.⁵¹ Given the success of later nonconformist movements the topic is clearly of value. Furthermore, the actions of Puritan radicals were inherently interesting, particularly during and immediately after their period of dominance in the mid-seventeenth century. They stand out amongst the orthodox or traditional majority, and the autobiographical tendency of the movements they belonged to often means that more information survives about their actions and beliefs

⁴⁹ For example, P. Jenkins, 'Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches in the Seventeenth Century', *HJ*, 23 (1980), pp. 275-93; J. Knight, "'From the Welsh good Lord deliver me": soldiers, papists, and civilians in Civil War Monmouthshire', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 151 (2005), 1-18; R. Matthews, "'Such a doleful president of misery and calamity": Protestant fears of Catholics in Monmouthshire in the First Civil War, 1642-46', *The Monmouthshire Antiquary*, 22 (2006), pp. 19-38.

⁵⁰ N. Evans and H. Pryce, 'Writing a Small Nation's Past: States, Race and Historical Culture' in *idem.* (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past: Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850-1950* (Farnham, 2013), p. 19; T. Richards, *Religious Developments*; *idem.*, *Wales under the Penal Code (1662-1687)* (1925); T. Rees, *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (1861).

⁵¹ For example, R. Allen, *Quaker Communities in Early Modern Wales* (Cardiff, 2007); L. Bowen, 'The Seeds and Fruits of Revolution: The Erbery Family and Religious Radicalism in Seventeenth-Century Glamorgan', *WHR*, 25 (2011), pp. 346-73; S.K. Roberts, 'Propagating the Gospel in Wales: The Making of the 1650 Act', *THSC*, 10 (2004 for 2003), pp. 57-75; *idem.*, 'How the West was Won: Parliamentary Politics, Religion, and the Military in South Wales, 1642-9', *WHR*, 21 (2003), pp. 646-74.

than those of the greater part of the of Welsh people. This study, however, focuses on the North-East Welsh gentry, a group whose attitude to Puritanism was never positive. As Thomas Richards commented disapprovingly, there were few genuine Puritans amongst those of gentle status in North-East Wales.⁵² This thesis will shift the focus to Anglican responses and treatment of radical Puritans in the period 1640 to 1688, and attempt to analyse the persistently persecutory approach to non-Catholic religious dissenters in the region. The North-East Welsh gentry resisted or condemned all attempts at toleration of nonconformity, believing the danger to the Church and State too great. The Welsh historicised culture ingrained the memories of 1641 to 1660 within the region's memory, associating them with the destabilising violence against the ideals of order and stability.

As Fiona McCall has ably summarised, English historiography has been guilty of failing to examine the Anglican experience in the same period. Some moves have been made to rectify this, however, including Ian Green's 1978 work on the restored church from 1660 to 1663, Michael Wolfe's study of Royalist clerical families, Judith Maltby's work on the Prayer Book and McCall's own examination of the experiences of the Anglican clergy during the Interregnum.⁵³ There are two principal relevant currents within English historiography in relation to the Church of England. First, the reaction and operation of the Church in response to the mid-seventeenth-century crises. John Morrill and Claire Cross have analysed the Church in the context of the Long Parliament, Civil Wars, and Interregnum, in terms of the operation of the Church as an organisation. John Spurr, Robert Bosher, Gary de Krey, Grant Tapsell, and Ian Green have examined its response to

⁵² T. Richards, 'Flintshire and the Puritan Movement', *FHSP*, 13 (1952-3), pp. 54-5, 57.

⁵³ I. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1978); M. Wolfe, "There very children were soe full of hatred": royalist clerical families and the politics of everyday conflict in Civil War and Interregnum England', *Studies in Church History* 40, (Woodbridge, 2004); J. Maltby, *Prayer book and people in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998); F. McCall, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013), pp.10-11.

the Restoration, the Restoration settlements, and the crises of 1678 to 1682.⁵⁴ These studies have largely focused on the actions, attitudes and publications of the Church's elite, and have been vital in revealing the ways in which the Church changed or became entrenched when faced with the vast challenges of 1641 to 1660. Second, historians such as Kenneth Fincham, Nicholas Tyacke, Bernard Capp and Judith Maltby have explored the functioning of the Church below the national level. These works have discussed the operation of national policies at a local level, answering questions about the reaction of the laity to change, for example to sacramental worship, ceremonialism, the propriety of images, and the Book of Common Prayer. In the case of Capp, they examine the response to Puritan attempts at religious reformation in local and national contexts.⁵⁵ This thesis engages more with the second strand of English historiography in terms of providing a regional case study of the response to religious change. The Welsh experience could act as a useful counterpoint to the more heterogeneous English regions, and may hopefully prompt further studies of the local operation of the Church.

The Welsh have been seen as proverbially royalist during the Civil Wars. They were depicted as such in contemporary pamphlets by parliamentarians and in narratives by proud royalists. Generations of historians have commented on the royalism of the Welsh gentry, in varying levels of detail.⁵⁶ Yet while some view Welsh royalism as a commonplace,

⁵⁴ G.S. de Krey, 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-82', in D.B. Hamilton and R. Strier (eds), *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 231-52; J. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England* (New Haven, 1991); G. Tapsell (ed.), *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012); R.S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662* (1951); Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*.

⁵⁵ B. Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2012); K. Fincham and N. Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007); J. Maltby, "'The Good Old Way': Prayer Book Protestantism in the 1640s and 1650s', *Studies in Church History*, 38 (2004), pp. 233-56; *Idem.*, 'Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, and the Formation of "Anglicanism"' in S. Platten (ed.), *Anglicanism and the Western Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion* (Norwich, 2003), pp. 122-43.

⁵⁶ For example, R. Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-1646* (Oxford, 1982); C. Hill, 'Puritans and the Dark Corners of the Land', in *idem.*, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England* (New Haven, 1991), p. 23; A. Hopper, *Turncoats & Renegades: Changing Sides During the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2012), p. 108.

there has been no detailed exploration of where Welsh royalism came from, historically or intellectually, what Welsh royalists believed, or its impact on events in Wales in the seventeenth century. Accepting Welsh royalism as a given means that its features and complexities have remained unexamined. The vast majority of work on Welsh royalists has focused on the period of the First Civil War and (to a lesser degree) the Interregnum, and there has been minimal attention paid to the Restoration or the later-seventeenth century. Most studies have concerned themselves with the question of allegiance. As with other aspects and regions of royalist interest, literary scholars have frequently taken the lead.⁵⁷ This means there is still significant ground to be covered in terms of Welsh political culture, of which royalism and loyalism form an important part.

Royalism as a movement or group has proven difficult to define, both for contemporaries and historians.⁵⁸ A further definition, of the difference between royalism and loyalism, has also been the source of historiographical debate – especially during the Civil Wars.

Whereas David Smith divided the English polity into ‘royalists’ and ‘loyalists’, Jason McElligott cautioned against establishing these polarities. According to Smith, ‘royalists’ demonstrated personal support for Charles I and his son, while loyalists were supporters of the concept of kingship but not necessarily of Charles I personally. The categories overlap, but cannot be equated or used interchangeably.⁵⁹ Barry Robertson has also grappled with

⁵⁷ L.M. Davies, ‘The Tregaer Manuscript’, *NLWJ*, 31: 3 (2000); F.M. Jones, ‘Huw Morys and the Civil Wars’, *Studia Celtica*, XLIV (2010); J. Knight, ‘Taking Sides: Royalist Commissioners of Array for Monmouthshire in the Civil War’, *Monmouthshire Antiquary*, 22 (2006); J.L. Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (1983); R. Matthews, ‘“To a Man for the King”: The Allegiance of Welsh Catholics during the First Civil War, 1642-6’, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, vol. 20 (2001); A. Rudrum, ‘Resistance, Collaboration, and Silence: Henry Vaughan and Breconshire Royalism’, in C.J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds), *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (Columbia, Miss., 1999).

⁵⁸ B. Robertson, *Royalists at War in Scotland and Ireland, 1638 – 1650* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 7, 20; G. Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Constructing Allegiance* (Ashgate, 2012), pp. 12-14; M.R.F. Williams, ‘The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649-1660’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), p. 912.

⁵⁹ D.L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalists and the Search for Settlement, c.1640-1649* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 319; J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 5-6; J. Loxley, *The Writing of Royalism*, pp. 3-6.

the problem, arguing for the replacement of ‘loyalist’ with ‘monarchist’ due to the imprecision of the term.⁶⁰ It is hard to disagree with Robertson that the polarity such definitions establish is artificial, particularly in any examination of the period directly before the Civil Wars or after 1647. The North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated evidence both of allegiance to monarchy more generally, and to the Stuarts specifically. A broader allegiance to monarchy played a significant part in Welsh gentry ideals, and extended into the past in the sense of loyalty to the native Welsh princes.

The necessity of establishing a term for a more general sense of loyalism or monarchism is evident when exploring the period beyond 1660, however, and in particular during the reign of James II. This is the point at which the North-East Welsh gentry wavered in their allegiance to the Stuarts, and where (to apply Smith’s categories) loyalism diverged from royalism. Before 1686 a strong and widespread allegiance to the Stuarts is clearly visible: their use of genealogical material to prove kinship links to the Stuarts, and the concentration in North-East Wales of royalist material objects using the image of the Stuart monarchs, clearly supports a consistent dynastic loyalty. In the two highly unstable years before the Glorious Revolution this was battered repeatedly by royal policies. Although they wished desperately to remain loyal to the Stuart king, James’s attacks on the territorial power, landed estates, and authority of the traditional gentry rulers, as well as on the Established Church, meant that they were forced into temporary (if not outright or military) opposition. In this thesis, therefore, Smith’s categories will be used largely to navigate these cross-period boundaries, while recognising that for the bulk of the period ‘loyalists’ in North-East Wales were mostly also ‘royalists’.

⁶⁰ Robertson, *Royalists at War*, p. 20.

Another relevant debate concerns the extent to which the opposition between ‘parliamentarian’ and ‘royalist’, with side-changers making up a third category, was really a binary one. The argument against using such terminology is that it elides distinctions within each ‘side’, rendering divided factions into one undivided whole. The two groups changed in composition over the long years of Civil War and Interregnum, prompted by external events and personal experience, and there were degrees of enthusiasm within both sides – an enthusiastic militant was not the same as a reluctantly pressed moderate or aspiring neutral.⁶¹ As Robinson argues, it is largely impossible to know what people were thinking when they decided at any particular point to support either the King or Parliament. We cannot know if reluctant North Walianians were forced by social pressure or the overwhelming power of numbers to support Charles I, or in most cases whether they believed strongly in the cause. Whether it is important to investigate the internal feelings of partisans, as John Morrill’s work indicates, or whether its unknowable nature means that a concentration on actions is the only useful approach, as Weil and Robinson argue, it seems clear that the outward actions and remaining evidence of the feelings of the majority of the North-East Welsh gentry demonstrate their consistent support for Charles I and his son.⁶² Their responses to the changing governments and policies of the Commonwealth and Protectorate suggest that their militancy in favour of the Stuarts was preserved throughout the late 1640s and 1650s.

During the last fifteen years English historiography has broadened its reach beyond the elite royalists who were for a long time the sole focus of research on royalism. Recent works have examined royalism alongside, for example, print and propaganda; the clergy;

⁶¹ Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament*, pp. 12-19; de Groot, *Royalist Identities*, pp. 90-1.

⁶² J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (1981), pp. 128, 187-9, 204; R. Weil, ‘Thinking about Allegiance in the English Civil War’, *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), pp. 184-5; Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament*, p. 18.

sedition; exile; spies; gender; and political thought.⁶³ Popular royalism has come to the fore, as well as royalism in Europe and the Atlantic archipelago beyond England.⁶⁴ This thesis has benefited greatly from this expansion, and touches on some of the themes outlined above, for example royalist political thought and the contribution made by the clergy. It does not concentrate on any of them as the principal focus, however, as the purpose is to survey North-East Welsh royalist political culture in a more holistic sense. All of these topics would benefit from the depth that regional case studies would provide, however, in order to draw out patterns that have remained unexplored.

III. Themes and structure

The major contributions of this thesis will be threefold. The North-East Welsh gentry will be reassessed in the light of their commitment to Welsh culture, language, history, and identity. North-East Welsh Anglicanism will be explored in a new depth, and the level of its importance to Welsh identity and political behaviour discovered. Finally, the Welsh approach to politics is portrayed in terms of the language the gentry used themselves, and

⁶³ For example, L. Bowen, 'Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639-1640 and 1642', *HJ*, 56 (2013), pp. 297-319; A. Hughes and J. Sanders, 'Gender, Geography and Exile: Royalists and the Low Countries in the 1650s', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 128-48; L. Liapi, "'Loyal Hind", "The Prince of Thieves": Crime Pamphlets and Royalist Propaganda', in S.F. Davies and P. Fletcher (eds), *News in Early Modern Europe: Currents and Connections* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 96-114; A. Milton, 'Coping with Alternatives: Religious Liberty in Royalist Thought, 1642-7', in R. Armstrong and T. Ó hAnnracháin (eds), *Insular Christianity: Alternative Modes of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c. 1570-1700* (Manchester, 2013), pp. 149-69; J. Peacey, 'Radicalism Relocated: Royalist Politics and Pamphleteering of the Late 1640s', in A. Hessayon and D. Finnegan (eds), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 51-68; G. Smith, *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies: Their Role in the British Civil Wars, 1640-1660* (Farnham, 2010); E. Vallance, 'Royalist Absolutism in the 1650s: The Case of Robert Sheringham', in C. Cuttica and G. Burgess (eds), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (2012), pp. 33-46; Williams, 'The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile'.

⁶⁴ For example, A.E. Button, 'Royalist Women Petitioners in South-West England, 1655-62', *Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000), pp. 53-66; C. Boswell, 'Popular Grievances and Royalist Propaganda in Interregnum England', *Seventeenth Century*, 27 (2012), pp. 313-34; L. Bowen, 'Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 44-66; H.J. Helmers, *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge, 2015); D.L. Smith, "'Our Fears Surpass Our Hopes": Virginian Reactions to the Execution of Charles I (1649-52)', in L. Henneton and L. Roper (eds), *Fear and the Shaping of Early American Societies* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 137-59; D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1987).

its interaction with concepts of Welsh gentility newly understood. The lives of three individual gentlemen, two of whom have received minimal scholarly attention, provide detailed examples of each of these strands.

The thesis is arranged thematically rather than chronologically. The first three chapters explore interlocking themes that focus on Welsh historicised culture, religion, and politics. While largely discussed separately, these themes are evidently closely interrelated. Religion and politics taken together were central forces within the mid- and late-seventeenth-century crises, and their separation here is artificial. For the sake of coherence and analysis, however, they have been examined separately, with recognition being made of their symbiosis at key points. The Welsh historicised culture was the basis from which many of aspects of Welsh religious attitudes and political activity were founded, but again is most easily explained initially on its own. The three case studies in chapter four exemplify aspects of the themes in the previous chapters. Taken together, the themes examined within the thesis provide a well-rounded picture of the culture of the North-East Welsh gentry from 1640 to 1688.

Chapter one discusses the continued importance of the medieval Welsh concepts of kinship and lineage in seventeenth-century North-East Wales. It considers their impact on power structures in the region and explores their significance for gentry ideals and behaviour. The chapter goes on to examine the connections between these concepts and the historicised culture and image of the principality as fostered by Welsh elites. The second section of the chapter considers the nature of this historicised culture in greater depth. It explores the ways in which it manifested itself and the impact it had on society and politics in Wales. Finally, the chapter investigates the importance of the Welsh language, arts, and music to the identity of the North-East Welsh gentry. North-East

Welsh gentry society was underpinned by an historical and lineage-based identity, which buttressed the authority of gentry leaders and formed the basis of highly influential kinship networks. This underpinning differentiates the North-East Welsh gentry from their English counterparts.

Chapter two discusses the manner in which the North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated their support for the Church of England, and posits reasons for the constancy of that support. It considers the written and material evidence of Welsh religious preferences, and demonstrates that there were some demonstrably Welsh tendencies within Church of England worship. The second section explores relationships between the North-East Welsh Protestant gentry and their Catholic counterparts. It connects kinship relations and regional ties in determining relations between adherents of the two faiths. It examines how the Protestant gentry of the region responded to national crises involving Catholics. Finally, the chapter explores the more fractious interactions between the predominantly Prayer Book protestant gentry and the Puritans of North-East Wales. It proposes reasons why radical Puritans were seen as a more urgent or dangerous threat locally than Catholics, and considers the importance of historical memory and Welsh identity within that assessment of religious nonconformity.

In chapter three the thesis examines the actions, ideas, and material culture of North-East Welsh politics. It explores North-East Welsh electoral practices, and the gentry's political actions and reactions in the period 1640 to 1688. In examining political ideas and material culture, the chapter also considers the expression of North-East Welsh politics. One aspect of this is the relative absence of party politics in the region throughout the period. One of the principal foci of the chapter is the persistence of royalism and loyalism as a component of North-East Welsh gentry identity. This chapter explores the language by which loyalism

was expressed, and its relationship to political actions in North-East Wales. The chapter provides insights into a strongly conservative and conformist localist political culture and considers reasons why such a political culture survived throughout the upheavals of the seventeenth century.

The three case studies in chapter four engage with themes within the three previous chapters. They discuss significant aspects of the thesis with a depth of detail that is impossible within the broad thematic chapters, by focussing on three individuals. This makes possible a more thorough exploration of the archives of a few regionally-important families, and the revelation of the range and breath of information within Welsh collections. The chosen individuals span the whole period from 1640 to 1688, and are examined in the light of one specific theme each. The first case study concerns Thomas Mostyn (1651-92), eldest son of Sir Roger Mostyn of Mostyn. It focuses on Mostyn's manuscripts and books, and discusses their significance in terms of Welsh historicised culture and history writing. Sir Thomas Hanmer (1612-78) of Hanmer and Bettisfield is the subject of the second case study. His religious affiliation is investigated in the light of evidence which could reveal him as either a typical North-East Welsh Anglican squire or as a 'church papist'.⁶⁵ This debate uncovers some of the central features both of Welsh Anglicanism and of attitudes to Catholicism in the region. Finally, Robert Davies (1616-66) of Gwysaney is investigated in relation to North-East Welsh royalism and loyalism.

⁶⁵ The term 'church papist' is a contemporary one, but was recovered initially by Alexandra Walsham in her thesis and monograph to refer to conformist Catholics. As she has commented, the categories of 'church papist' and recusant were not mutually exclusive, and neither were those of conformist and church papist. Conformity could be, for example, a gesture of loyalty to the Crown and state, or a temporary expedient to avoid zealous persecuting magistrates. A. Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (2nd edn., Woodbridge, 1999), pp. xiii, 73-4.

Chapter 1: Welsh society: kinship, history, and identity

Early modern Welsh society has rarely been described sympathetically. English pamphleteers of the 1640s, and their less politically motivated Tudor stage colleagues, depicted it as backward and poor.¹ Puritans and nonconformists, both English and Welsh, echoed this, describing a blinded, superstitious, and ignorant people in thrall to their clergy and social superiors.² Welsh society has not fared much better in the hands of historians, who until recent times have argued that it was in decline, losing its distinctive characteristics as its gentry rulers fled to London and adopted English customs.³ A detailed regional examination of North-East Wales throughout most of the seventeenth century does not bear this out. Elsewhere, Wales has frequently been discussed in terms of the colonised societies of the ‘margins’, a label which tends to marginalise of itself, assuming that these societies existed largely in relation to their larger or more powerful neighbours.⁴ While this was no doubt true to some extent, it ignores the survival of ancient and deep-rooted aspects of such societies which developed out of pre-conquest or pre-union contexts. Furthermore, there has been a tendency to internalise some of the rhetoric of the dominant English nation as regards Welsh (and no doubt also Irish) society. It suited English politicians, writers, and dramatists to characterise Wales as backward, particularly at times of political or religious conflict. This attitude to Wales and its history has not

¹ P. Lord, *Words with pictures: Welsh Images and Images of Wales in the Popular Press, 1640-1860* (Aberystwyth, 1995), p. 34; L. Bowen, ‘Representations of Wales and the Welsh during the Civil Wars and Interregnum’, *Historical Research*, 77 (2004), pp. 360-1, 364, 367.

² For example, NLW, MS 11440D fos 121-5: John Jones to Lowri Gwynn, Dublin, 25 May 1653; FRO, D/HE/494: William Cook to Elizabeth Edwards, Chester, 13 July 1674.

³ W. Llewelyn Williams, *The Making of Modern Wales: Studies in the Tudor Settlement of Wales* (1919); D. Williams, *A History of Modern Wales* (1950), p. 89; M. Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (1975), pp. 110-11; M. Stoye, ‘English “Nationalism”, Celtic Particularism, and the English Civil War’, *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), p. 1117; H. Kearney, *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 173.

⁴ This model has been criticised convincingly by Juliette Wood. Hechter, *Internal Colonialism*, *passim*; T. Thornton, ‘Nationhood at the Margin: Identity, Regionality and the English Crown in the Seventeenth Century’ in L. Scales and O. Zimmer (eds), *Power and the Nation in European History* (Cambridge, 2005); J. Wood, ‘Perceptions of the Past in Welsh Folklore Studies’, *Folklore*, 108 (1997), pp. 93-5.

entirely disappeared, and it has obscured some of the more interesting and distinctive aspects of Welsh society to the point that Wales is normally assumed to be little more than a slightly peculiar county of England.

This chapter will argue that there was much more continuity (and therefore distinctiveness) in the customs, organisational basis, and power structures of Welsh society than previously assumed in the period 1640 to 1688. The situation varied from North to South Wales, and from region to region, but in highly conservative regions like the North-East, Welsh society was sustained and enriched by kinship customs, culture, and a historicised concept of the Welsh people. There was a difference between societal organisation and norms in England and Wales, and this was recognised by English and Welsh people in the seventeenth century. While changing trends in fashion and literature were adopted, English was learned, read and written, and English poetry and music heard, Welshness and Welsh identity were still of considerable importance to the gentry of North-East Wales. It was crucial in how power relations were determined, and continued to define the place of the individual in society. These distinctively Welsh aspects form part of an explanation for Welsh royalism and loyalism, as well as for the genuine popularity of the Church of England in North-East Wales. This chapter re-defines ‘politics’, as broader than that which led Philip Jenkins to comment that Wales was the most thoroughly ‘other’ society in the British Isles, yet ‘so assimilated in political terms as to be essentially indistinguishable from any English region’.⁵ It extends John Gwynfor Jones’s argument that Welsh concepts of gentility and authority were sustained until the Civil War, proposing instead that these concepts had a much longer life, forming the basis for dissent in the 1650s and returning to prominence again at the Restoration.⁶

⁵ P. Jenkins, ‘Seventeenth-century Wales: definition and identity’ in B. Bradshaw and P. Roberts (eds), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 216.

⁶ J.G. Jones, *The Welsh Gentry 1536-1640: Images of Status, Honour and Authority* (Cardiff, 1998), p. 23.

The chapter will begin by discussing the continued importance of the medieval Welsh concepts of kinship and lineage in seventeenth-century North-East Wales; their impact on power structures in the region; their significance for gentry ideals and behaviour; and their connections with the historicised culture and image of the principality as fostered by Welsh elites. The second section of the chapter will discuss the nature of this historicised culture in greater depth, exploring the ways in which it manifested itself and the impact it had on society and politics in Wales. Finally, the chapter will examine the importance of the Welsh language, arts, and music to the identity of the gentry of North-East Wales. North-East Welsh gentry society was underpinned by an historical and lineage-based identity, which buttressed the authority of gentry leaders and formed the basis of highly influential kinship networks. This underpinning differentiates the North-East Welsh gentry from their English counterparts. While it is clear that the North-East Welsh gentry had access to a range of identities in different situations, their role as resident leaders of their region and kindred were of fundamental importance to their continued power and authority.

I: The Continuing Significance of Medieval Welsh Concepts of Gentility

Medieval Wales celebrated and prized gentility. This was the preserve of the *uchelwyr*, literally ‘high men’, powerful and ancient Welsh families, each led by the head of kindred or *pencenedl*. The *pencenedl* was the head of a hierarchically structured and extended regional family or kindred. They were extremely influential within their region and had the right to discipline their kindred. Their residences formed a geographical focus for the heritage and solidarity of the community, and their hospitality was (in theory) open to all. The bards acted as the mouthpiece of *uchelwyr* ideals, including an ordered and structured society,

pride in an ancestry or lineage which upheld that hierarchy, and an integrated community.⁷ The concept of kinship was a crucial component of this system. To medieval Welsh historians, ignoring kinship in any discussion of Welsh society would mean neglecting a fundamental building block of that society. There were different types of kinship. Kinship of inheritance differed from kinship of status and alliance, and within kinship of inheritance there were shallower and deeper degrees of kinship that had different functions.⁸

Rees Davies described kinship as fundamental to the Welsh construction of the social world: membership of a kinship group was the basis for an individual's identity, the way to locate them in society. It was the 'primary informing principle in the social and economic relationships of the individual'. It gave a sense of identity through defining one's place within a lineage, it clarified communal claims and responsibilities, and maintained social order. Kinsmen had a legal role. At judicial disputations they prosecuted cases of homicide compensation and shared responsibility for the payments, arranged marriages, and appointed guardians for minors. Pedigrees played a key role in proving or determining the result of some of these cases.⁹ Indeed although the 1536 Acts of Union removed the need to prove pedigrees in legal cases, they were still used at the Great Sessions as 'challenge pedigrees', to prove that either the sheriff or coroner (or their wives) were related to one of the parties involved in the dispute at issue. This could lead to the quashing of the jury and

⁷ J.G. Jones, *Concepts of Order and Gentility in Wales 1546-1640* (Llandysul, 1992), pp. 35, 45-8, 56; L.B. Smith, 'On the hospitality of the Welsh: A Comparative View', in H. Pryce and J. Watts (eds), *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 185-7.

⁸ T.M. Charles-Edwards, *Wales and the Britons, 350-1064* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 293-4.

⁹ R.R. Davies, 'Kinsmen, neighbours and communities in Wales and the western British Isles, c.1100-c.1400' in P. Stafford, J.L. Nelson and J. Martindale (eds), *Law, laity and solidarities: Essays in honour of Susan Reynolds* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 175-8.

expensive legal delays. Although this petered out towards the end of the seventeenth century it demonstrates the long continuities to be explored in this chapter.¹⁰

Lineage substantiated a person's authority, and governed personal interactions. It confirmed an individual's gentility, or *uchelwriaeth*, for which his lineage had to conform to certain criteria. Welsh attitudes were strongly affected by an 'economy of regard', and kinship formed an important part of that, explaining why even proverbially poor Welsh gentlemen were accorded respect in accordance with their status rather than their wealth.¹¹ Even in the medieval period, Englishmen observed the level of significance ascribed to kinship as a difference between themselves and the Welsh. As in the seventeenth century, medieval Englishmen joked about the Welsh obsession with genealogy and descent, and the importance of kinship within that. Yet medieval Welsh kinship defined a person's identity, and status, and their genealogy recorded and confirmed that.¹² In the seventeenth century Welsh gentlemen continued to be 'fathers of their countries' in a more profound and literal way than their English counterparts, and although this still resulted in the 'double legitimation' of royal authority and social power as described by Michael Braddick and John Walter in relation to England, it had a stronger effect in binding Welsh society together.¹³ The power of the North-East Welsh gentry was legitimated by the maintenance of the ideals of an ordered society, ordered by family relationships, alliances and obligations. This was further reinforced by references to the long-standing nature of these relationships and their roots in the medieval past.

¹⁰ M.L. Chapman, 'The Records of the Great Sessions for Wales', in J. and S. Rowlands, *Welsh Family History: A Guide to Research* (Birmingham, 1998), p.196; R. Suggett, 'The Welsh Language and the Court of Great Sessions' in G.H. Jenkins (ed.), *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution* (Cardiff, 1997), p. 158.

¹¹ L.B. Smith, 'On the hospitality of the Welsh: A Comparative View', p. 194.

¹² R.R. Davies, 'Kinsmen, neighbours and communities in Wales and the western British Isles, c.1100-c.1400', pp. 178; N.M. Powell, 'Genealogical narratives and kinship in Medieval Wales' in E.D. Kennedy and R. Radulescu (eds), *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France* (Turnhout, 2008), p. 176.

¹³ M.J. Braddick and J. Walter, 'Introduction. Grids of power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society' in *idem.* (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 27.

Kinship was, therefore, central to the organisation and unity of medieval Welsh society, supported by attendant concepts of gentility and social order. It seems odd that it has barely featured in historical studies focused on the years after the legislation of 1536. A close reading of work by Peter Roberts and Philip Jenkins reveals that they do acknowledge the continuing importance of some Welsh traditions in the seventeenth century, but these are largely underexplored.¹⁴ The general assumption, however, has been that after 1536 inspiration for gentry behaviour came from England, driven by desires for the social status brought by local office-holding. This presumes that the basis for Welsh medieval kinship and authority lay solely in the law and the governmental structures of Wales. This was clearly not the case. Kinship influenced power relations much more generally, in terms of using informal or 'soft' power to maintain the social order and defining the identity of individuals within communities. Welsh kinship was highly flexible and its social, political and cultural influence was broad. This meant that it was able to adapt convincingly to the newly introduced English power structures. The English county system, shrievalty, and relationship to central government in England overlaid existing Welsh norms in such an effective way that those pre-existing Welsh practices appeared invisible. In many ways, the changes of the mid-sixteenth century led to a system which had substantial superficial similarities with English concepts of kinship, gentility, and lineage. As Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes have argued, these English concepts also encompassed honour, authority and governance supported by land ownership, office-holding and lineage.¹⁵ It is also true that the Welsh gentry did not exist in splendid isolation, but interacted on a national and international level, bringing new ideas, trends in

¹⁴ P. Roberts, 'Tudor Wales, national identity and the British inheritance' in B. Bradshaw and P. Roberts (eds), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 21; P. Jenkins, 'Seventeenth-century Wales: definition and identity', p. 235.

¹⁵ F. Heal and C. Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 17, 22.

material culture, and cultural approaches into the principality. These were then adapted and built in to existing Welsh practices, or used alongside those more continuous traditions. Yet although there were significant similarities between English and Welsh approaches to kinship and gentility, many aspects of the Welsh approach had origins which reveal themselves in key differences. These include the use of genealogy, the extent to which Welsh gentility and culture was historicised and deeply contextualised with reference to the past, and the complexity and range of patronage networks.

Within the last few years historians have become much more explicitly aware of the continuing influence of customary approaches to kinship and gentility in Wales. This has its roots in the work of John Gwynfor Jones on concepts of gentility in early modern Wales, but extends his arguments regarding the continuance of a strongly kin-based and patristic community to argue for a more long-lasting, significant, and dynastic system.¹⁶ Shaun Evans's important and compelling research on the Mostyn family has clearly demonstrated the centrality of kinship, dynasty, and lineage in explaining that family's dominance in North Wales throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁷ Evans demonstrated the crucial importance of these concepts to a family's authority and *uchelwriaeth* (gentility), as well as the necessity in North-East Wales of those aspects being known widely and publicly for the maintenance of reputation and power. According to Evans, this *uchelwriaeth* provided the Mostyns with their primary legitimacy for 'exercising status, honour, and authority over certain North Wales communities'.¹⁸ Rhys Morgan

¹⁶ J.G. Jones, *Early Modern Wales, c.1525-1640* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 12, 45; J.G. Jones, *Concepts of Order and Gentility in Wales*; *idem.*, *The Welsh gentry, 1536-1640*; *idem.*, 'Concepts of Order and Gentility' in *idem* (ed.), *Class, community and culture in Tudor Wales* (Cardiff, 1989); *idem.*, 'The Welsh language in Local Government: Justices of the Peace and the Courts of Quarter Sessions c.1536-1800', in G.H. Jenkins, (ed.), *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution* (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 194-5.

¹⁷ S. Evans, "'To contynue in my bloud and name": Reproducing the Mostyn Dynasty, c.1540-1692' (Univ. of Aberystwyth PhD thesis, 2013).

¹⁸ Evans, "'To contynue in my bloud and name'", p. 9.

showed how kinship and alliance were vital in enabling Welsh settlers in Ireland to construct and maintain strong networks of power and patronage in the seventeenth century. Morgan has established that kinship networks survived migration to Ireland and created new networks in Ireland via ‘a sense of Welsh solidarity, loyalty to kinsmen and the practical advantages of mutually beneficial cooperation’.¹⁹ Both of these studies represent an important step in a new understanding and evaluation of the importance of kinship in seventeenth-century Wales.

Evans’s argument naturally and understandably affords the Mostyns a degree of exceptionalism, and this tends to obscure the importance of other family groups – it is unarguable that the Mostyns were amongst the leaders of their region, but their continued success means that their archives, land-holdings, and material possessions are unusually intact. Largely in contrast to the Mostyns, most of the other leading gentry families of a similar stature faded in wealth and importance during the nineteenth or early twentieth century, their libraries and documents sold at auction and their estates broken up.²⁰ In the seventeenth century, however, the family patrimony that provided, in Evans’s words, the ‘past-present-perpetual vehicle of the dynasty’, was a concept that underpinned Welsh gentry society more generally.²¹ It led to an adaptable and highly historicised culture, which in the later seventeenth century manifested itself in the study of medieval manuscripts and the writing of histories (small and large) of particular families, of periods, and of the region. This chapter will argue that the culture that Evans describes has to be even further differentiated from the English system and concept of gentility. Although there are some significant similarities, and aspects of Welsh tradition can be analysed using common terminology, there is more distinctiveness in the Welsh system than has previously been

¹⁹ R. Morgan, *The Welsh and the Shaping of Early Modern Ireland 1558-1641* (Woodbridge, 2014), p. 110.

²⁰ D. Huws, *Welsh Medieval Manuscripts* (Cardiff, 2000), p. 307.

²¹ Evans, “‘To contynue in my bloud and name”, p. 255.

acknowledged. This historicised culture will be examined in section two of this chapter. Evans's term 'Welsh ancestral patriotism' is applicable far beyond the Mostyn family, and continued to be central to the way that many North-East Welsh families justified their legitimacy. It also goes a significant way to explaining the fundamentally traumatised expressions of shock and severance upon their exile from power in the late 1640s and 1650s. The traditional rulers felt themselves to be 'civilly dead', suffering 'conquest' in an unnatural time. Poets associated the ejection of the 'old officeholders' with the imprisonment of the King, the 'scattering' of the bishops, and the rule of the 'scum of the earth'.²² The Restoration was trumpeted as a 'miraculous resurrection', and a 'deliverance from slavery'.²³ The North-East Welsh gentry for the most part had successfully persuaded their kindred, tenants, and neighbours that their authority was legitimate. The mid-seventeenth century provided a challenge to that authority but also ultimately led to its strengthening, as in 1660 the returning gentry rulers were represented (and seemingly accepted) as the local parallels to the return of the Stuart monarchs.

Welsh kinship traditions continued to be highly influential in several key ways throughout the period 1640 to 1688: for the maintenance of local or regional authority; for the portrayal of the gentry as the natural office-holders of the region; in operating highly developed and complex networks of mutual obligation and patronage; in maintaining broader gentry ideals including support for monarchy. This influence manifested itself in the prioritisation of kinship over religion and political difference, even at moments of acute political crisis, and in the claim of ancestral relationships to the Stuart monarchs. It was depicted as a natural value – an Interregnum letter of condolence wrote that the death of

²² BL, Add MS 14891: Welsh *Englynion* and Poems; FRO, D/HE/483: John Roberts to Evan Edwards, Llanrhayader, 23 July 1661; Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 13: Edward Lloyd to Anon., n.p., n.d.

²³ FRO, D/HE/483: John Roberts to Evan Edwards, Llanrhayader, 23 July 1661; NLW, MS 9066E no. 2236: Lady Grace Wynn to Richard Wynn, n.p., 4 June 1660.

John Wynne's wife, a daughter of the Mostyn family, took her away from the 'society and commerce which shee had here among us her kinred freinds and allianc', prioritising the 'natural' grief of the kindred over other relationships.²⁴ John Kerrigan argues that the importance of lineage to ruling Welsh gentry families was a symptom of the principality's social conservatism, but one that was preventative of the development of a stronger form of Welsh national community. This may indeed be the case, particularly in the modern sense of a national community, although it also rendered Wales distinct and separate culturally and politically from England.²⁵

The most evident practical impact of kinship in North-East Wales was its use by gentry families to maintain local or regional authority. Since the Union in 1536 the exercise of this authority locally and regionally had been partly formalised in the creation of Justices of the Peace and High Sheriffs in Wales and, under Elizabeth I, the implementation of Deputy Lieutenants. This supplemented, rather than replaced, the existing ways in which heads of gentry families could influence, persuade and command others. The greater gentry families of the region used their positions as head of their kindred to support, maintain, extend, or recover their power and authority in the years 1640-88. In gathering local offices they benefited from their long-established standing within their regions and from their kinship connections. Some local offices were particularly prized, such as the office of *custos rotulorum*, Deputy Lieutenant, and Councillor at the Council of the Marches and Wales. It was also a sign of status and honour to be chosen as Member of Parliament for the shire or the boroughs, and an analysis of the holders of this role in North-East Wales demonstrates the level of control exercised by a select few families and their clients. These include the Conways, Hammers, and Davieses in Flintshire and the Myddeltons and Salusburys in

²⁴ NLW, Bodewryd 72: William Mostyn to John Wynn, n.p., n.d.

²⁵ J. Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603-1707* (Oxford, 2008), p. 43.

Denbighshire.²⁶ For the North-East Welsh gentry this continuity in office was vital for the maintenance of the social order, and for political stability more generally. The individual patriarchs embodied that order, and one of their duties as *uchelwyr* was to maintain stability. This was the ultimate personalisation of authority, and can go some way to explaining the intense loyalty of many North-East Welsh gentlemen to the Stuart monarchy. The Crown was, as John Gwynfor Jones has argued, the fount of law and order, the monarch the national patriarch and the nation his metaphorical family – and in Wales this was taken more literally than in most regions.²⁷

Through this authority, North-East Welsh gentry families managed their patronage networks and called out their communities for military action. It was both a strategy of self-representation and a practical tactic. Through the continuous exercise of command to extended kin and dependents, the role of *pencenedl* retained its function throughout most of the seventeenth century. Indeed Sir Thomas Salusbury of Lleweni, after inheriting his lands in 1632 upon the death of his father, wrote to his uncle that he did not wish to travel or enter Court service at this point. He was ‘of an opinion that it were more for mee now to acquainte myself with myne owne countrye, wheather it hath pleased God to chouse for mee, than any other; and there to be knowne to my friends and kindred’. He justified this further with reference to the preferences of the North-East Welsh people: ‘Our countrymen... are a crafty kind of people, and... beare an internal hate to such as make themselves strangers unto them’. The *pencenedl* should be resident, should know his kin and his dependents, and be able to speak the language of the people.²⁸ The most visible

²⁶ *HoP 1660-1690*, I, 510-13; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished articles on Denbigh Boroughs, Denbighshire, Flint Boroughs, and Flintshire for 1640-60 section. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see these articles in draft.

²⁷ P. Griffiths, A. Fox, S. Hindle, ‘Introduction’, in *idem.* (eds), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), p. 2; J.G. Jones, *The Welsh Gentry*, pp. 43, 231-2.

²⁸ ‘Salusbury Correspondence’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 3rd ser., 26 (1861), pp. 121-2.

manifestation of the role of the *pencenedl* was in the exercise of patronage: the *pencenedl* could use his regional influence to obtain positions for his kindred or dependents in national institutions. The *pencenedl* could expect special favours as regards services, in particular the law – for example free legal counsel, or immediate execution of orders in relation to cases. He also used his influence to demand news and information, and exercised this to great effect at times of political crisis. These gentry leaders were the natural commanders at time of war, and their power and influence meant that they were seen as the natural governors of the region in times of peace, with their authority rooted in Welsh history rather than merely in wealth.

The most common reason for the activation of kinship connections was the desire to gain a position, either locally, at Court, or within the Church of England. This could take the form of the kindred petitioning the *pencenedl*, or the *pencenedl* using his connections to obtain advantages for himself or his close family. Alternatively, writers referred to themselves or the person requesting the favour as the recipient's 'allyesman' or 'alliesman'. This appears to have meant dependent or kinsman through marriage or political alliance, and remained in use throughout the seventeenth century despite the apparent collapse of such legal kinship categories after the end of Welsh law.²⁹ The language of kinship and obligation is seen frequently within these requests, with the description of family relationships forming a key part of the request. To this purpose, pedigrees were updated with notes on the alliances made by members of the family, and the positions they held at court, at the universities, and in the City of London. One Mostyn pedigree mentioned 'Richard Jonnes servant to the Lord Chancellor Bacon 1620', Sir Richard Yonge 'a gentlman of King James & King Charles most honorable privy Chamber in ordinarye', and noted the employment of John

²⁹ B.E. Howells (ed.), *A Calendar of Letters Relating to North Wales, 1533-c.1700* (Cardiff, 1967), p. 202; W.J. Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence, 1553-c.1700* (Cardiff, 1954), p. 175.

Mostyn (son of Sir Roger) as one of the chief gentlemen of Archbishop John Williams.³⁰

These were working documents, and could be used to keep track of kinship connections for the purposes of subsequently seeking patronage.

The exercise of patronage is frequently apparent in ecclesiastical matters. This could either take the form of gentlemen asking for the aid of their clerical kinsmen, or other gentlemen or dependents asking their neighbours, friends or family to intervene with their connections. It was common in Wales, as in England, that gentlemen aimed to secure livings for chosen individuals. In 1639 Sir Thomas Myddelton attempted to intervene in the living of Llanwnog on behalf of his 'frind' or dependent, the son of a local vicar.³¹

Similarly the bishop of St. Asaph, George Griffith, was forced to apologise to his 'kinsman' for the misinterpretation of a message in 1660, granting Sir Richard Wynn's desires in the matter of a preferment.³² In a slightly different example, the parishioners of Nerquis, writing via the local gentleman John Wynne, petitioned the Bishop of St. Asaph for a permanent curate for their village in 1640. Notably, this petition was sent by Wynne to his 'kinsman' Thomas Davies of Gwysaney, in the hope that Davies would intervene with his 'cosen' the bishop and Lord President Bridgewater, a close friend and kinsman of the Davies family.³³ John Dolben, Dean of Westminster and later Bishop of Rochester and archbishop of York, was extremely helpful to his kin in North-East and North-West Wales. He was able to obtain livings for dependents of the Wynn family and for relatives in Denbighshire. Dolben ensured success for Lady Grace Wynn against Henry Bridgeman,

³⁰ Although John Mostyn's employment with Williams was heavily scored out, possibly as a result of the disgrace of Williams in treating with the parliamentarian forces at the end of the First Civil War. BL, Add MS 61685: A BOOKE Shewing the true and auncient Genealogie of Sir Roger Moston of Moston, 1623.

³¹ NLW, Chirk E 1368: Draft letter of Sir Thomas Myddelton to the bishop of Bangor, May 1639.

³² NLW, MS 9066E no 2284: Bishop George Griffith to Sir Richard Wynn, Llanymynech, 5 Feb. 1660.

³³ NLW, MS 17156D fo 19: John Wynne to Thomas Davies, Nerquis, 5 Dec. 1640; NLW, MS 17156D fo 21: Petition of the parishioners of Nerquis to the bishop of St. Asaph, n.d.; NLW, MS 17156D fo 27: Bishop John Owen to Robert Davies, n.p., n.d.

Bishop of Sodor and Man, in 1675 when alongside Sir Thomas Meres and the archbishop of Canterbury, he 'set upon' Bridgeman for defying Gwydir.³⁴ For such favours, Thomas Bulkeley pronounced it 'an extrarordinary happynesse to the Publicke as well as comfort to the Deane of Westminsters Rellations that a person of his Eminences Abilities & integrity does move in that sphere of Power'.³⁵ In these cases the local gentry were the immediate point of contact for those seeking aid, with the expectation that they would use their connections to the benefit of the locality. High-ranking clergymen were expected to respond to the requests of their kin, particularly the *pencenedl* or senior members of the kindred. On the other hand, the *pencenedl* was required to intervene on the behalf of those in the region.

Patronage was equally important to those seeking lay office. In 1666 Sir John Salusbury of Lleweni informed Lady Grace Wynn that he would seek the help of 'cousin' William Dolben, secretary to the Earl of Manchester, in obtaining the position of *custos rotulorum* for Denbighshire, asking her intervention with the bishop of Rochester in support of the same.³⁶ In July 1684 Sir Roger Mostyn wrote to the duke of Beaufort's secretary asking that Beaufort's choice of militia captain, Thomas Whitley, be replaced by one Peter Pennant. In 1684 this was clearly a political choice, as Whitley was from a Whig family, but Mostyn made the case that Pennant's loyalty was unimpeachable, 'his Grandfather haveing been a Maijor under mee all the warr in the Late King's Services, of a Loyall family, and a worthy Gentleman'. In doing so, he appealed to Beaufort's honour and knowledge of Welsh custom as well as to his sense of recent history and memory.³⁷

³⁴ NLW, MS 9069E no 2723: Gawen Hudson to Lady Grace Wynn, n.p., Sept. 1675.

³⁵ NLW, MS 9067E no 2453: Thomas Bulkeley to Sir Richard Wynn, Dynas, 11 May 1666.

³⁶ Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence*, p. 127.

³⁷ BL, Add MS 38175 fo. 104: Sir Roger Mostyn to Mr. Crow, n.p., 5 July 1684.

Patronage could be sought for financial reasons. Sir Thomas Hanmer used the offices of his Parliamentarian uncle Roger Hanmer to ameliorate some of the financial strains of sequestration in 1647.³⁸ In 1663 Robert Pugh hoped in a letter to Maurice Wynn that he was ‘not wholly worne out of your memory’ as being ‘as being a poore Relation of yours, & having been som times heretofor an Officer under your Command’ when begging for Wynn’s aid with his application to the fund for the relief of loyal and indigent officers. Pugh claimed Wynn’s duty to ‘tender the welfare of a poore Kinsman, that really wishes your happiness’ should motivate him, giving names of prominent royalist supporters in case the family relationship alone was not enough.³⁹ During his Interregnum exile in La Rochelle Hugh Wynne of Flintshire requested that his brother help him purchase a ‘Stocke of Imployment’ which he promised to insure, in order to finance his continued exile following his flight from Anglesey. His appeal was prefaced with detailed enquiries into his family’s health and happiness, making it clear that the family relationship was intended to be reciprocal.⁴⁰ Financial aid for a university education was in the gift of North-East Welsh gentlemen. Maurice Wynn of Crogan (by 1667 one of the longest surviving sons of Sir John Wynn of Gwydir) apparently set up two scholarships to Oxford. Writing to solicit one of these for his son, Richard Edwards invoked extended kinship in his favour, saying:

I canot blame you for being mindefull of yr nearest relations, in the first place, in case you goe on in that purchase: If hereafter kindred afar off come under consideration, my sonne I believe will appear to be such, both by father, & mother too. I have heard my father say, many yeares before I came to Llanvayre, or indeed had any acquaintance with any of the house of Gwider, that he was akinne to that house, & that old Sr John Wynne, your father of worthy memorie, was pleased to acknowledge him, for his kinsman.⁴¹

³⁸ NLW, Bettisfield 26: Sir Thomas Hanmer to John Evelyn, Bettisfield, 22 Aug. 1668; Bettisfield 21: Roger Hanmer to Sir Thomas Hanmer, London, 18 Feb. 1647.

³⁹ NLW, MS 12403E no 45: Robert Pugh to Maurice Wynn, Dublin, 6 June 1663.

⁴⁰ NLW, Bodewryd 95: Hugh Wynne to John Wynne, La Rochelle, 10 June 1655.

⁴¹ NLW, MS 9067E no 2504: Richard Edwards to Maurice Wynn, Oswestry, 27 Mar. 1667.

Sir Thomas Myddelton and Robert Davies both had close associations with schools and universities. Throughout the period the Myddeltons funded a number of scholars from their local area to attend school or university at Oxford, while Davies donated a living in Holywell to a nominee of Jesus College. William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph from 1680, himself funded a number of students through their studies at Oxford.⁴² These donations could be presented as a benefit to the whole region. John Edwards requested that his brother-in-law Watkin Kyffin attempt to persuade Sir Thomas Myddelton to ‘bestow something’ on, or send his heir to, Jesus College, as ‘Northwales men shall fayre the worse, if the President perceives the best of the Country to bauke the house’.⁴³ This support for the university (and indeed school) education of promising but poor kinsman or dependents was part of the role of the *uchelwyr*.

Welsh kinship networks were used consistently in the pursuit of legal success. The Welsh were proverbially litigious – indeed it is notable that at the death of Hugh Roberts, the ninety-year-old vicar of Cerrigydrudion, it was commented that ‘in this his time he never sued any man, nor was sued att Law, by any’.⁴⁴ This certainly seems unusual when examining any seventeenth-century gentry family papers, from the Wynnes and Mostyns to the Trevors and Lloyds. Simon Thelwall, writing to his nephew in 1640, begged for his intervention on the behalf of his ‘kynsewoeman the wydow of Wm Mydleton’, pledging that it would oblige ‘my selfe and others of her kynne to acknowledge yor favour extended towards her’. This pledge of one head of family to another, more wealthy and influential gentry leader carried significant weight, and emphasised the gravity of the situation about

⁴² NLW, Chirk E 5594: John Edwards to Watkin Kyffin, Oxford, 4 Mar. 1636; Chirk E 6378: Peter ffoulkes to Thomas Prichard, London, 1 Apr. 1684; NLW, Gwysaney 17: Presentation by Jonathan Edwards, 7 Aug. 1692.

⁴³ NLW, Chirk E 1369: Jonathan Edwards to Watkin Kyffin, Oxford, 14 Jan. 1638.

⁴⁴ DRO, PD/18/1/1: Cerrigydrudion Parish Registers 1590-1735.

which he wrote.⁴⁵ Robert Mostyn made the Chancellor of the diocese of St. Asaph aware of 'his relation unto your family & your selfe' in an attempt to persuade him not to pursue a legal case against Sir Richard Wynn in 1661. Lady Grace Wynn demanded that Sir Thomas Meres prevent a case against the Wynns progressing in 1676. Meres used the Wynn family influence with William Williams and Sir William Dolben (both families allied to the Wynns) in achieving this.⁴⁶ Family relationships and kin alliances crucially formed much of the basis for electoral alliances, to be explored in detail in chapter three.

The authority of the *pencenedl* was also manifest in the resolution of disputes. Prominent gentry leaders could be requested to mediate in disputes prior to their going to law, or when the law had not provided a solution. The death of Archbishop John Williams at Gloddaeth in 1650 occasioned several years' dispute between Sir Owen Wynn and his wife's cousin Gruffith Williams, later Bishop of Ossory. In this instance Sir Roger Mostyn informally arbitrated between the two, Wynn citing his desire to avoid the courts. Wynn asked for 'freinds' to be nominated formally to mediate, 'And those freinds to be such as are of my Lords Kindred'. Wynn had previously written extensive notes on the meaning of the word 'kinsman' in common law, a definition necessary as Williams had spoken often of his intentions in relation to his 'kindred' during his lifetime. In this dispute between kinsmen, particularly where the *pencenedl* was concerned, the definition of kin was crucial, as were the individuals chosen to arbitrate internally.⁴⁷ In October 1676 Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaeth and Mutton Davies of Gwysaney were requested by Denbighshire JPs to intervene and mediate in a serious argument between Mr. Price of Vaynol and Mr. Wynne

⁴⁵ NLW, MS 1551E no 14a: Simon Thelwall to his nephew, Plas-Y-Ward, 9 July 1640.

⁴⁶ NLW, MS 9066E no 2281: Robert Mostyn to Sir Richard Wynn, Nant, 21 Jan. 1660; MS 9069E no 2744: Sir Thomas Meres to Lady Grace Wynn, n.p., 18 Jan. 1676.

⁴⁷ NLW, Add MS 468E no. 1914: Humphrey Jones to Owen Wynn, n.p., 1649; Add MS 468E no. 1999: Sir Owen Wynn to Gruffith Williams, 3 Jan. 1653; Add MS 468E no. 1997: 'Reasons that the word kinsman is not meant by the Heire at Comon law'.

of Melai. This quarrel had evidently drawn in many other gentlemen from throughout North-East Wales, and Mostyn and Davies were selected in order to ‘accommodate the difference’ between the two parties before the next sessions.⁴⁸

This system of arbitration was used to preserve the honour of those involved, and to bring an end to long-running disputes, with the gentleman mediators’ authority being respected. It was a continuation of the more formal medieval system of kindred courts, and was activated when a member (or a group) of the kindred requested intervention. The *pencenedl* could also be called upon to support other kin or dependents when they were engaged in a dispute at law with another family or group, as evidenced by a 1663 case where a group of tenants of Maurice Wynne of Crogan sued out a case in Chancery in his name, swearing to pay a share in the costs, in order to protect their ‘inioyment of our auncient right & privedge’ as held by their ‘predecessors’. The defendants were a group that the tenants claimed ‘had no libertie at all to the same, but what they had since the late unhappy trouble’.⁴⁹ Alternatively, the *pencenedl* could be encouraged to prosecute a case at law when the opponent was an enemy of his kindred, as was the case for Sir Thomas Salusbury in 1637, in a long-running case against William Dolben. He was encouraged to go ahead with the case as a matter of honour, as Dolben had insulted himself and ‘branches out of your noble house’, or kindred.⁵⁰ An appeal to history, via a communal agreement and a gentry leader, was typical of this form of intervention.

Another crucial example of the use of kin-based regional authority was in the exercise of military command. The recruiting and organising of forces within the North-East Welsh

⁴⁸ Bangor, Mostyn Add MS 9067 no. 55: Sir John Wynn *et al* to Thomas Mostyn and Mutton Davies, Denbigh, 4 Oct. 1676.

⁴⁹ NLW, MS 12403E no. 43: Group letter to Maurice Wynn, Disserth, 12 May 1663.

⁵⁰ Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence*, pp. 94-5.

region was couched strongly in the language of kinship and neighbourhood. This was particularly noticeable in 1642-3, but also visible at other times of political crisis, such as in 1688. As such, Sir Thomas Hanmer enlisted the help of four of his ‘cosins’, as well as ‘freinds’ and ‘other gentlemen of your neighbourhood’ in raising troops in January 1643. Robert Davies, to whom Hanmer’s note was circulated, passed it to another two of his cousins, and John Eyton circulated another message concerning military finances to ‘Cosin Jones’ as well as another cousin, Peter Griffith. Richard Grosvenor of Kinnerton, on the Cheshire side of the Welsh border, spoke of his ‘Cosin Eyton’s work to organise Flintshire in defence of Chester, encouraging David Pennant to take up Eyton’s baton and work more efficiently on the task. The 1642 oath of association written and taken by the North-East Welsh gentry made significant use of the language of neighbourhood, swearing to protect the lives and fortunes of their neighbours by the efforts of themselves and their friends.⁵¹ Sir Thomas Salusbury, head of the powerful Lleweni family of Denbighshire, exhorted David Pennant, sheriff of Flintshire, to procure as many subscriptions to the oath as he could, ‘both by your owne power & using all your friends, & amongst the rest if you please my name therein’. Furthermore, Salusbury described a course apparently taken in Shropshire by Sir Vincent Corbet and others:

every man to Labor & trye in the first place with their freinds & neighbors, what assistance he might have from them before he subscribed himself, & then the great Landlords as Sir Vincent Corbett & others, deale thus with their tenats that to such as will followe them in this Service for the defence of their Countrey if they miscarrie they shall have their leases renew’d with an advantage of the tearmes to their heyres or assignes, & he whose horse is killd shall Lawfully Claime the first herriot that falls to his Landlord. Such as will not followe their Landlords shallbe abandoned by them for ever, & excluded from all favor & protection from them.⁵²

⁵¹ WRO, CR2017/TP142/1: Sir Thomas Hanmer to Sir Richard Grosvenor, Bangor-on-Dee, 15 Jan. 1643; CR2017/TP142/2: Robert Davies to John Jones, n.p., n.d.; CR2017/TP645: John Eyton to John Jones, Leeswood, 4 Sept. 1642; CR2017/TP96: Richard Grosvenor to David Pennant, Kinnerton, 7 Dec. 1642; CR2017/TP647/1: Oath of Association of the gentry of North-East Wales, 1642.

⁵² WRO, CR2017/TP97: Sir Thomas Salusbury to David Pennant, Shrewsbury, 19 Dec. 1642.

There is no evidence as yet that the Welsh gentry used the strategy of threatening their tenants' leases or livelihoods in order to recruit troops – but much to demonstrate that extensive use was made of extended kinship connections, as well as imprisoning truculent non-payers of assessment for debt-related offences. David Pennant's record of proclamations that he sent out makes it clear that many of his agents for spreading of such royalist publications were close or extended kin.⁵³ On the Parliamentary side, Sir Thomas Myddelton made extensive use of his kin and dependents in raising his regiment, being unable to recruit from inside North Wales more widely. His London and Essex relations were mobilised in order to raise a respectable force, alongside his personal servants.⁵⁴ The use of such networks to raise troops for the First Civil War was far from unique to North-East Wales, yet pre-War correspondence demonstrates the intricacy of the kinship relationships and the extent to which the language of kinship was used intensely in activating forces for the King. The English gentry and nobility on both sides in the First Civil War also attempted to secure their tenants' support, though with varying levels of support – clearly not all were as successful as Corbet.⁵⁵

Alternatively, the language of kinship could be used in negotiations for surrender, both parties acknowledging their relationship in a bid to maintain honourable conduct, or in an attempt to obtain an earlier surrender. This is evident in the language between William Salesbury, governor of Denbigh Castle during the long siege of 1646. Sir Thomas Myddelton and Salesbury referred to each other as 'Your ould and true friend and Kinsman' and 'your Kinsman and would be your true friend, while Thomas Mytton and

⁵³ BL, Add MS 33374: The papers of John Jones of Gellilyfdy; FRO, D/DM/271: Tracts & papers relating to the Civil Wars, collected by David Pennant, High Sheriff of Flintshire.

⁵⁴ NLW, Chirk F 12543: Accounts of subscriptions to Sir Thomas Myddelton's expedition, 1643-4; TNA, SP 28/346: Accounts of Sir Thomas Middleton.

⁵⁵ M. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008), p. 232; Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 55, 65, 67-9, 81.

the same Salesbury wrote to each other as ‘Your poore Kinsman and old Play fellow’ and ‘Your Old frinde’.⁵⁶ Elsewhere the extent of family or kindred connections of an individual was viewed as a cause for concern. An account of the danger posed to royalist control of Anglesey in c.1644 portrayed Sir Hugh Owen as a threat in the North Wales region because he was an individual ‘whose Auncestors were borne in Anglisey, and hath great Alliance, and a 1000l per Annum by his wife, who is sister to Mr Lloyd, one of the 3 employed by the Parliament for the Militia for Carnarvon-shire’.⁵⁷ This shows a well-honed awareness of the strength of kinship and ties of alliance in the region, and demonstrates the potential of kinship to disrupt the politics and alliances of a region.

Kinship and lineage were used to promote the authority and power of a family. Evans argued that the use of dynastic symbols and techniques by the Mostyns was another important way in which their position as natural governors or territorial rulers was cemented.⁵⁸ Visual and material propaganda was visible across the region. The use of pedigrees, heraldic symbols in architecture, and in portraiture were all visual manifestations of the power of the gentry. Heal and Holmes note this tendency in English and Welsh gentry houses, although it is clear that the nature of the display in Welsh houses went beyond the level of presentation into a practical desire to cement the regional authority of the gentry.⁵⁹ It rooted their influence in history and lineage, and linked the achievements of the present to a glorious and (crucially) long-lived past. Genealogy was employed as a form of written and visual propaganda to demonstrate the longevity of a family, the historical roots of their power, and the ancient nature of their nobility and land ownership.

Genealogy depicted their links with other important families. Public spaces in North-East

⁵⁶ Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence*, pp. 159-160, 164-5.

⁵⁷ BL, Add MS 18981: A shorte viewe of the danger of Anglesey & Carnarvons surprisall by the Enemy, c.1644.

⁵⁸ Evans, “‘To contynue in my bloud and name’”, pp. 18-19.

⁵⁹ Heal and Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales*, p. 35.

Welsh houses and private notes on pedigrees reveal the importance of documenting and promoting such family ties. The Mostyn houses of Mostyn and Talacre both displayed the coats of arms of those families closely allied to theirs, on the mantelpieces and ceilings of their public rooms. In the reception rooms of Talacre coats of arms are painted on the ceiling, while they adorn the walls, ceilings, and windows of Mostyn Hall. The work of the bards, in praise-poetry and elegies, spoke of the ancient lineages of prominent families, their connection to other families, and the care that they took over governance and authority. As the seventeenth century progressed, portraits of prominent connections were used as an even more visible demonstration of the power of a lineage. Thus the Mostyn family commissioned and displayed a portrait of the Whitlockes, and the Davieses commissioned portraits of the Eyttons, Robinsons, and other connections. The concept and practical implications of kinship were of profound importance to the gentry of North-East Wales. Kinship strongly affected the way they behaved and represented themselves. It featured consistently in the historical, poetic and literary culture of Wales and in its self-representation as a nation.

II: Wales and the historicised nation

Another realm in which Welsh customs survived strongly into the seventeenth century was that of history, historical writing, and memory. It will be argued in this section that Wales had a peculiarly intense sense of history and historical identity, and that this was exemplified in historical writing, genealogy, prophecy, poetry, and art. Welsh culture, both popular and elite, had long been concerned with the memorialisation of lineage, the princes, and the Welsh people. Many of the canonical Welsh stories include extensive references to the pedigree or alliances of the protagonists, and characters within them locate themselves in relation to their kin or allies. Such relationships drive the narrative of these stories, for example the narrative prose tale *How Culhwch won Olwen*, where Arthur's

aid in Culhwch's quest is determined by their cousinage.⁶⁰ In the Welsh stories as with many folk tales, myths, and legends, the distinction between history and myth are unclear. As Judith Pollman has argued in relation to early modern Europe, the historical framing of folk tales and myths contributed significantly to their continued vitality – particularly the link with historical figures and real places.⁶¹ The earliest surviving written Welsh history and literature is all concerned with the lives of the princes and the ruling families, forming the foundation of the Welsh historical approach down the generations.⁶² Gentry families could place their ancestors (and thus their authority) into the realm of a broader national past, one that had been repeated through the centuries in oral performances and gatherings. This tendency to link the present to the past, and the past to the future, continued far beyond the medieval period. Its continuance into the sixteenth century is witnessed in an anonymous hostile report of popular and elite behaviour in North Wales:

Upon the sondays and hollidaies the multitude of all sortes of men woomen and Childerne of everie parishe doe use to meete in sondrie places either one some hill or one the side of some mountaine where there harperes and Crowthers singe them songes of the doeinges of there Auncestors namelie of their robberes againste the kinge of this realme and the English nation, and then doe they ripp up their petigres at length howe eche of them is distended from those their ould prince. Here alsoe doe they spende therre time in hearinge some parte of the lives of *Thalaasyn Marlin Beno Kybbye Iernin* and suche other the intended Prophettes and Sanctes of that cuntrie.

The Common sorte of gent of that cuntrie doe ordenarilie in everie place, and eche Companie advaunce the habilitie of the Dominion of Wales preferringe the same to be more then the valor of the kingdome of Scotlande and thabilities of the people of that province or parte of this realme.... And hereis to be noted whan they lie idelie one the mountaines sides howe than they talke of the fastnes and naturall strenght of everie waie place and hill of their Cuntrey.⁶³

This report has been used extensively elsewhere as evidence of the continuance of Welsh attachment to conservative religious traditions, but early modern historians have tended to

⁶⁰ 'How Culhwch won Olwen', in S. Davies (trans.), *The Mabinogion* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 179-203.

⁶¹ J. Pollman, 'Of living legends and authentic tales: how to get remembered in Early Modern Europe', *TRHS*, 23 (2013), pp. 105-6.

⁶² F. Jones, 'An Approach to Welsh Genealogy', *THSC*, (1948-9), p. 319.

⁶³ BL, Lansdowne MS 111/4: The state of North Wales touchinge Religion.

ignore its wider significance. These gatherings imply a much more socially all-encompassing attachment to Welsh history and lineage than merely an elite one. The report describes a continuing oral tradition, and a detailed knowledge of one's forebears and place in society, as well as a sense of national and regional pride. Although there is little evidence of such gatherings continuing into the seventeenth century (aside from pilgrimages and feasts), the cultural artefacts described in this source were still discussed, treasured, and copied into the eighteenth century.⁶⁴ Pedigrees continued to trace the lineage of the Welsh gentry back to the Welsh princes and to the Stuart kings. One Jacobean account of Welsh history noted the longevity of the rule of Welsh families, stating that:

Wales beinge the Refuge and place of savegard of the Remnant of the Auntient Brittaines (the first Inhabitanes of the Ile of great Brittain) Beinge driven thethe and dispossessed by the Saxon Kinges, havinge taken from them the fertill Countreyes of England held the same, and therein preserved their Auntient bloud Royall of the Kinges and Auntient families the posteritye of the Nation, their lawes, and auntient Language, from the furie and Cruell murder of the Saxons, Between wch two nations, there Continwed inplacable hatred and warres.⁶⁵

Welsh manuscripts became a form of social and intellectual currency in the second half of the seventeenth century, and were swapped, copied and discussed, and were used in the constructions of new genealogical histories. As Daniel Huws has commented, there was a Welsh manuscript tradition that was unbroken from the thirteenth century and still just about current in the nineteenth.⁶⁶ Indeed, Sir John Prise argued in 1543 that the Welsh had always been especially devoted to preserving their past, and that what Schwyzer calls 'culturally specific arts of memory', including genealogies and patronyms, had been in continuous use in Wales since antiquity.⁶⁷ Wales's highly historicised culture had a purpose

⁶⁴ BL, Add MS 19870 fo. 134: A Register of Assessments for troops, accounts of aids, and subsidies, proclamations, commissions, letters and orders of the Privy Council, and of the Lord President of Wales, with correspondence of the sheriff and justices of the county of Flint, 1586-1637; LPL, MS 943: Papers of Archbishop Laud.

⁶⁵ BL, Lansdowne MS 216: A historical account of government in Wales.

⁶⁶ Huws, *Welsh Medieval Manuscripts*, p. 23.

⁶⁷ P. Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 87.

and effect deeper than the equivalent interest in history and lineage that developed in England from the sixteenth century onwards. Early modern English antiquaries also used genealogy to reinforce the traditional hierarchy and their work fostered a nascent national consciousness. Here too, pedigree was linked to honour and authority, but at a much more superficial level.⁶⁸ Genealogy and historical writing did not, however, have the practical force or implications in England that it had in Wales, and was used to bolster an authority much less reliant on kinship and kin-based territorial power. Indeed Jan Broadway recognises this difference or separateness in her study of early modern local history, arguing that the Welsh ‘formed communities that are set as separate and distinct from the English as the French, German, Italians or Spanish’ in her period, and so does not include them in the scope of her study.⁶⁹

Pedigrees were the proverbial indicator of Welsh lineage, much mocked over the centuries by Englishmen who either failed to recognise the justification for the documents or who saw them as backward or ignorant.⁷⁰ As a confirmation of gentility and a display of power, pedigrees were vital. They ranged from working and relatively rough documents through to elaborate and sumptuously painted manuscripts, for example the ‘Painted Book’ of the Salesburys of Rug. The results of genealogical research were seen in the houses of the gentry, in their coats of arms, and even in their Civil War banners. Griffith Hughes, writing to John Thelwall in 1642, sent Thelwall a banner he had produced, with instructions as to how it could be attached to Thelwall’s trumpeter’s instrument. Hughes promised Thelwall’s pedigree roll or ‘card’ would be sent along shortly, produced ‘for love and respect, and not

⁶⁸ J. Broadway, *“No historie so meete”: Gentry Culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 108-9, 154-5.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁷⁰ Even patriotic Welshmen were not immune to such mockery – Sir Roger Mostyn described another gentleman as ‘worse than a long chapter full of hard names or a long pedigree. NLW, MS 9068E no. 2553: Sir Roger Mostyn to Sir Richard Wynn, Mostyn, 19 June 1669; Jones, ‘An Approach to Welsh Genealogy’, p. 304.

for gain'.⁷¹ Genealogical information, sometimes including a whole pedigree, was also central to Welsh praise poetry, so crucial was the concept of lineage to the honour and authority of gentry families. The bards were responsible for compiling genealogies and pedigrees, so integral was lineage to Welsh poetry.⁷² One late seventeenth-century *marwnad* to Sir Roger Mostyn (c.1623-90) spoke of his ancient and noble Welsh lineage going back to the princes of Powys and Ednyfed Vychan, as well as his family's contemporary and powerful connections with the Wynns of Gwydir, with Sir James Whitlock, and Sir John Trevor.⁷³ Pedigrees were frequently updated with births, deaths, marriages, and notable achievements, and could be displayed or shown off to interested parties. Pedigrees were used in land disputes to prove the right to land through inheritance. The Salusburys of Lleweni, for example, commissioned a search of historical records in one such dispute in 1637. John Salusbury of Bachegraig reported the information that 'we are no ways allied or of kynred, for 3 decents after Sir Thomas Salusbury the match was betwixt Lleweny and Beraygne' as a significant discovery.⁷⁴ Yet pedigrees were historical works as well as practical artefacts. Seventeenth-century pedigrees generally traced lineages back to medieval Welsh royalty and beyond, to Brutus or even occasionally Adam and Eve (as indeed did some European and English pedigrees). Those longer pedigrees stray, as Bartrum has argued, 'into the realm of legend', but in doing so give a sense of the historical narrative preferred by the bards and the gentry. In fact some pedigrees continued to be written in narrative form up to the end of the seventeenth century.⁷⁵ The 'Painted Book' traced the Salesburys back to the royal tribes of Wales, as did the 'true and auncient Genealogie' of Sir Roger Mostyn, created in 1623.

⁷¹ Howells (ed.), *A Calendar of Letters Relating to North Wales*, p. 188.

⁷² DRO, DD/WY/6674: Painted Book, c.1640; P.C. Bartrum, 'Notes on the Welsh Genealogical Manuscripts', *THSC*, 1968, p. 67.

⁷³ MH, 'Cywydd Marwnad Sir Roger Mostyn Marchog'.

⁷⁴ Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence*, pp. 91-2.

⁷⁵ MH, Handwritten book of regional pedigrees, c.1685; P.J. Bartrum, 'Notes on the Welsh Genealogical Manuscripts', p. 69; Jones, 'An Approach to Welsh genealogy', pp. 322, 325.

Narrative construction via pedigrees could have national as well as regional ramifications. One plausible reason proposed for the level of Welsh royalism is that the Stuart monarchs had some 'British blood in their veins', creating a close (if largely fictive) association between ancient Welsh gentry families and the Crown. The Tudor monarchs had legitimised this fiction by claiming a direct lineage from the ancient British kings described by Geoffrey of Monmouth. The intention was to legitimise their rule, and to benefit from the propagandistic value of the Merlin prophecies regarding the return of a British king, but the side effect was to give credence and support to the Welsh version of British history.⁷⁶ The existence of a kin relationship with the Stuarts made the gentry's loyalty to Charles I and his family more fundamental, as it embodied key ideals of Welsh society. These kinship links were demonstrated in pedigrees and genealogical research throughout Wales. Examples of pedigrees trace links to the Tudor and Stuart monarchs, giving an ideological dimension to Welsh royalism and loyalism throughout the seventeenth century. These claims would be unlikely to stand up to detailed scrutiny, but they nonetheless demonstrate the importance both of the concept of kinship and of the perceived relationship with the Crown. Indeed William Salesbury of Bachymbyd and Rug, writing to Thomas Mytton whilst under siege at Denbigh, rued the fact that 'soe noble a gentleman, soe generally beeloved, as yourselfe, of soe ancient, and soe worthy a stocke' should be responsible for the ruination of his 'country' and the kingdom.⁷⁷ By supporting parliament, Mytton had abandoned the role of the gentry, and the work of his lineage – by implication only royalism was a valid choice for one of an ancient line. Alongside the defence of the Church of England (seen as the ancient British Church revived), the loyalty of kindred and

⁷⁶ L. Bowen, 'Rediscovering Difference? Nations, Peoples, and Politics in the British Civil Wars', *History Compass*, 4/5 (2006), p. 845; Jones, *Early Modern Wales*, p. 202; G. Jones, 'Early Modern Welsh Nationalism and the British History' in S. Mottram and S. Prescott (eds), *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), p. 24.

⁷⁷ William, 2nd Baron Bagot (ed.), *Memorials of the Bagot family* (Blithfield, 1824), p. xxii.

loyalty to the ultimate *pencenedl* were two reasons for the Welsh support for Charles I from 1642 until his death.

As has already been implied, tracing kinship connections through genealogy encompassed the tracing and reinforcing of national origins. This formed part of a feedback loop in which the study of history promoted the importance of individual families, and the study of individual families represented the broader history and origins of the nation. National origin myths were developed and protected this way, and used as a justification for contemporary religious and political actions. These early medieval developments were driven by international trends as well as local ones – the spread of Latin literacy, for example, and the desire of Christian communities to situate themselves within the larger biblical ‘family’. The Welsh found their place by tracing their origins to Brutus, a connection first made in the ninth-century *Historia Brittonum* and popularised further in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s twelfth-century account of British origins.⁷⁸ Brutus was said to have been the first King of Britain, hence pedigrees aimed at proving their subjects belonged directly to the tribe of ‘ancient Britons’. These mythical origins were to be replicated in later accounts of the Welsh such as that of Sir John Prise, Humphrey Lhuyd, David Powel, and William Wynne, as well as in histories of individual families (most notably that of Sir John Wynn of Gwydir about his family) and, of course, pedigrees.⁷⁹

Other significant figures that feature regularly in pedigrees and histories of the Welsh, including Owain Glyndwr and Henry Tudor, also recur in Welsh prophecies, another integral aspect of Welsh culture and history. Prophecies were another feature of the

⁷⁸ D.E. Thornton, ‘Orality, literacy and genealogy in early medieval Ireland and Wales’, in H. Pryce (ed.), *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 94-5.

⁷⁹ Sir J. Prise, *Historiae Bryannicae Defensio* (1573); H. Lhuyd, *The Breviary of Britayne*, trans. T. Twyne (1573); D. Powel, *Historie of Cambria, now called Wales* (1584); W. Wynne, *History of Wales* (1692); Sir J. Wynn, *The History of the Gwydir Family* (1770).

English stereotype of the Welsh, and like pedigrees, were extremely popular. They were often copied within collections of poetry.⁸⁰ Their popularity lasted from their heyday in the medieval period into the eighteenth century, with examples copied and re-copied, particularly in circumstances where the ancient predictions seemed to fit contemporary circumstances. This included the Interregnum, where medieval prophecies of a returning Welsh hero to unite warring factions against a common (and distinctively English) enemy must have seemed particularly apt. It would be easy to cast Charles II in this role, especially considering the reputed kin connections to the Welsh ‘demonstrated’ in many pedigrees. Parliament’s casting of itself as an English institution would again fit the role of the enemy. There had long been a concern about the Welsh addiction to prophecy and its potential for political comment, and the copying of prophecies alongside royalist poetry bemoaning the fall of Charles I and the bishops suggests that its subversive tendencies remained strong into the seventeenth century.⁸¹

Seventeenth-century North-East Welsh gentlemen did not confine themselves to the commissioning or study of pedigrees. Throughout the period 1640 to 1688 they were fascinated with ancient Welsh manuscripts, and would go to great lengths to access rare examples. Indeed three out of the five most important manuscript collections in Wales were formed in North-East Wales, and the region appears to have a particularly strong and consistent interest in historical matters.⁸² Several gentlemen undertook historical research at a deeper level, intending to publish their work or at least share it amongst their peers. The evidence that survives is from the large letter collections of Gwydir, Gwysaney, and Mostyn, but it seems clear from that correspondence that the interest in Welsh history,

⁸⁰ M. Kay, ‘Prophecy in Welsh manuscripts’, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 26 (2006), pp. 77, 79-80.

⁸¹ BL, Add MS 14886: Welsh poetry and prophecies; BL, Add MS 14897: Welsh poetry and prophecies; L. Bowen, ‘Information, language, and political culture in early modern Wales’, *P&P*, 228 (2015), pp. 136-7.

⁸² Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p. 22.

manuscript and book collection was much more widespread. This may be illustrated with two brief case studies.

In the case of the Davies family of Gwysaney, an interest in history and genealogy spanned the generations. Gruffydd ap Ieuan ap Llywelyn Vychan of Llanerch, a poet and man of letters, apparently possessed a very valuable library that was still at Llanerch in 1601.⁸³

Robert Davies II (1581-1633) corresponded with other Welsh gentlemen about manuscripts, for example David Lhuyd and the well-known antiquary Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt. Lhuyd praised Robert Davies II's collections, his way of preserving the manuscripts and allowing other scholars to access them. He described himself as 'addicted' to such manuscripts and pledged his 'enformed love to my Cuntrey, to the language & laudable antiquities therof'.⁸⁴ This remarkable declaration makes the relationship between Welsh antiquarianism and identity explicit. Robert Davies III (1616-66) was sent a manuscript by a stranger, the executor of a will for a Flintshire gentleman who knew Davies's ancestor 'much esteemed & enquired after' the booke. He also had a lavish funeral which involved the herald Randle Holme.⁸⁵ Mutton Davies was described as 'brenin y llyfrau' or 'king of the books'.⁸⁶ Yet Robert Davies IV developed his interest to a much greater level. He built up a nationally significant collection of medieval Welsh manuscripts by borrowing, copying, buying and otherwise acquiring them. A 1778 catalogue of the Gwysaney libraries includes over 1700 printed books, 800 pamphlets and ninety-three manuscripts.⁸⁷ Davies married Leticia, daughter of Sir John Vaughan of Trawsgoed – himself known for having large collections of Welsh manuscripts. Letters to him frequently

⁸³ H.D. Emanuel, 'The Gwysaney Manuscripts', *NLWJ*, 7 (1952), p. 326.

⁸⁴ FRO, D/GW/2114D: David Lhuyd to Robert Davies, Lhuydiarth, 18 July 1628.

⁸⁵ Such funerals became less common as the Restoration went on, but were still normal practice amongst North-East Welsh greater gentry families. FRO, D/GW/2122: Peter Hughes to Robert Davies, Wing, 8 May 1665; NLW, MS 1603E: Transcripts of the Accounts of Anne Davies, p. 416.

⁸⁶ NLW, MS 17119A fos 14-16: Englynion i'r Pendefig Mutton Davies, 1684.

⁸⁷ NLW, Gwysaney 54: Catalogue of the books and manuscripts in Llanerch library, 1778.

contain asides relating to his collections.⁸⁸ He was a member of a circle of men interested in Welsh history and theology. Others in that circle included William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, and Humphrey Humphreys, Dean of Bangor. More widely, he was a frequent correspondent of Edward Lhuyd, Keeper of the Ashmolean, the Oxford antiquary Anthony Wood, and the theologian Henry Dodwell.⁸⁹ Davies allowed Lhuyd access to his own material but also commented on the usefulness of others' libraries and obtained access to them on Lhuyd's behalf. In return he was allowed to transcribe manuscripts from collections in Lhuyd's care.⁹⁰

The Gwysaney example is illustrative of Welsh interests and borrowing practices. The practice of borrowing, copying, returning and lending to favoured fellow enthusiasts was seemingly common, and is also referred to extensively in the letters of Thomas Mostyn, Humphrey Humphreys, and William Lloyd in the late 1670s and 1680s. These three men were also connected to Lhuyd and his circle. Lhuyd particularly complimented Humphreys' historical abilities, while others commented on his skills in the 'British language'. Mostyn's brother Richard continued the links with Lhuyd, corresponding about the Welsh language, antiquities, and manuscripts at Mostyn and in the wider region.⁹¹ Humphreys, Mostyn, and Lloyd all used pedigrees, charters, and monastic documents to investigate the history of the people and region in which they lived. They used kinship ties to locate, acquire, and copy manuscripts that would aid in their work. Humphreys borrowed 'Sr Thomas ap William's booke of pedigree' from Thomas Mostyn in October 1684 and in pursuit of his study of 'our British history' in 1686 begged 'the assistance of your MSS toward it & alsoe the lone

⁸⁸ For example, NLW, MS 1595E (unfoliated): Samuel Edgeley to Robert Davies, Acton, 18 May 1686; NLW, Gwysaney 60A: L. Davies to Robert Davies, n.p., 17 June 1700 (?).

⁸⁹ Bodl., MS Tanner 26 fo 39: Robert Davies to Anthony Wood, Llanerch, 9 Nov. 1691.

⁹⁰ Bodl., MS Ashmole 1814 fo 394: Robert Davies to Edward Lhuyd, n.p., 28 Oct. 1701; MS Ashmole 1814 fo 398: Robert Davies IV to Robert Davies V, Llanerch, 31 Mar. 1705.

⁹¹ 'Humphrey Humphreys (1648-1712)', in *DWB*, pp. 395-6; N. Lloyd, 'The Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn', *FHSP*, 25 (1971-2), pp. 41-54.

of your printed Galfridus Monumensensis & Gildas'. He borrowed the Bishop of St. Asaph's copy of Nennius, and 'Dr Davis's book of old Cowydd's' at the same time, and 'that chronology wch hath Llyfr Manach Gaerlleon writ on the back' in November 1685.

Humphreys showed an acute understanding of the role of different types of evidence in substantiating the claims of the manuscripts, writing to Mostyn that 'I beg such MS poems that are ancient for out of such I haue gathered somethings historicall & hope to find much more upon considering them more exactly at least something of the principles & humours of the age's wherein they were writ will be found'. Humphreys used Mostyn's intervention with the Catholic Mostyns of Talacre to enquire about the survival of 'indulgences granted to the votaryes of S^t Wenefrid' and although this search was unsuccessful he later updated Mostyn that he had found 'the decree which first made St Wenefred a saint & ordered her day to be obserued – it is soe late as to beare date Jan: 4. 1415'. Humphreys asked Mostyn's help in discovering a copy of 'Mr Owen Salesburys book' of pedigrees, Humphreys and Mostyn also exchanged information about Owain Gwynedd, Sir John Wynn's research, and the history of the diocese of Bangor. In return, Humphreys lent Mostyn his copy of 'Sir John Wynns booke', a copy of Lewis Dwnn's pedigrees that he himself had borrowed 'under such a charge', and 'the Pontifical of Bangor' that belonged to Bishop Anian in the thirteenth century. This manuscript, Humphreys wrote, 'is considerable because it is the onely one in the world & you see it is about 400 year old'.⁹² These examples demonstrate a particularly intense and successful

⁹² MH, MC vol. III, no. 58: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bodewryd, 10 Oct. 1684; vol. IV, no. 46: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 12 Jan. 1686; vol. III, no. 31: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 7 Dec. 1683; vol. III, no. 39: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, St. Asaph, 5 Mar. 1684; vol. III, no. 45: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p, n.d.; vol. III, no. 48: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.; vol. III, no. 56: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Kyffailgyfarch, 4 Aug. 1684; vol. III, no. 60: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 20 Nov. 1684; vol. IV, no. 40: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 18 Nov. 1685; vol. V, no. 7: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 21 Feb. 1687.

collaborative relationship, but many other North-East Welsh gentlemen either reported information about Welsh manuscripts to those they knew were interested, or sought access to them. Mostyn acquired manuscripts known to have previously been owned by the Thelwalls of Plas-y-Ward and the Wynns of Bodysgallen, and clearly borrowed manuscripts from others.⁹³ Mostyn and Humphreys' work indicates the continued importance and relevance of Welsh history and manuscript collections throughout the seventeenth century. It links the Welsh language intimately to this research, and to the historical conception of Wales. Pedigrees, lives of the princes, and traditions of the North-East Welsh region were central to that research.

Ancient Welsh history was used practically as well as for research and self-representation. In November 1647 the perennially indebted and financially embarrassed copyist John Jones of Gellilyfdy structured his protests about (at various times) royalist and Interregnum financial demands in the context of Welsh history. With reference to his own lineage dating back to 'Cyfynwall Moel Mud... being one of the owners of this land & supreme kinge of Bryttaen' Jones argued that the liberties and estates of Welsh gentlemen had been better protected by 'yor petitioners auncestors in 400 yeares warrs against the Romans, 600 yeares warrs against the Saxons, and 200 yeares warres against the Normans'. Jones was spectacularly unsuccessful in his attempts to secure his freedom through an argument that the crown or parliament was acting illegitimately and against the ancient rights and liberties of the Britons. His attempts to frame the protest thus are nonetheless interesting.⁹⁴ Jones argued that the new parliamentary assessments (as with royalist exactions during the First Civil War) were a breach of Welsh laws, and the rights of the Welsh gentlemen. Elsewhere

⁹³ Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p. 312.

⁹⁴ BL, Add MS 33374 ff24v-29: The Answer of John Jones gent to the Wrongfull Impositiones of money Imposed uppon hym or his lands by and of the Parlament Officers agaynst the lawe & Justice of this land of Wales.

in Jones's papers he claimed that Parliament had in 1651 instructed Rice Vaughan to investigate the ancient Welsh laws of Hywel Dda with a view to employing it 'for the Composinge of a lawe in English for the setlinge of an upright Government in this land'.⁹⁵ Another known antiquary, William Salesbury of Bachymbyd and Rug, used Welsh history and myth rhetorically in an attempt to gain the upper hand in an inheritance dispute with Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, in 1652. Salesbury argued that his actions were legal and just, because 'Constantine divided the empire between his sons. Brutus divided this island between his three sons. Cadwalader, the last king of the Brittaines, divided South Walls, North Walls, and Powis amongst his three sons'. This was too much for Goodman, who responded that 'In truth, at first I had thought you had mocked me... It should seeme that a man must read Antiquities, peruse the Roman histories, or at least consult with the Welsh Barrds, before he is fit to treat with you'.⁹⁶

Despite the Welsh fascination with the past, the Welsh historicised culture was not a fixed and inflexible culture of memory. More contemporary developments were woven into the web of pre-Roman and medieval cultural memories, particularly when the values demonstrated by those developments accorded closely with those that continued to be important from the past. The royalism and loyalty of the North-East Welsh gentry was one key strand of those more contemporary developments. The more positive values of the North-East Welsh royalists – loyalty to monarchy, devotion to the social order, military bravery and unity – coincided with the ancient values of the Welsh gentry and bardic order, and could easily be absorbed within the same tradition. In royalist poetry, letters, and histories, the famed Welsh loyalty to the Crown featured strongly, both during and long after the Restoration. Royalist families made reference to their loyalty when applying for

⁹⁵ BL, Add MS 33374 fos 50-1: John Jones to Sir Raph Maddison, Gellilyfdy, 28 Jan. 1651.

⁹⁶ Smith (ed.), *Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence*, pp. 177-8.

positions, in portraits, and on the tombstones of those family members who had suffered during the Civil War and Interregnum. A *marwnad* to Colonel Hugh Wynn of Bodysgallen spoke of his courageous service in the Civil War and the power of the Wynns to recruit men: 'He went to the war dear Colonel, brave and beloved by all, a thousand strong men of the Wynns, quickly came to his command'. It goes on to speak of his service alongside Sir Roger Mostyn in the siege of Chester, describing the besiegers as 'cruel men', and the starvation endured in a bid to exhaust 'the party of the Crown'.⁹⁷ Wynn died in 1674, and if this elegy is contemporary, it demonstrates the importance of the royalist experience in defining a Welsh royalist individual's biography and memory. The values in such elegies parallel (most probably consciously) those of Wynn's forefathers, including masculinity, honour, regional power, and bravery.

III: Welsh Self-Identification, Language, and Culture

This chapter has argued that the distinctions between behaviour in Wales and England lay in the historical differences in political, social and legal systems, as well as in the historicised culture of the principality. The main difference identified by historians and contemporaries, however, has been one of language. To an English observer, the Welsh language clearly separated those of one national group from their neighbours. The Welsh language has been dubbed the 'most potent palladium of nationhood'. The word *iaith*, now meaning only 'language', signified both 'nation' and 'language' in medieval times. As clear indicators of difference between England and Wales this has in some ways continued to be the case.⁹⁸ This concentration on language has, however, led to a deeply problematic set of assumptions about the Welsh gentry, their tenants and dependents, focusing on the

⁹⁷ MH, *Cwydyddau ac Awdlau i Hen Deulu Mostyn*, pp.31-4: 'Cywydd marwnad Huw Wynn o Fodysgallen Esq'.

⁹⁸ Roberts, 'Tudor Wales, national identity and the British inheritance', p. 13; P. Jenkins, *A History of Modern Wales 1536-1990* (Harlow, 1992), p. 59; L. Bowen, *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c.1603-1642*, (Cardiff, 2007), p. 7.

tendency of the gentry to write principally in English and to visit London, thus speaking English. This tendency has aided in the construction of an image of the Anglicised and alienated gentry which had much more basis in fact in the eighteenth century. Fuelled by a nonconformist desire to separate the heroic ordinary man (the *gwerin*) from their oppressive overlords, and to render nonconformist religion, which supported the Welsh language, as the 'true' religion, it distorted seventeenth-century studies for at least one hundred and fifty years. Some have described (at least in the later seventeenth century) a tendency for Welsh to retreat into the parlour – that rather than being a publicly useful language, it became part of an antiquarianised and cosy private identity rather than something practical or necessary to the gentry.⁹⁹

There are two principal difficulties with the Anglicisation hypothesis. First, a detailed examination of any North-East Welsh gentry collection would demonstrate that the family concerned was highly likely to have spoken or understood the Welsh language. Secondly, it was possible in the seventeenth century, as it is now, to identify as Welsh despite not having the language.¹⁰⁰ The objection that Welsh became the cosy antiquarianised hobby of the gentry also bears little weight amongst many prominent individuals and families. Their residence in Wales, dealings with tenants, and collection of Welsh manuscripts and poetry was surely evidence of the continued everyday usage of Welsh rather than a marginalisation of the language or culture. There were, however, other aspects of Welsh culture which could embody a Welsh identity alongside the language. Welsh music, poetry, and traditions continued to be a feature of social life in North-East Wales, amongst the greater gentry

⁹⁹ G.A. Williams, *When was Wales? A History of the Welsh* (1985), pp. 130-1.

¹⁰⁰ The idea that language is the sole determinant of national identity has been challenged most effectively by literary scholars, for example: R. Singer, 'Liberating Britain from Foreign Bondage: A Welsh revision of the Wars of the Roses in L.M. Spooner's *Gladys of Harlech; Or, The Sacrifice* (1858)' in P. Lindfield and C. Margrave (eds), *Rule Britannia? Britain and Britishness 1707-1901* (Newcastle, 2015); S. Prescott, "'If there be Helicon in Wales it is': Writing Wales in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth Century Poetry' in S. Mottram and S. Prescott (eds), *Writing Wales from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 130-47.

families as well as those of less exalted social position. Here it will be argued that Welsh gentlemen and women saw themselves Welsh, referring to their Welsh identity alongside others that they were able to utilise when convenient – Member of Parliament, clergyman, gentleman within the wider Stuart monarchy, for example. They chose to maintain bardic and musical traditions, perhaps associating these traditions with those territorial powers and authority that they maintained alongside them.

Philip Jenkins has described the inclination of Welshmen to identify themselves as such as ‘ethnic self-identification’, an apt label – in history and poetry the Welsh depicted themselves as a different ‘race’, separate yet living alongside the English. Prominent Welshmen self-identified as ‘mountainous Welshmen’, and those travelling in and out of Wales discussed their movements in relation to crossing the border into England or out of Wales.¹⁰¹ Those exiled from North-East Wales, either due to work or political affiliation, complained of missing their homeland and sought the company of fellow Welshmen. Jonathan Edwardes, Archdeacon of Derry, was one such Welshman. Writing to his nephew in 1679, he spoke of his ‘Native love to my own Countrey’ and bemoaned the fact that he had not ‘heard from any of my friends of Wales’.¹⁰² Others would entrust their letters only to their Welsh ‘Country men’ or kinsmen, socialising with them in a particular tavern in Dublin.¹⁰³ An officer at the siege of Chester referred to two soldiers lost in the storming of the city as ‘our Welshmen’, and a letter describing shortages caused by the siege talked of how ‘the Welsh...beg all their meat and are almost famished’.¹⁰⁴ Bishop William Lloyd made frequent references to Welshness – either to identify kin, to explain his ‘rules’ for appointing only Welsh-speaking or bilingual ministers and to describe the

¹⁰¹ Jenkins, *A History of Modern Wales 1536-1990*, p. 66.

¹⁰² NLW, MS 11449E fo. 6: Jonathan Edwardes to John Jones Junior, Newtown, Ireland, 28 Oct. 1679.

¹⁰³ WRO, CR2017/TP105/3: Roger Pyers to Pyers Pennant, Killilongford, Ireland, 5 July 1670;

CR2017/TP105/5: Roger Pyers to Pyers Pennant, Killilongford, Ireland, 16 Nov. 1672.

¹⁰⁴ R.N. Dore (ed.), *The Letter Books of Sir William Brereton*, (2 vols, Stroud, 1990), II, 104, 202.

behaviour of others towards his fellow Welshmen. Writing to Archbishop Sancroft and his chaplain Henry Maurice (a kinsman of Lloyd's) he worried about the career of a son of the late Bishop Robert Morgan of Bangor and his potential to be elected to All Souls at Oxford because 'the fellows as I am told have no kindness for our Country' and 'none is to come in there with a Welsh name'.¹⁰⁵ In the 1650s John Jones the regicide wished to meet a wife in 'my native Country'.¹⁰⁶ Jones came from Merionethshire, had lands in Denbighshire, Flintshire and Caernarvonshire and had kin in Monmouthshire. Prior to the First Civil War he had lived in Denbighshire. It is likely, therefore, that the 'country' he was referring to was Wales as a whole rather than any specific county.

Lloyd Bowen has described a 'discourse of Britishness', important to most Welshmen and women. He argues that Welsh identity – regional or national – was one of several identities open to the Welsh gentry in the seventeenth century. A Welsh gentleman could be patriotically Welsh without negating his role in the English state, and he could play an official role in that state while prioritising his region or county.¹⁰⁷ This argument certainly has strong support in North-East Wales, where gentlemen were able fluidly to shift between different roles and identities depending on the context in which they were operating at the time. Yet it can be argued that some identities were more important than others. Aside from a minority of cases in times of political crisis, North-East Welsh gentlemen prioritised more ancient roles, those of kin or territory, above those that served others – central government or the county unit. Those roles served the requirements of the

¹⁰⁵ Bodl., MS Tanner 36 fo. 22: Bishop William Lloyd to Archbishop Sancroft, n.p., 4 May 1681; MS Tanner 35 fo. 113: Bishop William Lloyd to Archbishop Sancroft, n.p., 25 Oct. 1682; MS Tanner 35 fo. 119: Bishop William Lloyd to Rev. Mr Maurice, n.p., 30 Oct. 1682.

¹⁰⁶ NLW, MS 11440D fo. 70: John Jones to Morgan Llwyd, Dublin, 23 Aug. 1652; MS 11440D fos 103-106: John Jones to Morgan Llwyd, Dublin, 1 Mar. 1653; MS 11440D fo. 121: John Jones to Lowri Gwynn, Dublin, 25 May 1653.

¹⁰⁷ L. Bowen, 'Fashioning communities: the county community in early modern Wales', in J. Eales and A. Hopper (eds), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hatfield, 2012), pp. 97-9.

uchelmyr, of service and commitment to an ordered society, and were part of the expected behaviour and role of the long-established gentry rulers. The broader Welsh identity was an overarching concept, a cultural and political framework in which the *uchelmyr* could locate themselves.

Despite the qualifications made in this chapter regarding language, it was still an important aspect of Welshness. The seventeenth century was a period of linguistic transition. Anglicisation, when it happened, was not uniform across Wales, or even within regions and families. To say, as Hechter does, that the gentry ‘went to great lengths to dissociate themselves from their rude and barbaric countrymen’ after the Reformation, or that ‘[b]y 1640, the Anglicization of the Welsh gentry had reached its final stages’ is clearly fundamentally incorrect.¹⁰⁸ Philip Jenkins has argued that Welsh actually continued to be used and well known at all levels of Welsh society long after the end of the seventeenth century.¹⁰⁹ In North-East Wales this argument receives strong support from correspondence and legal documents in particular. In 1676 John Dolben of Wrexham wrote to his mother that he had got revenge on an individual ‘with a parsell of Welsh Rimes which Rings his knell all over Carnarvon shire’ – presumably satirical verses against this anonymous enemy.¹¹⁰ Bishop William Lloyd of St. Asaph, who wrote regularly about the need for Welsh-speaking ministers, regretted that he would not be able to appoint a favoured candidate to a living in the diocese because there were ‘none in my gift which has not many souls that do not understand English.’ The need for bilingual ministers was also discussed by one of his predecessors, and was a reason why his immediate predecessor’s nephew was removed from his living.¹¹¹ Welsh Bibles, Prayer Books, homilies and

¹⁰⁸ Hechter, *Internal Colonisation*, pp. 110-11.

¹⁰⁹ Jenkins, ‘Seventeenth-century Wales: definition and identity’, p. 215.

¹¹⁰ CRO, DSS/1/2/2/4: John Dolben to Mrs Shakerley, Wrexham, 5 Sept. 1675.

¹¹¹ Bodl., MS Tanner 36 fo. 53: William Lloyd to Archbishop Sancroft, n.p., 21 June 1681.

sermons in the parish churches were in regular use and the gentry most certainly in the congregation.

The North-East Welsh gentry used their knowledge of their neighbours and tenants to their advantage. In order to raise the maximum number of volunteers for the county militia in December 1642, Commissioners of Array notified High Constables that ‘we desire everie Minister in each parish Church to publishe the whole cause aforesaid & Contents of this our warrant in the vulgar languadge givinge their best exhortations to their parishioners of their forward obedience hereunto.’¹¹² John Lloyd and Edward Lhuyd, when corresponding in the 1680s and 1690s, casually used Welsh when discussing natural history and ancient manuscripts. When wishing Lhuyd’s new fellows and Sir John Wynne good luck at Oxford in 1686, Lloyd wrote ruefully that, ‘I am sensible you & Sir Wynne condemn me for the Snowdon patterns, (ond nid rhyfedd dim, by gwyddid’r achos).’¹¹³ In 1693 Edward Lhuyd described the state of the Breton language to Richard Mostyn, noting how, ‘their Gentry and Merchants speak it in their towns; but more corruptly, than ours in N. Wales, and they seem to have been more discourage’d by Mounsieur’s jeering them than those of sense and Education are amongst us’.¹¹⁴ This is notable – in boasting of the purity with which the North Welsh gentry spoke the language and in its positive comparison of the support for the languages in both places. Although the letter is from one more disposed to be positive about the Welsh language (as a chronicler of Welsh habits and traditions) it is a useful indication of the state of the language even after the period 1640-88.

¹¹² E.g. NLW, MS 12205A: Welsh and English Sermons by John Piers, 1641-1707; FRO, P/14/1/21: Cilcain Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1657-1706; WRO, CR2017/TP646: Orders from the Sheriff and JPs of Flintshire to the High Constables of Consilt, 8 Dec. 1642.

¹¹³ Roughly translated as ‘it isn’t odd, if you know the cause’. Several of the letters are printed in B. Roberts, ‘Llythyr John Lloyd at Edward Lhuyd’, *NLWJ*, 17 (1971), pp. 99, 102-4, 107.

¹¹⁴ Printed in N. Lloyd, ‘The correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn’, p. 39.

Welsh culture cannot be solely identified with the language, as important as it may be. An examination of poetry, accounts and correspondence demonstrates that Welsh culture was far more diverse. It encompassed festive traditions, poetry, music, and art. It was capable of absorbing English fashions without being destroyed – portraiture, for example, may have removed some of the gloss from traditional Welsh bardic poetry as a form of representation, but it did much to continue the representation of family loyalties and alliances forged over generations. The sheer number and range of seventeenth-century royal portraits, for example, exemplify the loyalty of the North-West gentry in this period. These included miniatures to be worn covertly, but also large portraits of Charles I, Henrietta Maria, and Charles II. While this may seem like an expression of English fealty, the Welsh loyalty to the Crown was an expression of ancient Welsh ideals and loyalty to a kindred.¹¹⁵ Portraiture, furthermore, was linked to genealogy and heraldry, and was often undertaken by heralds such as Randle Holme, Deputy Herald and Chester resident. Portraits often included symbolic references to the family lineage of the sitter, and the possession of portraits of extended family members was one way of demonstrating allegiance.¹¹⁶ The Davieses of Gwysaney, for example, commissioned portraits of Sir Peter Mutton and Sir John Vaughan of Trawsgoed in the early seventeenth century, and continued to chart their alliances with pictures of Sir Gerard Eyton and Sir John Robinson. The number of portraits commissioned clearly outnumbers those still in existence, and a significant number of family letters discuss painters or ‘limners’, as well as portraits commissioned and sat for. They were valued for sentimental reasons and as expensive portable objects. Lady Sarah Wynn, for example, begged her husband ‘remember thy promises and thy picture, I pray doe not deny me it, but let me have it drawne’, intending it

¹¹⁵ Examples can still be seen at Mostyn Hall and Gwysaney, whilst others are in the possession of the Hanmer family.

¹¹⁶ R. Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, and Publics in Provincial England, 1540-1640* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 102, 110-13.

to remind her of him while he was away at parliament. Sir Thomas Hanmer moved his 'pictures' between residences in the mid-1650s, Sir Evan Lloyd tried desperately to regain 'pictures which cost him 50l' from Denbigh Castle following its surrender in 1646, and the Myddeltons commissioned pictures from a Mr. King of London in 1678.¹¹⁷

Much has been written about the decline in patronage of the bards, due to creeping Anglicisation and the rise of other trends such as portraiture. There does seem to have been a decline in the number of bards and, many have argued, in the number of houses that would receive and patronise them.¹¹⁸ An examination of the families of North-East Wales indicates that in this highly conservative region the number of patrons was still fairly high, although it is not clear whether the frequency of commissions declined. It is possible, however, that historians have credited the bards' complaints too greatly in the seventeenth century, and that the drastic decline in their fortunes was not until very late in the seventeenth century. The records of the Myddelton family of Chirk, including unusually full household and family accounts, do much to reveal the cultural preoccupations of North-East Welsh elite families. Sir Thomas Myddelton (1586-1666) continued to patronise Welsh poets, craftsmen, and musicians. So although the Myddeltons have been described by David Klausner as 'Welsh only by residence', and as evidence of the increasing Anglicisation of the cultural scene in Wales, their actions do not bear this out.¹¹⁹ Sir Thomas Myddelton patronised traditional Welsh musicians and poets as well as English dramatists and musicians. He commissioned (or at least paid for) *cynyddau* from Welsh

¹¹⁷ NLW, MS 9066E no 2235: Lady Sarah to Sir Richard Wynn, Gwydir, 4 June 1660; CRO, DSS 1/2/2/2: John Dolben to Lady Shakerley, Wrexham, 15 Feb. 1676; NLW, Bettisfield 1663: Sir Thomas Hanmer's Notebook, 1654-7; FRO, D/G/3275 no 85: Samuel Wood to Sir John Trevor, Chester, 17 Oct. 1646; NLW, Chirk E 3372: Thomas Lloyd to Thomas Edwards, London, 29 June 1678.

¹¹⁸ J.G. Jones, 'Scribes and Patrons in the Seventeenth Century', in P.H. Jones and E. Rees (eds), *A Nation and its Books: A History of the Book in Wales* (Aberystwyth, 1998), pp. 84-5.

¹¹⁹ D. Klausner, 'Family entertainments among the Salusburys of Llewenni and their circle, 1595-1641', *Welsh Music History*, 6 (2004), p. 139.

poets throughout his life, and this continued to a lesser degree after his grandson inherited the estate.¹²⁰ This patronage is also highly visible in other families, most notably the Mostyns of Mostyn, Davieses of Gwysaney and Wynns of Gwydir. Sir Thomas Mostyn, in particular, was a prodigious patron of bards, which the volumes of *cynyddau* dedicated to him will testify. Traditional cultural and religious practices were maintained at Chirk by the second baronet. Sir Thomas hosted a company of players in 1678, as well as attending traditional church festivals such as the wakes and *phygain*, a Welsh language service that takes place on Christmas Day as the sun rises.

The Chirk accounts suggest that household musicians, in particular harpists, were the norm in North-East Wales. Myddelton's accounts repeatedly note payments to musicians, for example 'to the Harp' during a 1653 visit to Maurice Wynne, 'to John Morgan the Harper' in June 1654, and 'to the musicke' during his daughter's wedding in 1654. In 1661 Thomas Pritchard noted a payment to 'the man that sang Welsh carols vi^d'. Such payments were particularly noted when Myddelton visited other prominent families, building a picture of musical entertainment in Wales and the Marches in this period. The Herberts of Chirbury, Wynnes of Gwydir, Myddeltons at Plas Cadwgan, and the Breretons of Burras all employed household musicians during the Interregnum and beyond. Sir Richard Wynn even kept a household harpist in his London residence.¹²¹ Edward Lloyd of Llanforda, for one, counted 'our natural & British Musicke' as the 'Heiroliphicke of our Country & Nation', begging for the loan of a harp from his cousin so that he could 'restore the house to its wealthy & pristine garbe'.¹²² Sally Harper has described a 'contrasting soundscape' in

¹²⁰ Sir Thomas Myddelton (2nd bart.) paid for a *cynydd* for Robert Myddelton in 1674, and a *marwnad* was composed upon the death of Lady Ann Herbert of Chirbury, his aunt, in 1670. W.M. Myddelton (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts (continued) A.D. 1666-1753* (Horncastle, 1931), p.107; NLW, Chirk A 6: Cywydd Marwnad yr Anrhyddus Arglwyddes, Ann: Gwraid Arglwydd Herbert o Lessin, yn Sir Drefaldwyn, Anno Domini 1670.

¹²¹ W.M. Myddelton (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts, A.D. 1605-1666* (St. Albans, 1908), pp. 44, 46, 47, 59, 60, 102; Myddelton, *Chirk Castle Accounts (continued)*, p. 49.

¹²² Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo 133: Edward Lloyd to Cosen Tom, n.p., n.d.

Wales, with genuine differences existing between Welsh and English musical traditions – despite the popularity of the harp in areas of both countries, the status and function of harpists differed enough for Jenkins’ ‘suggestive’ similarities to pale. Welsh harpists were often also bards. These bards performed panegyric poetry to simple musical accompaniment at feasts and weddings, or declaimed elegies after funerals. Welsh music existed hand-in-hand with genealogy, history, and tradition.¹²³

Welsh language and arts continued to be used and patronised by North-East Welsh gentlemen in the period 1640-88. Household bards and musicians, as well as their travelling colleagues, were patronised at most prominent gentry houses. There is little sign that the gentry became less proficient in Welsh in general, and their interest in their native ‘British’ princely roots, and the manuscripts that illuminated earlier life in the region do not substantiate the picture of an alienated foreign group, removed from the lives of their dependents. The North-East Welsh gentry self-identified as Welsh. Their pedigree and heritage was the determinant of one of their chief modes of identity, and this was to affect their religious, political, and intellectual outlook.

IV: Conclusion

Many North-East Welsh gentry families subscribed to customary ideals and concepts of kinship throughout the seventeenth century. Although the ways in which they expressed these ideals changed gradually during the period 1640-88, the ideals of the duty and responsibilities of kin, role of the *pencenedl*, reciprocal patronage networks, and adherence to the Crown and an hierarchical and ordered society, remained relevant. It would be naïve to

¹²³ Jenkins, *History of Modern Wales*, pp. 58-9; S. Harper, ‘“Songes of the doeings of their auncestors”: Aspects of Welsh and English Musical Traditions’, in R. Kennedy and S. Meecham-Jones (eds), *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 232, 236.

suggest that these ideals led to a society without dissent or faction. They did not – North-East Welsh society had political factions, a minority of religious dissent (after 1660), and was plagued by lawsuits. The desire for an ordered society and the practical implications of kinship did, however, lead to distinctive strategies to approach these problems. It led to a pervasive political royalism and religious conformity, and meant that after the Restoration, political and religious radicals were denounced and prosecuted with enthusiasm, as will be examined in chapter three.

The importance of lineage to this highly kin-focused society meant that the recording of the past was of paramount importance. This resulted in an obsession with genealogy, pedigrees, heraldry, and the exhibition of one's lineage in public. It rendered every occasion as one for the public representation of history – whether a funeral or marriage, feast or battle. One's arms could be displayed on a banner, in stained glass, on a set of silver spoons, or in a bookplate. As authority was rooted in the ancient power of the lineage, the public (and private) representation of it was vital. Other forms of historical writing and memorialisation derived from this. The late seventeenth century thirst for historical research was taken up with enthusiasm in North-East Wales, embodying the continuation of a tendency to chronicle, archive, and defend the ancient and illustrious past of the principality.

Welsh arts, culture, and language maintained their traditional hold on the North-East Welsh gentry. Although the bardic order declined throughout Wales, Welsh traditional poetry and music appears to have retained a reasonable level of support in the conservative North-East, and held its own until the late seventeenth century. An obsession with political news from London and abroad fitted into a 'collecting' culture, where knowledge was a currency that the regional patriarchs were expected to acquire first. It added to and

complemented, rather than detracted from, Welsh culture and news of a regional interest. The society of North-East Wales was not the backward or inward-looking desert described by the English wits, but a rich and complex combination of the past and present, a flexible and successful web.

Chapter 2: Religion in North-East Wales

This chapter will argue that the loyalty to the Church of England in North-East Wales, and the tendency of the gentry to provide limited protection for local Catholic worshippers, were both linked to the continuance of medieval kinship traditions and of the historicised nature of Welsh identity. The Church of England was portrayed by sixteenth-century Welsh humanists and translators as the Celtic Church, the original and pure institution polluted following Augustine's landing in 597. It was staffed by Welsh-speaking clergymen, often from local families, or from families with local connections. It allowed for the continuance of highly conservative traditional practices, and in return, those ritualistic or beautifying tendencies promoted by Archbishop William Laud in the years immediately before the Civil War were not unfamiliar or unwelcome to many Welsh worshippers. The personnel of the Church were sheltered throughout the Interregnum, and were returned to their posts as soon as possible following the Restoration. These patterns indicate a regional approach to religion that has generally only been remarked on in relation to Catholic populations in areas such as Lancashire, or in Puritan areas of the east and south-east of England. The consistent nature of the North-East Welsh allegiance to the Church is remarkable even in comparison to areas of England known for their religious conservatism. The comparative weakness of Puritanism, even during the Interregnum, was partly because of its perceived foreignness. Certain strands of Puritan worship also actively opposed fondly held traditions of Welsh religious life. After the Restoration, there was an added political and historical dimension to the mistrust of nonconformists which only increased the unpopularity of dissenting worship throughout the remainder of the seventeenth century. While Catholicism as an international political force was opposed, it was still the 'Old Faith', the *Hen Ffydd*, known and understood in Wales. In North-East

Wales, kin and local allegiance was significantly more important than religious faith, even at times of the greatest religious and political tension. This provides a partial explanation for the gentry's negative response to James II's pro-Catholic policies. When such policies began to threaten the Church, local government, and their territorial dominance it appeared that the King's actions were pushing the kingdom into a situation similar to that of 1641. While they wished that he would amend his policies, they were not prepared to collaborate in the downfall of everything they had fought so hard to protect.

This chapter will first explore ways in which the North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated their support for the Church of England, and posit reasons for the constancy of that support. It will consider written and material evidence of Welsh religious preferences, and demonstrate that there were some demonstrably Welsh tendencies within Church of England worship. The second section will examine relationships between the North-East Welsh Protestant gentry and their Catholic counterparts. It will develop arguments concerning the importance of kinship relations and regional ties in determining relations between adherents of the two faiths, and examine how the Protestant gentry of the region responded to national crises involving Catholics. Finally, the chapter will explore the more fractious interactions between the predominantly Prayer Book protestant gentry and the Puritans of North-East Wales. It will propose reasons why Puritans (and later nonconformists) were seen as a more urgent or dangerous threat locally than Catholics, and consider the importance of historical memory and Welsh identity within that.

I: The Welshness of the Church of England

The gentry of North-East Wales were steadfastly and consistently loyal to the Church of England throughout the period 1640 to 1688. This loyalty continued throughout the dark days of the Interregnum, when many traditional rites and rituals were banned alongside the

use of the Prayer Book. John Morrill and Judith Maltby have demonstrated that such loyalty existed in England too, although the impression given is of pockets of loyalist resistance rather than the persistent survival of a significant Anglican community.¹ When faced with a choice in the late seventeenth century of supporting James II or the Church, the North-East Welsh gentry (like many across England and Wales) chose the Church. It is important, therefore, to consider first why the Church of England and its personnel became the focus of such loyalty, and second how and why this was retained throughout the seventeenth century. This chapter will propose three main reasons. The Church was a key component of the ordered and hierarchical world of Welsh society, stemming from medieval concepts of gentility and order. The protection of it as an institution (particularly one with the monarch at the head) was the duty of the gentry. The Church was also part of Welsh history, operated in the Welsh language, and was, it was argued, a distinctly Welsh institution. As such, it needed to be maintained and treasured by the Welsh as a key aspect of their heritage – and defended against ‘foreign’ incursions or attempts to change its rituals and form. The familial relationships between many of the personnel of the Church and the gentry meant that the protection of the Church was part of the wider concept of kinship and allegiance. The Church buildings were the sites of displays of ancestral patrimony such as funeral monuments, and pew ownership as a denotation of status was guarded jealously. Finally, the North-East Welsh gentry had genuine religious as well as historical and political motives for defending the Church of England.

The Church and the Ordered Society

¹ J. Morrill, ‘The Church in England, 1642-9’, in *idem.* (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 90-1; J. Maltby, ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of “Anglicanism”, 1642-60’ in C. Durston and J. Maltby (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 159-60.

The Church of England played an important part in the ordered society described in chapter one. Alongside the Crown, the native community, and the law, it was one of the main social categories that John Gwynfor Jones, writing about the early modern period, describes as maintaining peace and security and establishing ‘the common good’.² In a similar way, the Church was a crucial institution in medieval Wales, although clearly the institution changed significantly following the beginning of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. It was vital to protect and support the Church, therefore, partly because it was part of an interlocking system which would be destabilised should any of the elements be missing. The Church and the ‘native community’ had been interwoven for hundreds of years, with certain kindred groups associated with particular churches.³ It is much more difficult to establish a distinctively Welsh element to this vision of the established Church’s place in an ordered society than it is to differentiate Welsh customs and society as a whole. The ideal ordered and balanced society was a common concept across early modern Europe. Despite this, the solidarity of North-East Welsh support for the Church of England was profound. The consistent references in Royalist poetry of the 1640s and 1650s to the profound impact of its destruction demonstrate that the Welsh saw the established Church as fundamental to the functioning of their society.

In petitioning in favour of episcopacy and the Prayer Book in 1642, sheltering the Church in the Interregnum, and prosecuting nonconformists post-Restoration, the North-East Welsh gentry saw themselves as protecting the stability of Welsh society as well as the Church as a religious institution. This helps to make sense of the North-East Welsh response to perceived and real threats to the Church of England. The March 1642 North

² J.G. Jones, *Concepts of Order and Gentility in Wales, 1546-1640* (Llandysul, 1992), p. 156.

³ R.R. Davies, ‘Kinsmen, neighbours and communities in Wales and the western British Isles, c.1100-c.1400’ in P. Stafford, J.L. Nelson and J. Martindale (eds), *Law, laity and solidarities: Essays in honour of Susan Reynolds* (Manchester, 2001), p. 176.

Welsh petition to parliament warned of the ‘scruples and jealousies’ likely to arise as a ‘dangerous consequence of innovation’. It argued that episcopacy was a ‘comfortable experience which we feele and which our Fathers have told us of the conveniency and moderation of this government together with the antiquacy of the same’. The County had agreed, the petitioners wrote, that this was the ‘unanimous and undivided request’ of them all, who ‘cannot without some trembling entertaine a thought of change’.⁴ The call to respect history, antiquity, and precedent was consistent throughout other Welsh appeals to King and parliament, and speaks once more to the centrality of history to the political and religious behaviour of the Welsh gentry.⁵ The fact that the organisers of such petitions used gentry and clergy contacts within the parish system to solicit signatures further emphasises the drawing together of the North-East Welsh community to protest against potential destabilising changes.⁶ Individual gentlemen in the early 1640s explicitly associated religion and divine right monarchy. In the summer of 1642 Sir Thomas Salusbury wrote to his sister to explain the motivations behind his journey to join the king in York. He argued that he could not ‘serve the Lord’ unless ‘I serue his anoynted allsoe’. Quoting first Solomon (‘Fear God & the King & meddle not with those that are given to change’) and then St. Peter (‘ffear God & honour the King’), he wrote of how disobeying anointed kings had brought constant warfare and destruction to the Low Countries and Germany. In Salusbury’s mind, even if the King, like Philip II, was a tyrant, opposing him with force could only lead to chaos.⁷ In this sense religious motivations could be as important in

⁴ *The humble petition of the Gentry, Clergy, and other Inhabitants, subscribed of the Counties of Flint, Denbigh, Mountgomery, Carnarvan, Anglesey, Merioneth, being the six Shires of Northwales, as was presented this present March the 15th 1641* (1642).

⁵ *To the honourable court the House of Commons now assembled in Parliament, the humble petition of many hundred thousands, inhabiting within the thirteen shires of Wales, Directed to the House the 12 of February, 1641* (1642); *The humble petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Free-holders, of the County of Flint, presented to his Majesty at York, the fourth of August, 1642* (1642).

⁶ NLW, Lleweni MS 194: Dr David Lloyd to Sir Thomas Salusbury, Ruthin, 21 July 1642.

⁷ NLW, MS 5390D fos 251-3: Sir Thomas Salusbury to Lady Ursula Lloyd, n.p., 27 June 1642.

explaining royalist support as parliamentarian. Fear of political chaos caused by an unbalanced polity was an important part of that explanation.

The events and policies of the Interregnum only further affirmed the need to protect the Church and its hierarchy in order to maintain a stable society. A 1647 poem by John Griffith of Bwclai, Anglesey, demonstrates that the downfall of the Church and its hierarchy was seen as an integral part of the political and religious chaos of the times. In a simulated dialogue, the poet asked ‘Will the Church return to its old ways?’ and ‘Will there be unity between Christians?’ The response came that the Church would not come to its ‘just state’, the Captain would not go back to being a cobbler, oppressive taxation would not end, old officeholders would not return, and the invasion of military foreigners would not cease:

Tra fo’r brenin mewn caeth garchar
Tra fo’r escobion llynn ar wascar
Tra fo o scum y byd a Welson.
Ni ddaw byth y byd a welson.⁸

Archibald Sparke, until 1656 the vicar of Northop, despaired of the religious changes of the 1650s. He signalled his defiance and his confusion as follows:

is it because the modellers and cantoners of Commonwealth and Church cannot endure to tread in beaten paths but will be Antipodes to all those whose feet stand streight? if so (untill I can see them walking on their own heads as they have alreadie troden upon the Heads of the people) I will proceed in my journey on the plains.⁹

The idea that the world had been turned upside down was a common royalist trope, expressed in ballads, pamphlets, and poetry across England and Wales.¹⁰ Yet the insistence

⁸ [W]hile the King is imprisoned/ while the bishops are dispersed/ whilst we see the scum of the earth/ The world we saw will not return?. With thanks to Dr Bethan Jenkins for her translation of this poem. BL, Add MS 14891: Collection of Welsh Englynion and Poetry.

⁹ NLW, MS 12463B: Notebook of Archibald Sparke, 1652-9.

¹⁰ See my forthcoming article for an exploration of one such royalist ballad. S.L. Ward, ‘Round-head Knaves’: The Ballad of Wrexham and the subversive political culture of Interregnum North-East Wales?.

that the world would not function again until everything was in its ‘proper’ place, including the old officeholders and the Church, was absolutely central to Welsh royalism. It can be seen before the First Civil War, and had its origins in much earlier ideals and concepts.

Following the Restoration the North-East Welsh gentry and the region’s Church of England clergy were quick to resume control. The Restoration was portrayed as a ‘great blessing and deliverance from slavery’ and a ‘miraculous resurrection from the grave’, for sufferers who had been ‘civilly dead’ – both gentlemen and clergy.¹¹ They sought to reconstruct the ideal balanced society as they saw it. Chapter three will examine the implications of this for political culture in North-East Wales. From 1660 onwards the gentry, in their official positions as justices of the peace and Deputy Lieutenants, attempted to ensure that 1641 would never come again. This meant enforcing the successive uniformity laws, prosecuting Protestant nonconformists, and attempting to prevent those involved in Interregnum politics from keeping their positions in national or regional government. The consequences for local nonconformists of these attempts to rebuild the society of 1640 are explored in the final section of this chapter. From 1685 the North-East Welsh gentry were forced to protect the Church and their ordered society from what would have been an unexpected angle in 1660 – from the King, James II, and his determined attempts to introduce toleration for Catholics. The purging of corporations and the Bench that resulted from an attempt to create a more amenable presence in local government threatened local power structures. James’s attempt to pack parliament was perceived as an attack on the country’s government and liberties, and alongside the implications for the established church, it was too much for even the loyalty of the North-

¹¹ NLW, MS 9066E no. 2236: Lady Grace Wynn to Richard Wynn, n.p., 4 June 1660; FRO, D/HE/483: John Roberts to Evan Edwards, Llanrhayader, 23 July 1661.

East Welsh gentry to support. Their reactions are examined in the second section of this chapter.

The Church of Wales?

A second reason for the continued loyalty of the North-East Welsh gentry to the Church of England was the concept of it as an institution with Welsh origins, where the Welsh language had a home. From the 1530s onwards, an idea emerged that there had been a pure and independent Church of England before the arrival of Augustine, a Church free from the shackles of Rome. From this emerged the concept of England as an ‘Elect Nation’.¹² This went hand in hand with the fiction described in chapter one, that the Tudor monarchs were connected in a direct lineage to the ancient British kings – making them the legitimate rulers of England and Wales. Both of these narratives also legitimised the argument of the Welsh humanists that the origins of the two most important institutions in England were in fact Welsh. According to William Salesbury and Bishop Richard Davies, the 1567 translators of the New Testament and Prayer Book, the ancient Britons were converted to the pure faith while the Saxons were inveigled by Augustine into accepting the impurities of Rome. When the Britons were defeated, via treachery, the Welsh Scriptures were lost – and with it the pure Celtic Church. The Reformation was, according to this interpretation, a recovery and a return to that Church.¹³ The Church of England, in effect, was the Celtic Church reborn. It is true that this seems like a somewhat tenuous argument with which to lure away believers from the ‘Old Faith’. It is an intellectual and

¹² L. Bowen, ‘The Battle of Britain: History and Reformation in Early Modern Wales’, in T. Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 136-7; F. Heal, ‘What Can King Lucius Do for You?’, *The Reformation and the Early British Church*, *EHR*, 120 (2005), pp. 596-7, 606; J. Nice, ‘“The Peculiar Place of God”: Early Modern Representations of England and France’, *EHR*, 121 (2006), pp. 1012-13; B.S. Robinson, ‘“Darke Speech”: Matthew Parker and the Reforming of History’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, pp. 1062-4, 1081.

¹³ P. Roberts, ‘Tudor Wales, National Identity and the British Inheritance’, in B. Bradshaw and P. Roberts (eds), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 20.

historical argument rather than one of theology or even self-interest. Yet alongside other considerations, it makes sense that it was accepted – at least amongst the educated gentry and bards, and in England as well as in Wales.¹⁴ The historicised culture of Wales, described in chapter one, made it more likely that this narrative would be accepted in Wales than elsewhere. The primacy of genealogy in Welsh culture, and the importance of historical narrative in supporting power structures within the region all contributed to circumstances in which Salesbury and Davies’s rhetoric was accepted. This was supported by a number of Welsh histories which made similar claims, for example Powel’s *Historiae of Cambria*.¹⁵

The link continued throughout the period. That this idea was still current in the seventeenth century can be seen in its usage in the 1642 pro-Church and Crown petitions presented by the gentry and clergy of North-East Wales. The petition of the six counties of North Wales referred to the ancient British origins of episcopacy. The petitioners wrote that:

It is, as we believe, that forme which came into this *Island* with the first plantation of Religion here, and God so blest this *Island*, that Religion came in early with the first dawning of the day very neare or in the time of the Apostles themselves, And in the succession of all after ages the same hath been constantly maintained amongst us, and that without any eminent interruption or gainesaying even till these our dayes.¹⁶

Similarly Humphrey Humphreys, Dean of Bangor from 1680 until 1689, focused his historical research on the medieval Welsh Church, and the ancient nature of the link between the princes of Gwynedd and the bishops.¹⁷

¹⁴ A. Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham, 2014), p. 191.

¹⁵ D. Powel, *Historie of Cambria, now called Wales* (1584).

¹⁶ BL, Harley MS 1980: Collection of Handwritten Welsh Tracts; *The humble petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Free-holders, of the County of Flint, presented to his Majesty at York, the fourth of August, 1642; The humble petition of the Gentry, Clergy, and other Inhabitants, subscribed of the Counties of Flint, Denbigh, Mountgomery, Carnarvan, Anglesey, Merioneth, being the six Shires of Northwales, as was presented this present March the 15th 1641.*

¹⁷ MH, MC vol. III no. 31: Humphrey Humphreys to Sir Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 7 Dec. 1683.

It is furthermore true that, as Peter Roberts argues, the reformed Church of England made an accommodation with the traditional culture of Wales – the language, ritual, and culture of the Church in Wales was attuned to Welsh traditions in a compromise with the past.¹⁸ It was particularly important that the Church allowed for worship in the Welsh language. Wales was ninety per cent monoglot Welsh-speaking in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Church of England gave the Welsh population the opportunity to worship in their own language, approved of and supported by the governors of the Church and ministered to by Welsh clergymen. There was a deliberate policy of appointing Welsh-speaking clergymen to Welsh parishes implemented from the 1560s onwards. Bishops Richard Davies in the 1560s, William Hughes in the 1580s, John Owen in the 1630s and 1640s, and William Lloyd in the 1680s all insisted that the Welsh language was a necessity for their clergymen. In 1630 John Owen ordered that the first sermon at morning service be delivered in Welsh, while William Lloyd administered Confirmation in Welsh, informing his Chancellor so ‘that none may be in care to think how to make their people understand me’.¹⁹ On one level this was an entirely practical policy relating to fulfilling the spiritual needs of monoglot parishioners, but it was also effective in creating a sense of a Welsh Church. Protestant doctrines were also promulgated in devotional literature in the Welsh language, such as *Yn y Llyfr Hwn* (1547), which contained versions of the Ten Commandments, Lord’s Prayer and Creed, and *Y Llyfr Pbygain*, the Book of Matins (1612).

The bishops of St. Asaph played a consistent role in the production of Welsh language materials – Bishops Richard Davies, William Morgan, George Griffith, John Owen and

¹⁸ Roberts, ‘Tudor Wales, National Identity and the British Inheritance’, p. 21.

¹⁹ J.G. Jones, ‘The Reformation Bishops of St. Asaph’, *JWEH*, 7 (1990), p. 34; D.R. Thomas, *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph*, pp. 273-4; A. Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd: Bishop, Politician, Author and Prophet, 1627-1717* (1952), pp. 55, 84.

William Lloyd all worked for the publication and distribution of orthodox spiritual books in Welsh. John Owen wrote a Welsh treatise on the Ten Commandments which he attempted to gain a license for in 1641, George Griffith played a significant role in the new Welsh Prayer Book of 1664, and in the 1680s and 1690s William Lloyd wrote, ordered, and distributed Welsh catechisms and other material with the help of the press at Oxford.²⁰ Philip Jenkins has argued that throughout the early modern period, the Church in Wales was ‘strongly national and even patriotic in character’, and this clearly resonates in relation to North-East Wales.²¹ Churchwardens’ accounts show that Welsh language Prayer Books were bought, used, and maintained. New editions were purchased after the Restoration, and their repair and re-binding demonstrates that they were frequently used.²² The Welsh were criticised by Puritan and parliamentary propagandists for their fondness for the litanies of the Prayer Book, and this is one fairly accurate element of the anti-Welsh stereotype. Lloyd Bowen has written of Welsh spirituality as ‘conservative in nature, a religion of the liturgy rather than of the puritan sermon’. The failure to develop a Puritan preaching or scriptural tradition is blamed by Bowen on the poverty of the Church and the limited ownership of Welsh Bibles, placing radical religion out of the reach of ordinary Welsh people. The stipends offered in Wales were not enough to attract the most highly qualified graduates, and the population not wealthy enough to pay for the parallel system of lecturers that existed in many English urban areas. Yet even in the Interregnum, when the Welsh had every chance to embrace Puritan teachings, the popularity of the Church of England and its Prayer Book held firm.²³ The Welsh adherence to the Prayer Book was

²⁰ BL, Add MS 4274 fo. 225: William Lloyd to John Fell, n.p., 29 Jan. 1684; G.M. Griffith, ‘Some Extra Diocesan Activities of Bishop George Griffith of St. Asaph’, *NLWJ*, 12 (1962), p. 300; G. Williams, ‘John Owen (*bap.* 1580, *d.* 1651)’, *ODNB*.

²¹ P. Jenkins, ‘The Anglican Church and the Unity of Britain: The Welsh Experience, 1560-1714’, in S.G. Ellis and S. Barber (eds), *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State 1485-1725* (1995), pp. 118-20, 124.

²² For example, FRO, P/14/1/21: Cilcain Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1657-1706; NLW, MS 1593E/iii: Caerwys Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1662-9; FRO, D/KK/115: Mold Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1654-1663.

²³ L. Bowen, *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c.1603-1642* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 210-12.

ascribed by mid-seventeenth-century Puritan critics to popish leanings. It may well have been the case that the Prayer Book appealed to conservatively religious Welsh people, seeing familiar elements of litany therein. The fact that the liturgy had been available in the Welsh language since the sixteenth century identified it with Welsh history and culture, and it became part of within Welsh perceptions of their own past and identity.

Chapter one discussed the importance and influence of kinship upon North-East Welsh gentry society. It can also be argued that kinship had a similarly important role to play in the adoption and popularity of the Church of England in the period 1640 to 1688. As within English society, the Church was seen as an honourable and worthy career, particularly for younger sons of gentry families. In Wales, these sons would frequently then be situated in parishes near to their kin. The requirement for Welsh-speaking clergy made this much more likely, and resulted in a situation where in the seventeenth century all of the greater gentry families of North-East Wales were related to at least one former or current bishop. Bishop John Owen, for example, was married into the Griffith and Wynn families, and ‘claimed to be connected by descent to every family of quality’.²⁴ Kin relationships to the lower clergy were even more common, embedding the Welsh Church within the community in a highly effective way. This had been the case since before the Reformation, and continued after it. Lists of clergymen from 1563 include familiar names, and subsequent lists that identify the clergymen of North-East Wales repeatedly demonstrate the longevity of this principle in the region.²⁵ Historians of both the Elizabethan and Restoration churches have argued that this was a deliberate policy

²⁴ It is interesting how many clergymen of Welsh clergy families who were born in England still retained the Welsh language and a detailed knowledge of their Welsh ancestry. G. Williams, ‘John Owen (*bap.* 1580, *d.* 1651)’, *ODNB*.

²⁵ M. Gray, ‘The Diocese of St. Asaph in 1563’, *JWRH* (1993), 14-33; D.R. Thomas, ‘A Discoverie of the Present State of the Byshoppricke of St. Asaphe’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (1884), 53-8; NLW, Chirk A 15: Incumbents of Denbighshire, c. 1637.

intended to establish the Church in the affections of local people, and it seems to have been highly successful. Ian Green, for example, argued that the new appointees in 1660 were obscure men, but that they were chosen because of ‘the close relationship which often existed between them and their new dioceses’.²⁶ John R. Guy believes that the Welsh bishops appointed in 1660 were ‘carefully and correctly chosen’, citing Hugh Lloyd of Llandaff as a good example of such a choice – a man who had served within his diocese for a considerable period of time, with experience as a schoolmaster and as a cathedral prebend before 1642. In his view, the ‘spearhead of the restoration of church life was to be the employment of indigenous clergy at all levels of the diocesan hierarchy’.²⁷

George Griffith, the Restoration appointee for St. Asaph, conforms to this pattern. He had held livings in the St. Asaph diocese since 1631 and had been chaplain to the former Bishop, John Owen. His rapid rise in the Church in the 1630s owed a lot to his kinsman Owen, who was Griffith’s brother William’s father-in-law. Griffith was related to many prominent families in the region, had apparently served as a schoolmaster in the 1650s, and consistently spoke out for the importance of providing Welsh language materials. Griffith advocated the appointment of clergymen who were at least bilingual, even beyond the Welsh border.²⁸ He was involved in the committee for the preparation of the new Welsh Prayer Book, and had additionally been outspoken against radical Puritans in the 1650s, taking part in a public debate with Vavasor Powell in 1652 and publishing tracts defending formal prayers and church government in 1653.²⁹ Many of the names of those ordained by

²⁶ Jones, ‘The Reformation Bishops of St. Asaph’, pp. 25-6; I.M. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978), p. 96.

²⁷ J.R. Guy, ‘The significance of Indigenous Clergy in the Welsh Church at the Restoration’, in S. Mews (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 16 (Oxford, 1982), pp. 336-7.

²⁸ NLW, Brogyntyn PEC/1/2/19: George Griffith to Col. William Owen, Westminster, 10 Dec. 1664.

²⁹ G. Griffith, *A Bold Challenge of an Itinerant Preacher* (1652); G. Griffith, *A Relation of a Disputation between Dr. Griffith and Mr. V. Powell* (1653); G. Griffith, *A Welsh Narrative Corrected and Taught to Speak True English and some Latine* (1653); D. Lloyd, *Memoires of the lives, actions, sufferings & deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent personages, that suffered by death, sequestration, decimation, or otherwise, for the Protestant religion, and the great principle*

Griffith in 1665 are familiar North Welsh names, some being the sons of clergymen in the diocese.³⁰ This is equally evident in lists of the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph throughout the period, as well as in lists of ordained clergymen.³¹ William Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph from 1680 to 1699, was another appointee with well-established Welsh connections, an interest in the Welsh language, and a concern for appointing Welsh speakers. Throughout the hierarchy and the majority of the period, therefore, there was an effort to provide indigenous clergy with Welsh language capabilities, in order to provide for the spiritual needs of the parishioners. It fostered an identification of the Church with the local community.

Worship and visual culture in North-East Wales

Finally, there were genuine religious preferences being expressed in the popularity of the Church of England in North-East Wales. The continued use of the Prayer Book was a contemporary choice as well as a reflection of the historical Welsh fondness for ritualistic worship. This can be seen in the continued adherence to Prayer Book worship during the Interregnum, and the efforts to protect the Prayer Book after the Restoration. The Book of Common Prayer was purchased by many parishes in both the English and Welsh language, and was mended or replaced when necessary. Surviving parish records demonstrate that new editions were bought as soon as they were available – especially the new English Prayer Book in 1662 and the Welsh translation in 1664. Further copies were bought as necessary throughout the later seventeenth century, and individuals also sought out

thereof, allegiance to their sovereign, in our late intestine wars, from the year 1637, to the year 1660. and from thence continued to 1666 (1677), p. 560; J.G. Jones, 'George Griffith (1601–1666/7)', ODNB.

³⁰ LPL, MS 943: Papers of William Laud.

³¹ NLW, SA/CR/1: Chapter Act Book of St. Asaph, 1666-81; SA/CR/2: Chapter Act Book of St. Asaph, 1681-1754; SA/MISC/802: Answers of Bishop George Griffith to the questionnaire from Archbishop Sheldon, 1666; SA/MISC/507: Ordination list of Bishop William Lloyd, 21 Dec. 1685; SA/MISC/515: List of Curates in the Rural Deanery of Tegeingl, 1683.

particular editions for their own use.³² Cilcain, for example, purchased their ‘new Wilsh Common prayer booke’ in 1664, and in that year listed two Welsh Bibles, one ‘Weilsh Testament’, two Welsh Prayer Books, one English Prayer Book, and a book of homilies in Welsh amongst the possessions of the church.³³ It seems to have been common for gentry families to own one or more copies of the Book of Common Prayer, sometimes using it to note important events or dates, such as the birth and baptism of children. Every new edition of the Prayer Book was purchased, in varying sizes and imprints.

Following the First Civil War, the Prayer Book was seen as a sign of political allegiance as well as religious adherence. Even the noting of childrens’ baptisms with godparents by the Mostyns in the 1650s within the Book of Common Prayer is a political statement, allying the continuance of this ceremony, banned in 1645 alongside the outlawed Prayer Book. That those godparents were also prominent local royalists only underlines this argument. Remaining parish records or clergymen’s notebooks demonstrate this was not rare or confined to the gentry, although from those surviving records it seems that such baptisms often took place in the private chapels of the gentry.³⁴ Private worship appears to have been common, and the possibility of attending a traditional service demonstrated by the actions of those living just outside Wales, like the fervent royalist Edward Lloyd of Llanforda, who slipped between Wales and England in order to escape prosecution and worship in his favoured manner.³⁵ Prosecutions for not using the Prayer Book resumed in Flintshire even before the King’s return, with six clergymen prosecuted at the Great Sessions in April 1660.³⁶

³² FRO, P/14/1/21: Cilcain Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1657-1706.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ D.R. Thomas (ed.), *Y Cwita Cyfarnydd: The Chronicle Written by the Famous Clarke, Peter Roberts, Notary Public, for the Years 1607-46* (1883), pp. 233-6.

³⁵ Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 119: Edward Lloyd to Robert Ellis, Acton, 21 Apr. 1648; *Ibid.*, fo. 116: Edward Lloyd to Frances Lloyd, n.p., n.d.

³⁶ NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fos 226v-227.

The national church's Elizabethan compromise with Welsh traditions also encompassed ritual, ceremony, and visual culture. Although there were complaints from central government and successive bishops of St. Asaph about the superstitious nature of the North-East Welsh people, there was room for continuance in religious culture from the old faith to the new.³⁷ Madeleine Gray has written of the remarkable survival of medieval visual and material culture in Welsh churches. Visual imagery, including the use of symbols such as crucifixes, survived frequently beyond the seventeenth century. Late medieval stained glass remains in some North-East Welsh parish churches today, including the Seven Sacrament window at Llandyrnog, the Jesse window at Llanrhaeadr-yng-Nghinmeirch, and the east window at Gresford depicting the mystery of the Incarnation. Accounts also tell of a window at Llanasa that depicted the Passion, with the Virgin Mary and a bishop placed alongside images associated with the Passion such as the cock. Wall paintings provide evidence of the popular veneration of saints, and rood screens survived in many churches. Parish churchyards still contained carved village crosses and other pre-Reformation features. At Betws Gwerfil Coch a set of late fourteenth century carved altar panels depicting the Crucifixion, the Virgin Mary, and St. John the Baptist still survive.³⁸ Sir Thomas Myddelton was said to have a crucifix in his private chapel at Chirk Castle, Sir Richard Wynn requested that Edward Petre find him a stained glass image of a 'crosse' for his chapel at Gwydir in 1674, and in 1647 William Salesbury of Bachymbyd and Rug

³⁷ There were also accounts from ordinary visitors to Holywell, for example Justinian Paget in 1630. BL, Cotton MS Vitellius C I: Account of Protestants visiting Holywell, 1579; LPL, MS 943: Correspondence and Papers of William Laud; BL, Lansdowne MS 111/4L: The state of North Wales touching religion; BL, Harley MS 1026: Memorandum Book of Justinian Paget.

³⁸ Martin Crampin has recently published a detailed account of stained glass in Wales. M. Crampin, *Stained Glass from Welsh Churches* (Talybont, 2014); M. Gray, "The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time": The Reformation Church in Wales' in T.Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 43-5; D.G. Thomas, *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph*, pp. 293-4, 308, 395, 405.

decorated his own chapel with angels, vine leaves, and intricate carvings in Welsh and English.³⁹

This tendency towards the glorification of God through visual imagery provides further support for Bowen's argument that Laudian policies on the renovation and beautification of churches, the removal of the altar to the east end of the church, and the installation of altar rails were received 'without significant resistance or comment' in Wales. There is evidence of the repair and renovation of churches throughout North-East Wales in the 1630s, as well as of the moving of altars.⁴⁰ New donations of church plate were received by North-East Welsh parish churches in the 1630s, and there is evidence from several churches of the installation of altar rails. Out of the forty-nine surviving seventeenth-century communion cups in the St. Asaph diocese, sixteen were donated during the period of the Laudian ascendancy - more than was donated in any other single period.⁴¹ This provides some useful context for North-East Welsh correspondence favouring Laud and Strafford, as well as for the concern shown in such letters about the destruction of visual imagery in London in 1641.⁴²

Perhaps given Bishop John Owen's Visitation Articles of 1637 and 1642, these alterations and donations should not be surprising. They were uncompromisingly Laudian, including articles on the possession of a communion cup of gold or silver, a 'comely surplesse with large sleeves, a faire covering of silke or other decent stuffe for the communion table, a fair

³⁹ W.H. Myddelton (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts, A.D. 1605-1666* (St. Albans, 1908), p. x; NLW, MS 9069E no. 2701: Edward Petre to Sir Richard Wynn, n.p., 3 Oct. 1674.

⁴⁰ Although as Bowen states, most of the altars were moved only after the metropolitan visitation of 1636. Bowen, *Politics of the Principality*, pp. 9, 215-19, 224, 233-4.

⁴¹ M.H. Ridgway, *Church Plate of St. Asaph Diocese* (Denbigh, 1997), pp. 284-5.

⁴² NLW, MS 9063E no. 1692: John Mostyn to Sir Owen Wynn, Cilcain, 5 Oct. 1641; MS 9063E no. 1681: Maurice Wynn to Owen Wynn, n.p., 30 Mar. 1641; Lleweni MS 172: Simon Thelwall to Sir Thomas Salusbury, n.p., 2 Dec. 1640; Lleweni MS 175: Sir Thomas Myddelton to Sir Thomas Salusbury, n.p., 23 Jan. 1641; Lleweni MS 176: James Lloyd to Lady Salusbury, n.p., 9 Mar. 1641.

linnen cloth to be laid over it at the administration of the communion'. Churchwardens were also questioned on the provision of a pulpit, the railing in of the altar, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and unlicensed preachers.⁴³ Owen was a former chaplain of Charles I and clearly attempted to ensure that the Laudian reforms were being carried out. Owen may not have taken court proceedings in order to implement the re-positioning and railing in of the altar, but from the surviving records it is plausible that he did not need to in many cases.⁴⁴ The extensive remodelling of both cathedral and parish churches within the Chester diocese provided further impetus or encouragement for the changes, especially given the overlap within Flintshire of both dioceses.⁴⁵ Another plausible suggestion is that Laudianism received popular lay support from church papists, particularly in parts of England where Protestantism had initially struggled to gain momentum.⁴⁶ As will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, there were significant numbers of Catholics and church papists within the St. Asaph diocese. The extreme traditionalism of the region in matters of ritual and visual symbolism widens the applicability of that suggestion, creating a broader constituency to whom the Laudian reforms would naturally appeal.

Further evidence of a traditional fondness for the visual and musical aspects of worship emerges in accounts dating from the First Civil War and Interregnum. Descriptions of iconoclasm in North-East Welsh parish churches make it clear that North-East Welsh parishes did not obey the orders of the House of Commons of September 1641 relating to

⁴³ K. Fincham (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (2 vols, Woodbridge, 1998), I, 172-82.

⁴⁴ J. Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism* (Oxford, 1992), p. 218.

⁴⁵ K. Fincham and N. Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 233, 238-9, 243, 247.

⁴⁶ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, p. 272; A. Walsham, 'The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and "Parish Anglicans" in Early Stuart England', *JEH*, 49 (1998), pp. 620-51; M. Questier, 'Conformity, Catholicism and the Law' in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English church, c.1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 257-8; R. Cust, 'Catholicism, Antiquarianism, and Gentry Honour: The Writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midlands History*, 23 (1998), 45; C. Haigh, 'The Church of England, the Catholics, and the People', in *idem.* (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke, 1984), pp. 214-19.

the moving of communion tables, removal of rails and imagery, and levelling of chancels.⁴⁷ This can be substantiated by the testimony of Captain Byrch, a royalist officer writing to the Marquis of Ormonde's secretary in December 1643. He wrote of the withdrawal of 'religious Ministers that loved Conscience and the King' into the local royalist-held castles, and the initial plunder only of surplices from Holywell parish church. In a detailed account, Byrch described the situation in Hawarden church:

In windows where there was oriental glass they broke in pieces only the faces; as to be frugal as they could; they left sometimes the whole bodies of painted Bishops, though in their rochets. But if there was anything in the language of the beast, though it was but an *hoc fecit*, or at worst *orate*, &c.... which had stood for many years, and might many more without idolatry, that was dashed out. They had pulled down the rails about the table... and brought down the table into the midst of the Church. Some of our soldiers came and swore it stood not right... and set it close to the *East* wall again.

The same soldiers 'did the like villany' as well as destroying 'one of the best pair of organs in the King's dominions' in Wrexham.⁴⁸ The iconoclasm described in these narratives was viewed with horror. In 1643 the herald Randle Holme, based in Chester but with extensive links to Flintshire and Denbighshire families, recorded horror at the damage done to the churches of Wrexham, Holywell and Flint, where they 'did puldowne the organes defaced the windowes in all the Churches and the Monuments of divers pulled down the Armes & hachments in all churches'. Further plunder was recorded by the St. Asaph chronicler Peter Roberts in April 1645, and the post-Restoration replacement of stone fonts surely indicates that there was a movement in the Interregnum to remove or destroy them.⁴⁹ Iconoclasm was prosecuted after the Restoration where possible. Andrew Milles of St. Asaph, for example, was prosecuted very shortly after the Restoration in 1660 for 'remoueing one of the Seates of the Cathedrall Church of St. Asaph into the Lower end of the Church and

⁴⁷ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, p. 276.

⁴⁸ T. Carte (ed.), *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, Concerning the Affairs of England, from the year 1641 to 1660: Found among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers* (2 vols, 1739), I, 29-34.

⁴⁹ A.R.J.S. Adolph, 'Randle Holme (1570/71–1655)', *ODNB*; BL, Harley MS 2125: Collections of Randle Holme; Thomas (ed.), *Y Cwitta Cyfarwydd*, p. 216; BL, Add MS 33373: Chronicle.

Conuerting it into a Calues Stye. And for keepinge his horses Kyne and Sheepe in the same Church'.⁵⁰

Significant repairs to church buildings and fixtures were undertaken in many North-East Welsh parishes following the Restoration. Stained glass windows that had been hidden were replaced, for example the Jesse window at Llandrhaeadr and that of the crucified Christ and the saints at Llanfair Dyffryn Clwyd. Communion cloths and napkins were bought in Caerwys and Cilcain.⁵¹ The churchyard cross was repaired in Worthenbury in 1661, and the font replaced, not without controversy.⁵² It was as early as 1665 in Cilcain when the altar rails were recovered from the two gentlemen who had purchased them in 1658. Charges were paid for 'settinge up the railes about the alter paintinge them & making two new' and 'To the smith for iron barres to sett up ye raile doores'.⁵³ The 'Railes about the Communion table' were re-installed even earlier in Mold, in 1663.⁵⁴ The repair of altar rails in Derwen and Bryneglwys in the 1670s strongly implies they had been in place for some time.⁵⁵ Although, as Fincham and Tyacke have observed, altar rails did not necessarily mean that the rails contained a 'table placed altarwise at the top of the chancel', it is interesting that the rails were replaced at such an early point in the Restoration. Only ten out of 114 parishes in London had re-erected rails in the early 1660s, yet at least four parishes in North-East Wales had done so by 1665.⁵⁶ The purchase and wearing of

⁵⁰ NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fo. 227.

⁵¹ NLW, MS 1593E/iii: Caerwys Churchwardens' Accounts, 1662-9; FRO, P/14/12/1: Cilcain Churchwardens' Accounts, 1657-1706.

⁵² M.H. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A. of Broad Oak, Flintshire, A.D. 1631-1696* (1882), pp. 79, 81.

⁵³ The term 'altar' was used in all four sets of Churchwardens' accounts sampled here. FRO, P/14/1/21: Cilcain Churchwardens' Accounts, 1657-1706; FRO, D/KK/115: Mold Churchwardens' Accounts, 1654-1663; DRO, PD/11/1/12, Bryneglwys Churchwardens' Accounts 1660-80; DRO, PD/25/2/1: Derwen Churchwardens' Accounts, 1660-1814.

⁵⁴ FRO, D/KK/115: Mold Churchwardens' Accounts, 1654-1663.

⁵⁵ DRO, PD/11/1/12: Bryneglwys Churchwardens' Accounts, 1660-80; PD/25/2/1: Derwen Churchwardens' Accounts, 1660-1814.

⁵⁶ The surviving data is extremely minimal. There are only seven sets of extant churchwardens' accounts for Flintshire and Denbighshire parishes covering the 1660s. Out of the five sets consulted to date, four indicate

surplices began immediately after the Restoration in all parishes considered here. The parish churches were re-beautified, and their ceremonial features re-installed. The early stage at which this was implemented demonstrates the importance of those features to the parishioners, and the support of the gentry was significant in achieving it. Traditional Welsh services, such as *phygain*, the service on Christmas Day which takes place as the sun rises, were reinstated, for example at Worthenbury during Christmas 1661.⁵⁷

The North-East Welsh gentry, therefore, supported a highly conservative and traditional form of Anglicanism, in the liturgy, ritual, and fabric of the Church. They demonstrated loyalty to the Church throughout the period, prioritising it even at times of significant political crisis. They saw it as a pillar of their authority, and an institution of stability. Its personnel were strongly connected to the gentry families of the region, and so the protection of the Church of England was a kinship issue as well as a religious one. The gentry show no evidence of being involved in pre-Reformation rituals such as dressing the church, but did nothing to stop them either. They were actively involved in the renovation of churches after the Restoration. This suggests that for most of them local traditions, even if ‘popish’ in appearance, were not perceived as a threat to the Church or to themselves as patrons.

II. Catholicism and the North-East Welsh Gentry

Given the obsessive interest of the North-East Welsh gentry in domestic and international news, and the geographical proximity of the region to Ireland, their attitude towards Catholics was fairly relaxed. Geraint Jenkins claims that there was an ‘irrational, almost

the early presence of altar rails. All five refer at some point to the communion table as an ‘altar’. Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, p. 317.

⁵⁷ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 102.

pathological, fear of Catholics in Wales' but this is difficult to find in the North-East.⁵⁸ In fact, outside of periods of national crisis the attitude of the North-East Welsh gentry to Catholic worship in the region was remarkably flexible. Even after events such as the Irish Rebellion in 1641, or the revelation of the Popish Plot in 1678 the Protestant gentry of North-East Wales remained comparatively measured in their response. This chapter will propose several reasons for this. First, Catholics were part of the pattern of sociability and neighbourliness in the region. This has been observed in many English counties before the Civil War outside times of political crisis, but in North-East Wales it continued throughout the period 1640 to 1688.⁵⁹ Once again, kinship is of paramount importance. In Flintshire and Denbighshire Catholics of gentry status remained part of a community of honour and lineage. Their history and ancient respectability as members of Welsh gentry families overrode any potential threat they might pose. The extent to which this remained the case sets the region apart from English counties. Second, Catholicism was not generally perceived as a serious political threat. Mark Goldie has observed of Tories in 1680 that they did not believe Catholicism posed a fundamental threat in so Protestant a nation.⁶⁰ In North-East Wales the 'old faith' was respected for its ancientness, and even during the Long Parliament it was not seen as posing a threat to the Church or the local political authorities. In a highly conservative area, there was also the additional complication that ordinary religious worship was already highly ceremonial, ritualistic, and included elements of pre-Reformation practice. From 1660 the Catholic threat was perceived to be in stark contrast to the danger posed by Protestant nonconformists. Catholic recusants were presented and fined, but central government always suspected strongly that they were not

⁵⁸ G.H. Jenkins, *The Foundations of Modern Wales 1642-1780* (Oxford, 1993), p. 188.

⁵⁹ A. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (1975), p. 101; R. Clark, 'Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire 1603-1730' (Univ. of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1979), pp. 74-75, 101-2; J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973), p. 58; C. Holmes, *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980), p. 40.

⁶⁰ M. Goldie, 'Politics and Religion in the Era of the *Entring Book*' in M. Goldie, (ed.), *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice. I. Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 4.

sought out with the requisite energy or enthusiasm. Correspondence bears this out, and reveals that in times of danger the local Protestant gentry worked to protect their Catholic kinsmen from the unwanted attentions of the state. Perhaps the most significant factor that affected the attitudes of individual gentlemen to local Catholics was their family connections. This could mean, for example, that gentlemen whose attitudes to national religious matters appear uncompromisingly anti-popish and pro-Church felt able to offer advice and guidance to those under risk of prosecution for involvement in the Popish Plot in the early 1680s. The only politico-religious crisis that had serious consequences within North-East Wales was James II's attempts to implement religious toleration for Catholics and Protestant dissenters. While operating a *de facto* toleration of Catholics themselves, the Protestant gentry resisted James's attempts to diminish the authority of the Church of England, alongside the attendant consequence of their removal from local power.

The Catholic population, kinship, and sociability

North-East Wales, and particularly Flintshire, had a reasonably high concentration of Catholics. Out of the 1,122 Catholics said to be in Wales in 1676, 275 (just over twenty-five per cent) were in the St. Asaph diocese. As Philip Jenkins contends, these figures should almost certainly be taken as an absolute minimum. Madeleine Gray and Thomas Kennedy have argued that recusants were under-reported in North Wales, and a detailed examination of seventeenth-century recusancy records would no doubt bear this out.⁶¹ In one Great Sessions return from 1654 sixty-one Catholic recusants were presented from only seven parishes, and in 1657 twenty of the seventy-one recusants presented were from one parish, Bettisfield in Flintshire.⁶² The recusancy records and censuses that act as the

⁶¹ P. Jenkins, 'Anti-Popery on the Welsh Marches in the Seventeenth Century', *HJ*, 23 (1980), p. 276; T. Kennedy, 'Roman Catholic Recusancy in Denbighshire', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society*, 42 (1993), 34; M. Gray, 'The Diocese of Bangor in the late sixteenth century', *JWEH*, 5 (1988), p. 38.

⁶² NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fos 138v-139v.

principal source for identifying Catholics are doubtful even in the proportion of nonconformists they present. The St. Asaph *Notitiae* of 1681 identified 164 Catholics (and four families for which numbers were not given) but only eight Protestant nonconformists and one uncounted family. Both of these figures are problematic, and most likely represent an underestimation of the Catholic population, but the proportions of Catholics to Protestant nonconformists in the *Notitiae* are much more in keeping with individual presentations at the Quarter Sessions than those in the Compton Census. They also conform to the pattern identified in Monmouthshire and many English counties of clustering in particular parishes, for example Holywell and Wrexham.⁶³ As has been commonly identified in English counties, these clusters formed around recusant gentry families, for example the Mostyns and Petres of Greenfield and the Morgans of Bettisfield.⁶⁴ It is important to recognise that categories like ‘recusant’, ‘church papist’ and ‘conformist’ were all extremely fluid, as was confessional identity in this period.

Individuals could conform, convert to Catholicism, or move between the two depending on, for example, their own circumstances and national events.⁶⁵ The Jesuits based at Greenfield claimed conversions in North-East Wales throughout the seventeenth century, including thirty-five in 1672 and fifty-two in 1673.⁶⁶ Owen Salesbury, a son of the staunchly Anglican family of Bachymbyd and Rûg, converted to Catholicism in 1685,

⁶³ Not every parish provided a count of recusants or Protestant nonconformists for the *Notitiae*, for example. NLW, SA/MISC/1492: 1912 Addendum to the *Notitiae* of St. Asaph, 1681-7; A. Whiteman (ed.), with the assistance of M. Clapinson, *The Compton Census of 1676: A Critical Edition* (Oxford, 1986), p. 491; P. Jenkins, ‘Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches’, p. 277.

⁶⁴ A. Hughes, *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 63; G. Baker, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman* (Manchester, 2010); J. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974), p. 18; Bossy, *English Catholic Community*, pp. 168-9, 175-7; J. Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 13-14; W. Sheils, ‘“Getting on” and “getting along” in parish and town: Catholics and their neighbours in England’ in B. Kaplan *et al* (eds), *Catholic Communities in Protestant states: Britain and the Netherlands c.1570-1720* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 69-72; Holmes, *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire*, p. 41.

⁶⁵ Partly, at least, because conformity and recusancy were so ill-defined. A. Walsham, *Church Papists* (1991), pp. 73-6; Questier, ‘Conformity, Catholicism and the Law’, pp. 240-1; Baker, *Reading and Politics*, p. 5.

⁶⁶ It appears from Jesuit records that many of these were visitors to the Well rather than local people. H. Foley (ed.), *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (7 vols, 1875-83), IV, 527, 536.

allegedly 'seduced' by his Catholic uncle Gabriel. His conversion was described as 'the suprizing & afflicting news of your desertion of the Church & Religion wherein you were batiz'd & bred' by his kinsman Thomas Mostyn.⁶⁷ Some of the apparently conformist gentry who acted as JPs or Deputy Lieutenants, for example Sir Thomas Hanmer, left behind strong evidence that they were, in fact, church papists.

It is significant that the vast majority of the Protestant gentry who occupied positions of power and authority in the region counted Catholic recusants amongst their extended family. Out of the identifiable Justices of the Peace on the Flintshire Bench in 1640 all were connected to Catholic families, and only two of the twenty identifiable resident JPs in 1660 did not have local Catholic links. The evidence for Deputy Lieutenants is also extremely striking. All of the Flintshire Deputy Lieutenants for 1661 were connected to Catholic families.⁶⁸ All of the greater gentry families in Flintshire – the Mostyns, Hanmers, Conways and Pennants – had a Catholic cadet branch, and most of the others had at least one identifiable Catholic relative. As might be expected from a community in which the clergy were connected so intimately with the gentry of the region, this applied to them as well – even the Bishop George Griffith of St. Asaph had a Jesuit cousin.⁶⁹ Even in comparison to counties such as Lancashire, Derbyshire, and Cheshire, where there were also sizeable Catholic populations, the interconnectedness with the ruling gentry was remarkable. In Derbyshire, for example, twenty-five per cent of JPs had close connections

⁶⁷ While traditionally Catholic families were not apparently viewed negatively, conversions were, and Salesbury was interrogated both by Bishop William Lloyd and his own extended family in an attempt to bring him back to the Church of England. Bangor, MS 9069E no. 27: Robert Hookes to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 11 Apr. 1685; MS 9069E no. 28: William Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, London, 14 Apr. 1685; MS 9069E no. 32: Owen Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, Rug, 25 May 1685, with Mostyn's reply appended.

⁶⁸ There are three JPs in 1640, and two in 1660, whose family identities are not traceable as their names are extremely common. J.R.S. Phillips, *The Justices of the Peace in Wales and Monmouthshire, 1541 to 1689* (Cardiff, 1975), pp. 109, 114; TNA, SP 29/42 fo.136 List by Rich. Earl of Carbery, Lord Lieutenant of North Wales, of the Deputy Lieutenants in the several counties.

⁶⁹ T.W. Pritchard, *St. Winifrede, her Holy Well and the Jesuit Mission*, (Wrexham, 2009), p.179.

with recusants in the period 1608 to 1638.⁷⁰ This must have had an impact upon their attitudes to the prosecution of Catholics, and greatly limited attempts to actively identify the ‘popishly affected’.

Concerns that North-East Welsh magistrates were not applying recusancy laws sufficiently rigorously or investigating possible church papists were ongoing throughout the seventeenth century, and periodic exhortations from central government apparently still fell on deaf ears. In 1636 Flintshire JPs were encouraged by the Chief Justice of the Great Sessions for North Wales to hinder pilgrimages to St. Winifred’s Well and to report those ‘of ranke or qualitie’ who attended the well. There is no evidence to suggest this happened. The JPs of Flintshire were again admonished by the Privy Council in 1681 due to the ‘great numbers of Popish recusants’ in the county and the total absence of convictions for recusancy.⁷¹ It was more important to the North-East Welsh gentry to maintain a stable and harmonious local community than to gratify the needs of the centre.

Relationships between North-East Welsh Protestant and Catholic families were, for the most part, cordial and sociable. Kinship, once again, played a significant part in this. The Catholic recusant families in the region were all related to powerful Protestant gentry families, and in North-East Wales throughout the period kinship was more important than religion in determining relationships between individuals and families. Families such as the Morgans of Golden Grove (Flintshire), Mostyns of Talacre, and Pughs of Creuddyn were of ancient lineage. They commanded significant authority in the region because of this, and

⁷⁰ Clark, ‘Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire’, p. 76; B.G. Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Manchester, 1978), pp. 27-8.

⁷¹ BL, Add MS 19870: Register of assessments for troops, accounts of aids and subsidies, proclamations, commissions, letters and orders of the Privy Council, and of the Lord President of Wales, with correspondence of the sheriff and justices of the county of Flint, in North Wales, 1586-1637; NLW, MS 17057E: Transcripts of warrants following forfeitures of popish recusants' estates.

were considered acceptable marriage partners for their Protestant neighbours and kinsmen. The importance of bringing honour and an alliance of status to one's family meant that marriages to Catholic ladies were acceptable for North-East Welsh gentlemen. Bishop John Fell wrote to Thomas Mostyn to express his fears of the consequences of Mostyn's marriage to a Cheshire Catholic, asking that he 'never seek refuge at the Roman Asylum' and instructing Mostyn to aim to convert his lady.⁷² Mostyn defended his marriage to another correspondent on the grounds of her family, substantial dowry, and because 'the sweetness of her nature & the goodness of her temper has finish'd wht her eye had begun'.⁷³ While he did include a stipulation in his will that his children be brought up away from his wife's relatives (especially the Giffards), he also allowed her to use the Mostyn chapel for her own Catholic worship.⁷⁴ Yet Mostyn expressed severe doubts about the Duke of York's suitability to rule without significant Protestant safeguards, for which he was temporarily removed from all his commissions. Mostyn argued for the Church 'as now established by Law'. When he wrote bitterly to the duke of Beaufort to express his grievances, he defended himself on the grounds of his family's loyalty, his religion, and his loyalty to the King.⁷⁵ For one who saw popery as such a threat nationally, Mostyn was able to accommodate Catholicism extremely close to home. The sons of Catholic gentry families of the region intermarried with some of the most powerful recusant families in England, as well as with local Catholic and Protestant families. English alliances were necessary to maintain the Catholic community, even if second wives were often chosen from local gentry families.⁷⁶ Such Catholic alliances took place between North-East Welsh

⁷² MH, MC vol. I, no. 52: John Fell to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 21 July 1676.

⁷³ MH, MC, vol. I no. 1: Thomas Mostyn to Lord Bulkeley, Poole, 26 July 1672.

⁷⁴ Bangor, Mostyn 183: Will of Sir Thomas Mostyn; Lord Mostyn and T.A. Glenn, *History of the Family of Mostyn of Mostyn* (1925), p. 156.

⁷⁵ Evans, "To contynue in my bloud and name", p. 174; NLW, MS 3072E/129: Mostyn historical documents and letters, vol. II.

⁷⁶ T. Kennedy, 'The Edwards family of Plas Newydd in Chirkland', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society* 41 (1992), p. 85.

families and, for example, the Throckmortons of Warwickshire, Brockholes and Downes of Lancashire, Petres of Essex, Savages of Cheshire and Giffards of Shropshire.⁷⁷ It meant that Welsh Catholics were operated within at least two powerful networks: the local Welsh networks of kinship, heritage, and community, and a wider Catholic network of religious belief and support.

Catholics were well integrated within local political and social networks throughout the seventeenth century. Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaeth, for example, corresponded regularly and even swapped pornographic novels with the Catholic Sir Edward Mostyn of Talacre in 1676. While the Pugh (or Pue) family of Creuddyn were known recusants, they were also fully involved in election manoeuvring alongside the Mostyns of Talacre and the Petres of Greenfield.⁷⁸ When the different branches of the Mostyn family fell out, the same systems of arbitration were used for the Catholic and Protestant families. A Church of England clergyman was appointed as an external arbitrator.⁷⁹ The death of the Catholic Edward Morgan of Goldgreave was commemorated by the clerk of St. Asaph, Peter Roberts, alongside his father ‘the famous lawyer’. Catholics attended marriages and funerals of their Protestant neighbours.⁸⁰ As Margaret Spufford, William Sheils, and Michael Questier have identified elsewhere, recusant families continued to be involved in local affairs despite their legal status as recusants.⁸¹ The Edwards family of Chirk, Denbighshire, remained active

⁷⁷ E.G. Jones, ‘Catholic Recusancy in the counties of Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery, 1581-1625’, *THSC*, (1945), p. 120.

⁷⁸ MH, MC, vol. I, no 58: Edward Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Talacre, 20 Nov. 1676; MC, vol. I, no 62: Edward Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Talacre, 27 Dec. 1676; MH, MC vol. II no 22: Edward Petre to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

⁷⁹ MH, MC, vol. III, no 28: Owen Thelwall to Thomas Mostyn, Wrexham, 29 Oct. 1683; vol. III, no 32: Edward Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Havodynnos, 7 Dec. 1683.

⁸⁰ BL, Harley MS 2129: Funeral Certificates and Orders of Randle Holme; Thomas (ed.), *Y Cwtta Cyfarwydd*, pp. 32. 194.

⁸¹ Many (although by no means all) references to the ability of Catholics to retain local positions relate to the years prior to the Civil War. Sheils, “‘Getting on’ and “‘getting along’ in parish and town”, pp. 67-8; M. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006); A. Walsham, ‘Supping with Satan’s Disciples: Spiritual and Secular Sociability in Post-Reformation England’, in N. Lewycky and A. Morton (eds), *Getting Along?: Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 52-4; Blackwood, *Lancashire Gentry*, p. 57.

leaders of their community, acting as trustees of an Oswestry fund for the poor in 1638 and contributing alongside the Myddletons and Trevors towards the renewal of Oswestry's charter in 1673.⁸² Bishop Godfrey Goodman, after apparently converting to Catholicism on his deathbed, expected that his charitable bequests to the town of Ruthin be carried out. These included a travel bursary to gentleman preferably from 'the House of Talacre', while his trustees included the Anglican bishops of St. Asaph and Bangor, and the Chief Justice of Chester alongside some of his Protestant kin.⁸³ Catholics continued to be proposed for local office even if they were known recusants, from recusant families, or occasional conformists. John Parry of Twysog, Denbighshire, was initially proposed as sheriff of that county despite being labelled 'Catholick', in the 1630s. He, or one of his sons, served in several local offices during the subsequent fifty years, and was one of the Catholic JPs placed on the Bench by James II. William Conway and Robert Morgan of Golden Grove were proposed in 1632, Edward Pennant of Bagillt was put forward in 1633, while William Lloyd of Halghton was high on the list of candidates for sheriff in 1639 and 1640, despite being 'a very able man, but popishly affected'.⁸⁴

It is likely that a comparison of the more detailed 1650s recusancy records with the lists of local JPs and sheriffs would yield more such examples. These Catholic families were clearly not seen as a political or religious threat to the Protestant elites, in stark contrast to the situation in Monmouthshire and Glamorgan in a similar period. One explanation for this is that although they behaved politically, engaged in political networks, and held local

⁸² Kennedy, 'The Edwards family of Plas Newydd in Chirkland', p .84.

⁸³ R. Newcombe, *A Memoir of Gabriel Goodman... also of Godfrey Goodman, D. D. Bishop of Gloucester* (Ruthin, 1825), Appendix P [pages unnumbered].

⁸⁴ HL, EL 7133: List of proposed sheriffs for Flintshire, 1632; EL 7147: List of names for office in Denbighshire and Flintshire, n.d.; EL 7143: List of proposed sheriffs for Flintshire, Denbighshire, and Montgomeryshire, 1633; EL 7276: List of proposed sheriffs for Flintshire, 1639; EL 7323: List of proposed sheriffs for Flint, Denbigh, and Montgomery, 1640; EL 7506: List of proposed sheriffs by Magdalen Bagenall, 1633.

positions, they were not 'politicised' in the same way as Monmouthshire or Glamorgan Catholics. They were linked to local Protestant families, rather than being extremely powerful themselves, or connected to powerful Catholic aristocratic families. They did not suffer from the same instability in terms of religious allegiances, with conversions rare amongst the gentry, and feuds taking place over land or power rather than religion.⁸⁵

Anti-popery: North-East Welsh reactions to national and local anti-Catholic scares

These ties of kinship and alliance brought considerable protection to Catholics at times of danger. Recent work on English Catholics has demonstrated that Protestant friends and family tended to protect Catholic neighbours despite a deep-seated fear of popery, even at the height of anti-popish hysteria.⁸⁶ It is likely, as Anthony Milton argues, that popular anti-Catholicism's polarising depiction of papists as 'alien, exotic, but above all foreign' made a disregard of local Catholicism easier.⁸⁷ Kin, neighbours, and friends were definitely not foreign, and therefore could be ignored as a potential threat. The North-East Welsh gentry were extremely active in shielding their Catholic friends and relatives. Protestant gentlemen acted to protect their kin from outside threats, for example from Parliamentary military forces, or from anti-Catholic hysteria in 1641 at the start of the Long Parliament, or following the discovery of the so-called Popish Plot in 1678. Thomas Spicer wrote to Sir Owen Wynn about parliament's discontent at the suspension of the sentence against the Catholic priest John Goodman in January 1641. As well as excusing the dearth of parliamentary news on those grounds, Spicer took the opportunity to warn Wynn to, 'Let

⁸⁵ P. Jenkins, 'Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches', p. 276; *idem.*, *The Making of a Ruling Class: The Glamorgan Gentry, 1640-1790* (1983), pp. 124-6.

⁸⁶ Although this was evidently not the case in all regions or counties, as with Monmouth, Glamorgan, or Warwickshire. Baker, *Reading and Politics*, pp. 5, 57-62; A. Hobson, 'The King's Most Loyal Subjects: The Relationship between Anglican Loyalists and Roman Catholics in the Reign of Charles II', *Royal Stuart Review*, 1996, pp. 9-10; A. Milton, 'A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism', in A.F. Marotti (ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), pp. 99-100, 102; Hughes, *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire*, p. 64; Jenkins, *The Making of a Ruling Class*, pp. 124-5; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 16-17, 58-60.

⁸⁷ Milton, 'A Qualified Intolerance', p. 105.

my Cosen Tho: Ellis haue a Care & not seduce any, to the Romish Religion lest he be enuied'.⁸⁸ Spicer's advice demonstrated family concern for Ellis rather than fear of Ellis's religious proclivities or actions. Similarly, Wynn himself aided his kinswoman Anne Petre when after the outbreak of hostilities in 1642 Petre, the wife of Wynn's late kinsman John Mostyn of Talacre, sought a house for her family and 'sum spetiall frinds which desiers to sugerne with us'. By October her search for an agreement had become more desperate, fearing 'reporte of younge hothames coming to Chester' she begged for a refuge, writing that 'myne, and Mr Petre earnest desire is, to be under your winge, and within your limitts some where, for a shelter in these miserable, and troblesome times'. Wynn evidently succeeded, finding the family a house previously occupied by the Holland family.⁸⁹

Even in 1679, at the height of the Popish Plot, Thomas Mostyn was engaged heavily in protecting his 'uncle' Petre's assets in North-East Wales, advising him how best to conceal his money and travel beyond seas. Mostyn's willingness to provide this level of aid to one so suspected of involvement in the plot, as well as to correspond secretly with him via Petre's 'sister' Pennant, demonstrates that the obligations of kin far outweighed those of religion or national concern. Mostyn, as a firm supporter of the Protestant Church of England, attempted to persuade Petre that the plot should make him think twice, arguing: 'I should neuer aduise any one to quitt his Religion for fear off ye laws nor esteem him for it, but I shoud think that man stupid who were not soe alarm'd at so horrid execrable & bloody a plott as this is'. Mostyn's dismissal of law as a reason to change religion is revealing, yet seemingly typical of the administrative approach of North-East Welsh gentlemen. Petre's counter-argument was that 'I shall not goe about to denye but that some

⁸⁸ NLW, MS 9062E no 1674: Thomas Spicer to Owen Wynn, Holborn, 30 Jan. 1641.

⁸⁹ NLW, MS 9063E no 1714: Anne Petre to Owen Wynn, Greenfield, 25 Sep. 1642; NLW, MS 9063E no 1716: Anne Petre to Owen Wynn, n.p., 26 Oct. 1642; NLW, MS 9063E no 1717: Anne Petre to Owen Wynn, n.p., 28 Oct. 1642.

of our Religion haue practiced ill thinges, which those of other principles haue also done, yett that is noe argument that they are generally approued in the Church; and when I am satisfied they are, I shall desist to bee a member of it'. It seems to have been accepted by Mostyn, and did not lead to a breach in their relationship.⁹⁰ Sir Edward Mostyn of Talacre, head of the Catholic branch of the Mostyn family, was forced to flee in the same year. Sir Edward was suspected of involvement in the plot via his wife's priest, and was included on the list of those whose estates would be confiscated and who would be removed from their areas. In the immediate aftermath of the Popish Plot, in December 1678, one of the suspects was said to be 'gone in to Wales with his lady', the wife of Sir Edward Mostyn of Talacre. This did not bode well for the Mostyns in the anti-Papist outcry afterwards. As the records and Mostyn's daughter's biography note, he and his family rather sensibly went 'beyond seas' until the furore had died down.⁹¹ Alexandra Walsham has suggested that early modern communities established 'demarcated boundaries', where religion and other dimensions of experience were separated. As a consequence of these demarcations, Catholics and Protestants could socialise, debate, and maintain friendships despite their religion.⁹² Thomas Mostyn's actions indicate that, even in situations where these boundaries were clearly breached, kinship still trumped religion at times of crisis. Unlike Sir Thomas Shirley in early seventeenth-century Northamptonshire, the Catholic Mostyns and Petre *could* trust their Protestant friends and kinsmen.⁹³

Even in times of extreme anxiety about popery the majority of the North-East Welsh gentry did not panic or demonstrate overt or violent anti-Catholicism either locally or nationally. Unlike neighbouring Cheshire or Monmouthshire, rumours of Catholic

⁹⁰ MH, MC vol. II no 44: Edward Petre to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 22 Apr. 1679; MC vol. II no 45: Thomas Mostyn to Edward Petre, n.p., 26 Apr. 1679; MC vol. II no 47: Thomas Mostyn to Edward Petre, n.p., n.d.

⁹¹ HMC, *11th report*, pp. 52-3, 230-231; E. Bedingfield, *The life of Margaret Mostyn, mother Margaret of Jesus* (1878).

⁹² Walsham, 'Supping with Satan's Disciples', p. 55.

⁹³ Cust, 'Catholicism, Antiquarianism, and Gentry Honour', pp. 44-45.

uprisings and the fear of the Irish (especially following the outbreak of rebellion in 1641) did not lead to local panic.⁹⁴ Their comments in correspondence focused on the practical or local implications of events. In 1640, as fears of the influence of Catholics within the Court were steering policy in parliament, the future parliamentarian Simon Thelwall wrote to Sir Thomas Salusbury criticising the decision to remove Catholic officers from military command, 'for without question Colonell Asheton and other Brave Commanders popishe and popishlye affected removed from the Armye will not onelye produce a Weakenes but a distemper alsoe'.⁹⁵ Reports of the Irish rebellion were sent to North-East Wales by the Flintshire MP John Mostyn, as with other items of news. Although this report indicated the urgency of parliament's actions, it did not contain any evidence of fears in relation to Catholics in North Wales itself, or for North-East Welsh people resident in Ireland.⁹⁶ Reports of Catholic risings or invasions at times of national crisis were treated with scepticism, for example, rumours of a rising by local Catholics in November 1641 in Conwy, and the report of an Irish invasion in December 1688. In both cases reports seem to have been assessed calmly and dismissed as untrue. In 1688 the gentry initially met upon an alarmist report of Sir Robert Owen, but upon more certain news from a 'person of credit' they were stood down by Sir Richard Myddelton.⁹⁷ While the religious and political culture of North-East Wales was certainly conservative, it was not insular, ignorant, or unconcerned with national events. The attitudes of the North-East Welsh gentry did not come about through a lack of information, but rather via a localist interpretation of significant amounts of domestic and foreign news.

⁹⁴ Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-1660*, p. 37; Matthews, 'Protestant fears of Catholics in Monmouthshire during the First Civil War', pp. 13-14.

⁹⁵ NLW, Lleweni 172: Simon Thelwall to Sir Thomas Salusbury, n.p., 2 Dec. 1640.

⁹⁶ NLW, MS 9063E no 1694: John Mostyn to Sir Roger Mostyn, London, 11 Nov. 1641.

⁹⁷ MH, MC vol. V no 50: Henry Price to Thomas Mostyn, Ruthin, 16 Dec. 1688; NLW, MS 9063E no 1695: Griffith Williams to Owen Wynn, Conwy, Nov. 164; CRO, DSS 1/3/23: Sir Robert Owen to Sir Richard Myddelton, n.p., n.d.

It took over a year for a shipwrecked Catholic priest, Charles Mihan to be executed in Denbighshire. After Mihan was captured in 1678, Sir John Salusbury, JP, MP and Alderman of Denbigh, undertook a lengthy correspondence with his superiors in London concerning what should be done with the priest. The delay (partly due to slow replies from London) was noted in the House of Commons, and an address was sent to the king urging that a speedy trial be held. Thomas Kennedy has claimed that Salusbury, in facilitating the execution of Mihan, was acting in sympathy with the ‘mood’ of the moment. Sharon Howard argues to the contrary, that Salusbury’s reluctance and slow response was evidence that the aforementioned mood was not straightforward in Denbighshire.⁹⁸ Howard’s argument certainly makes more sense given the local context. There were few incidents of local anti-Catholic violence even immediately after the Popish Plot was ‘revealed’ in 1678 or in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution in 1688. The Jesuits at the Residence of St. Winifred described themselves as living in ‘constant fear and peril’ in 1679 in avoiding the Privy Council’s pursuivants, but even so acknowledged that they fared better than their brothers in South Wales, who suffered vicious persecution at the hands of local people.⁹⁹ The rumoured Irish invasion of 1688 sent a panicked mob around to the house of a Jesuit priest in Whitchurch, but there appears not to have been any incidents in Flintshire. The one possible attack in Denbighshire was carried out in December 1688 against a Catholic former JP, John Parry of Tywysog, by a crowd led by a yeoman who broke into his house and carried away some of his belongings. The motives for even this attack are inferred to be anti-Catholic but apart from the combination of date and the individual attacked, there is no firm evidence that the mob had religious motivations. Around the same time two Catholics from Powys Castle were arrested carrying ‘popish relicts’. They were imprisoned until the following September for refusing to swear the oaths of allegiance and

⁹⁸ Kennedy, ‘Roman Catholicism in Denbighshire’, p.33; S. Howard, *Law and Disorder in Early Modern Wales* (Cardiff, 2008), pp.161-2.

⁹⁹ Foley (ed.), *Records*, V, 940.

supremacy.¹⁰⁰ This was a lengthy imprisonment but still lacks the intensity of the persecution in other parts of Wales and England.

III. Puritanism and the North-East Welsh Gentry 1640-88

Before the 1640s Puritanism was far from an alien concept to the North-East Welsh gentry, but neither was it one that had much purchase among any social group in the local region. After the Restoration, however, the behaviour and number of Protestant nonconformists became a significant preoccupation locally and nationally. In North-East Wales this remained the case for the rest of the seventeenth century, even at times of anti-Catholic hysteria. The region was, as will be discussed in chapter three, overwhelmingly dominated in the 1640s by royalists, in the 1660s and 1670s by Court supporters, and from the late 1670s onwards by Tories. While the degree of Toryism varied between individuals and families, there were very few who were prepared to publically declare themselves as Parliamentarians, Country party supporters, or Whigs. This is vitally important considering the strong politico-religious connections in the period, and while defence of the established church was one clear priority of the North-East Welsh gentry, preventing faction and promoting political and social order was closely allied with that, as discussed in chapters one and three. This created a situation of extreme discomfort for Protestant nonconformists from 1660 onwards. Nonconformists were viewed as dangerous seducers, as promoters of discord and rebellion in religion and in the state. They were seen as a threat to local order and security, and were subject to arrest, prosecution, and harassment, whether moderate Presbyterians such as Philip Henry, or radical Quakers such as Brian

¹⁰⁰ Howard, *Law and Disorder in Early Modern Wales*, p. 164.

Sixsmith.¹⁰¹ Pre-existing kinship traditions, allied to long-standing Welsh gentry ideals of social order and support for central institutions, provided the pre-conditions for a determinedly anti-Puritan culture from the mid-seventeenth century onwards. These pre-conditions placed the North-East Welsh towards the more extreme end of the political spectrum in England, and meant that any local spectrum would consist of variance within that extreme. From 1660 this was heightened by a culture of memory that made constant reference to the Civil War and Interregnum – and in a predominantly royalist area, it is unsurprising that this increased tensions even further. While persecution intensified at times of royalist, Court, or Tory dominance in national institutions, caused by fears of plots or assassination attempts, the situation never significantly improved for nonconformists after 1660. The Declarations of Indulgence provided some respite, but only increased the frustration of the local gentry towards nonconformity in the region.

Although the behaviour of London Puritans featured frequently in letters sharing news from the capital, there was no reference made to them in any locally-focussed correspondence prior to the First Civil War. While their numbers grew rapidly in Cheshire from the 1580s to the 1610s, reports from the Bishop of St. Asaph to Archbishop Laud made no reference to Puritan nonconformists before 1640. In 1640 the reference is to a ‘Conventicle of meane Persons’, most probably the radical Puritans of Wrexham.¹⁰² Even after the Restoration they were a tiny minority. Geraint Jenkins estimates that as little as 1.15 per cent of the entire Welsh population were nonconformists in 1676. The Compton Census revealed that only 1.4 per cent of the population of St. Asaph diocese were nonconformists in 1676. Jenkins describes Dissent in North-East Wales as ‘well-

¹⁰¹ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*; G.M. Griffiths, ‘The Restoration of St. Asaph: The Episcopate of Bishop George Griffith, 1660-1666 Part 2’, *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, 13, (1963), p.30.

¹⁰² LPL, MS 943 fo. 296: Report of Archbishop Laud to Charles I, 1640; J. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-1660*, p. 19.

established' on the strength of the figures for the deaneries of Bromfield and Yale and Marchia. Certainly the Wrexham congregation was sizeable when considering the dissenting population of Wales but even so it only reached 132 people in the Compton Census, and many of the other dissenting congregations in these deaneries were in Shropshire or Merionethshire.¹⁰³ In 1663 the Presbyterian Philip Henry wrote in despair at the dwindling congregations following the Restoration, and the small number of those who stood firm in the face of persecution. By 1686 he feared for the future of nonconformist congregations, writing that the 'sad face of Barroness is upon our Congregations, many waxing worse & worse, few better and better, And is the Axe layd to the Root?'¹⁰⁴ On Henry's testimony to James II in October 1687, most of this small group were 'for a Moderate Presbytery'.¹⁰⁵ Local nonconformists were known to those in authority, and despite the best efforts of nonconformist historians to prove otherwise, it seems there were simply not very many of them. Yet the persecution of Puritans and Protestant nonconformists after 1660 was not driven by their number, but by the danger they were perceived to pose to the Church and state.

The role of memory in religious persecution

Historians of the Restoration and later seventeenth century are agreed that memories of the Civil War and Interregnum were central to the way that nonconformists were treated after 1660 in England.¹⁰⁶ In North-East Wales, this was intensified by the near uniformity of royalist support in the region, which made revenge against the former Puritan governors

¹⁰³ The figures for Denbighshire and Flintshire were even lower, as the St. Asaph diocese included areas of Shropshire and Merionethshire with sizeable dissenting congregations. G.H. Jenkins, *Protestant Dissenters in Wales 1639-1689* (Cardiff, 1992), p.58; Whiteman (ed.), *The Compton Census of 1676*, pp. 491, 506-9.

¹⁰⁴ Henry wrote of the eclipse of the 'Presbyterian Interest' in Wrexham, referring to the 'ancient christian fellowship there as 'decayed' in 1663. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, pp. 132, 137; Bodl., MS Eng. Letters e.29 fo. 24: Philip Henry to Matthew Henry, n.p., 7 May 1686.

¹⁰⁵ BL, Add MS 42849 fo. 13: Philip Henry to Henry Ashurst, n.p., 28 Oct. 1687.

¹⁰⁶ For example, J. Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000); G. Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007); Goldie, 'Politics and Religion in the Era of the *Entring Book*', pp. 1-32.

particularly sweet and effective. On the Flintshire Bench of 10 September 1660, only three individuals had not been fined or sequestered in the Interregnum for involvement with the royalist cause, and these were Interregnum appointees. By 1664 this fell to one.¹⁰⁷ The majority of those on the Restoration Bench were also strong supporters of the Church of England, and several others were conformist Catholics. As established in section two of this chapter, as well as fighting in the First Civil War, North-East Welsh Catholics suffered perhaps more in the Interregnum from fines and sequestration than at any other time, being deprived of the protection of their Protestant kin. The victorious parliamentary army included many Puritan soldiers, including those who participated in iconoclasm in North-East Welsh parish churches during their campaign. Although fighting under Sir Thomas Myddelton's Welsh colours, many were from the South-East or East of England, and were portrayed as foreign invaders in Welsh royalist poetry of the period.¹⁰⁸ Some of these Puritan soldiers, such as Hugh Courtney and John Carter, carved out estates and careers for themselves in Wales, and became heavily involved in Interregnum governance in the region. Many of the 'Approvers' appointed to the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales were English or incomers from other areas.¹⁰⁹ During that time Church of England ministers were ejected, familiar rituals proscribed, and tithes, lands sold, and advowsons confiscated – sometimes to the profit of parliamentary grandees such as John Jones.¹¹⁰ Political acts of Interregnum governments, for example the regicide, were twinned with religious acts in the minds of royalist opposition. A poem noted in the back of Quarter Sessions records made this connection explicit:

The scripture bids for sin to fast & pray

¹⁰⁷ This gentleman, Thomas Crichley, was a client of Sir John Trevor, possibly representing his interest on the Bench. Phillips, *Justices of the Peace in Wales*, pp. 114-15.

¹⁰⁸ TNA, SP 28/346: Accounts of Sir Thomas Middleton; BL, Add MS 14891: Collection of Welsh *Englynion* and poems.

¹⁰⁹ G. Williams, 'Part 1: 1603-1660', in N. Yates (ed.), *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603-1920* (Cardiff, 2007), p. 39.

¹¹⁰ LPL, Comm VII/1-2: Records of the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales; Comm XIIa/1: Copy return for sale of Dean and Chapter lands, 1648-50; MS 1027: Sequestered livings in Wales, 1662; BL, Add MS 9049: Bishops' Lands sales, 1647-51.

Why giue you thankes then for a bloody day
hypocrits is this you round head pranks
Leave off for shame & trouble god no further
ffor hee expects noe thankes for doeing murther.¹¹¹

Puritan government in the Interregnum hit at the core of North-East Welsh gentry concerns: their Church, descended from the ancient Celtic Church; their ancient lineage and right to govern; the ordered and hierarchical society; and their property rights.¹¹²

This had short and long-term consequences. A petition in June or July 1660, from the gentry of the six counties of North Wales, bemoaned the way that they had suffered in the Interregnum at the hands of those who, ‘under pretence of propagating the Gospel, have for a long time shut up our Churches, converted the endowments of the Church to their own use, and soweth the seeds of false Doctrine and Schism among us’. They requested that the king redress this grievance by causing ‘all those good and wholesome Laws for uniformity in Religion, the Government of the Church, and the maintenance of the Clergy, to be put in execution’. As with many other Welsh petitions, they addressed their appeal to history – those laws had been made after the Reformation, and under Charles II’s predecessors. This petition also goes some way to confounding the argument that the royalist gentry principally sought the restoration of the Church in order to recover their own power and influence.¹¹³ The North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated from the very point of the King’s arrival that the Puritan ascendancy was over, and that measures would be taken against those who had governed matters of religion in the 1640s and 1650s. It meant that legal reprisals against Puritans came quickly. This began with the Puritan clergy,

¹¹¹ There is no indication as to who noted this poem or why. It does not appear to relate to any prosecutions within the book. NLW, Chirk B 1: Book of Orders made at Denbigh Quarter Session 1647-62.

¹¹² See S.L. Ward, ‘Responses to godly government in North-East Wales, 1646-1660: gentility, religion and Royalist political activity’, in C. Knaack and J. van Tol (eds), *Godly Governance, Religion and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, forthcoming).

¹¹³ This petition is not recorded in the Commons Journals, and the only remaining evidence of it nationally is in the official newspaper *Mercurius Publicus*. *Mercurius Publicus*, 27 (28 June-5 July 1660), pp. 417-18.

particularly those intruded during the Interregnum. The first presentations for not reading the Book of Common Prayer in Flintshire and Denbighshire were in the first Great Sessions after the Restoration, and the process of ejection came soon after. Sir Thomas Hanmer complained of Richard Steele, the intruded minister of Hanmer, as early as October 1660.¹¹⁴ Sermons were preached which, by their choice of text, intended to show Puritans that their time of prominence was over, and that they would be scattered. Others preached against ‘false teachers & false Doctrines’, namely in Worthenbury church, while the former Puritan minister was in the congregation. On the anniversary of the King’s return in 1662 Archibald Sparke preached on Luke 1: 74-5, including the line that God had come to ‘rescue us from our enemies, and to enable us to serve him without fear’, and on the anniversary of ‘K. Charles the first his martyrdom’ in 1663 Sparke took James 5: 6 as his text, ‘You have condemned and murdered the innocent one, who was not opposing you’.¹¹⁵ Puritan congregations were harassed and harried by both the naturally pugnacious (such as Sir Roger Puleston) and those gentlemen who had suffered most in the Interregnum.¹¹⁶ Prominent individuals such as Sir Thomas Myddelton acted against gentlemen who had profited from Interregnum policies and opportunities, petitioning Charles II to prevent them gaining profitable local offices in the region.¹¹⁷ The North-East Welsh gentry attempted to clean out the local political and religious establishment and remove all traces of Interregnum Puritanism.

¹¹⁴ F. McCall, *Baal’s Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013), p. 248; NLW, Bettisfield 108: Order by the Commission for the confirming and restoring of Ministers to Richard Steele, 20 Oct. 1660; Crown Book of Flint, fo. 228v.

¹¹⁵ The assize sermon at Chester in September 1661 was from Genesis 49: 5-7. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, pp. 96, 100; NLW, MS 12463B: Notebook of Archibald Sparke, 1652-9.

¹¹⁶ It is possible that Puleston’s temper was not improved by his drunkenness – his father-in-law described his sobriety as so rare that it happened ‘but upon a great eclipse’. NLW, MS 9066E no 2322: Sir Roger Mostyn, Mostyn, 4 Nov. 1661; Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 75.

¹¹⁷ NLW, MS 9066E no 2272: The Humble Petition of diverse Lords Knights & gentlemen Inhabitants of the six Counties of Northwalles; MS 9066E no 2240: Sir Richard Wynn to Lady Grace Wynn, n.p., 12 June 1660; MS 9066E no 2257: Thomas Bulkeley to Sir Richard Wynn, n.p., 11 Sept. 1660; MS 9066E no 2261: Thomas Bulkeley to Sir Richard Wynn, 23 Sept. 1660.

In the long term, memories of the Civil War and Interregnum became a vital component of the bogeyman figure of the dissenter for the Court and the conservative gentry. A culture of memory was pervasive in English society and politics in the later seventeenth century, and historians such as Jonathan Scott, Grant Tapsell, and Matthew Neufeld have argued persuasively for its impact on national policy and local responses to it from 1660 onwards.¹¹⁸ The Interregnum behaviour or allegiance of Puritans was recalled repeatedly when they were suspected of, or prosecuted for, plots in the Restoration. These memories were kept alive by newsletters and correspondence from London. Even when the Civil War generation was dead, their sons and grandsons often perpetuated the culture of memory by reading about Civil Wars and Interregnum, and maintaining collections of royalist memorabilia and portraits. North-East Welsh gentlemen, like many of their English counterparts, demonstrated a sustained interest in the history of the 1640s and 1650s, purchasing biographies and histories of the period and key figures within it. Partisan histories were published even as soon as the First Civil War ended, and continued to be written long after the Restoration, particularly as political crises seemed to render their lessons more relevant.¹¹⁹ Some even wrote their own manuscript histories of the Civil War, believing that Wales and its contribution had been neglected by English writers, or wanting to add their own perspective to that offered by printed texts.¹²⁰ Others, such as Dr. David Lloyd, canon of St. Asaph and later rector of Northop, printed fervently royalist biographies, and a pamphlet accusing dissenters of continued disloyalty to the monarchy

¹¹⁸ Scott, *England's Troubles*; Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85*; M. Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013); D.C. Beaver, *Parish Communities and Religious Conflict in the Vale of Gloucester 1590-1690* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 253.

¹¹⁹ NLW, Chirk A 29: Library Catalogue, 1704; Chirk E 10597: Bookseller's bill, 1671; NLW, MS 9065E no 2092: Catalogue of Books at Mostyn, n.d.; Peniarth PB1: Catalogue of Books at Penbedw, c.1690s; MS 17126D: Catalogue of the Books in Llanerch Library, 1778; W.M. Myddelton (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts, 1605-1666* (St. Albans, 1908), p. 103; D. Cressy, 'Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', *HLQ*, 68 (2005), pp.257-68; R. MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague, 1974).

¹²⁰ NLW, Chirk A 14: A breife description of the Civil War in Northwales...; NLW, Wynnstay 113: Transcript of an 'Account of the Rebellion in north and south Wales in Oliver Cromwell's time, n.d.; Sweeney Hall A4: Dialogue about the outbreak of the Civil War.

and Church of England.¹²¹ Royalist and Anglican texts were popular in late-seventeenth century North-East Welsh libraries, and new editions of books on Laud, Charles I, or the Civil Wars were purchased when they appeared. As with participants in the Dutch revolt in the Low Countries, the gentry may have reframed their own or their family accounts of their royalism and suffering in the Civil War to make them providential or to suggest some form of control over their lives. The accounts of Edward Lloyd of Llanforda and Bishop Godfrey Goodman particularly fit this mould.¹²² The view of the malice and threat posed by their former enemies, on the other hand, was recounted as an unchanging and static feature of life.¹²³ Sir Geoffrey Shakerley, Bishop William Lloyd and others frequently, and often explicitly, referred to the Civil War record of nonconformists, twinning religious nonconformity with past (and future) political insurrection.¹²⁴ This was only strengthened by the various radical plots and uprisings after 1660. With such plots the radicals, while they never succeeded in toppling the government, ‘made their presence felt’, implying that recent scholars are correct in deeming the radical threat somewhat credible.¹²⁵ The effect of the plots was to further entrench the conservative gentry in what they saw as a defensive position, constantly remembering the disasters of the Civil War and Interregnum and their impact upon their families, the Church, and the Crown.

¹²¹ Lloyd’s *Memoires*, a biographical dictionary of those who had suffered in the King’s service, includes many Welsh royalists from Denbighshire and Flintshire whose contributions to royalism would otherwise have been ignored by Restoration historians. T. Cooper, ‘David Lloyd (1635–1692)’, rev. Andrew Lacey, *ODNB*.

¹²² NLW, Sweeney Hall A4 fos 10r-10v: Draft of ‘The true Narrative of Capt: Edward Lloyds Actions & Sufferings in & for his Majesties service’; BL, Egerton MS 2182 fos 2-8v: Bishop Goodman’s Prayer & account of his sufferings, 1650; Newcombe, *A Memoir of Gabriel Goodman... also of Godfrey Goodman*.

¹²³ J. Pollmann, ‘Of living legends and authentic tales: how to get remembered in Early Modern Europe’, *TRHS*, 23 (2013), p. 106.

¹²⁴ TNA, SP 29/262 fo. 175: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Secretary Williamson, Chester, 10 July 1669; SP 29/276 fo. 155: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Williamson, Chester, 13 June 1670; SP 29/277 fo. 11: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Williamson, Chester, 2 July 1670; SP 29/44 fo. 94: James Hicke to Secretary Nicholas, Wrexham, 13 Nov. 1661; SP 29/41 fo. 3: Thomas Baker to Henry Bishop, Wrexham, 2 Sept. 1661; Bodl., MS Tanner 146, fo. 30: Bishop William Lloyd to Archbishop Sancroft, n.p., 21 Jan. 1684.

¹²⁵ Tapsell, *Personal Rule of Charles II*, p. 69.

When considered alongside the existing Welsh historicised culture it is no wonder that the North-East Welsh gentry maintained such a strong anti-Puritan stance. It was a foreign religion, without ties to Welsh history or families, was proven to be politically and religiously dangerous, and aimed to overthrow everything the North-East Welsh gentry held dear. There were no prominent or powerful Puritan gentlemen after the Restoration as in Cheshire, Shropshire, Devon, or Herefordshire, nor had there been in the fifty years prior to the First Civil War.¹²⁶ The gentry of North-East Wales effectively saw the Restoration Church of England as being under siege from nonconformists as it was in the Interregnum, with themselves as a key bastion of defence. From medieval times their role had been to uphold order and maintain institutions that protected order – the Crown, the Church, and the local community. They were Tories before Toryism was invented, and consistency and loyalty was vital to their self-presentation and image. James II's 1686 purge of the commission of the peace must have rankled even more in the light of this. For a Stuart monarch to remove them from their positions and replace them with (in some cases) direct descendants of the Puritan governors, or obscure incomers, tested their loyalty to the extreme.¹²⁷ It once again recalled memories of that period, and raised the spectre of Civil War.

Harassment, persuasion, and imprisonment, 1660-88

Persecution was not limited to prosecution and imprisonment. There were a range of ways in which nonconformists were persecuted, including threatening words, financial penalties, ejection, harassment, and presentation at the Quarter Sessions or Great Sessions. They were followed, monitored, and questioned about their associates and co-believers.

Excommunication was used as a punishment throughout the period by all of the St. Asaph

¹²⁶ M. Stoye, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994), pp. 20-1; Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-66*, pp. 33-44, 266.

¹²⁷ Phillips, *Justices of the Peace in Wales*, p. 122.

bishops, and sometimes dissenters were refused burial in the light of their excommunication.¹²⁸ Arrest, imprisonment and examination happened to most nonconformists only at times of national or local crisis. Using this broad definition, persecution was continuous in the period 1660 to 1688. It is harder to assess the regularity of prosecutions (using the Elizabethan statutes or the Restoration 'laws for uniformity') in North-East Wales. While there has been some analysis of prosecutions in the Great Sessions during the episcopate of Bishop George Griffith, no such systematic work has been done for the rest of the period. Despite its prominent role within Welsh historiography, much of the discussion of prosecutions for religious dissent has been rather imprecise, relying solely on impressionistic evidence or concentrating on numbers of dissenters rather than undertaking thorough analyses of court records.¹²⁹ In many areas of England prosecutions were sporadic after 1660, increasing after the discovery of radical plots, but there is evidence to suggest that dissenters were prosecuted more regularly in Denbighshire and Flintshire.¹³⁰ Denbighshire Great Sessions rolls show regular presentments from 1660 to 1666, rather than peaking solely in years after plots. In 1665, the year of the Dale-Buffett plot, twenty-six people were presented by the High Constable of Bromfield, while in 1666 twenty-seven were reported.¹³¹ All of the resident bishops of St. Asaph in the period 1660 to 1688 enforced the laws against nonconformists, and it seems from the years 1660-5 that local officials, clergymen, and churchwardens also reported and presented Protestant nonconformists who did not attend their parish church.

¹²⁸ T. Richards, *Wales Under the Penal Code (1662-1687)* (1925), pp. 19, 41.

¹²⁹ Two of the only articles that use the Great Sessions records in order to discuss this kind of information are: G.M. Griffiths, 'The Restoration of St. Asaph: The Episcopate of Bishop George Griffith, 1660-6', *Publications of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, 13 (1963); G.M. Griffiths, 'Glimpses of Denbighshire in the Records of the Great Sessions', in *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society*, 22 (1973).

¹³⁰ A. Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 134-5, 200-201; Clark, 'Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire', pp. 241-2; T. Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (2006), p. 76.

¹³¹ Griffiths, 'The Restoration of St. Asaph', p. 30.

Reports of individual nonconformists are evident in surviving churchwardens' accounts and in the St. Asaph *Notitiae* ordered by Bishop William Lloyd in 1681.

Nonconformists' diaries and notebooks indicate ongoing harassment, as well as the arrests and imprisonment that occurred at times of national crisis.¹³² It is possible, therefore, to see the presentments in Griffith's episcopate as forming a pattern for those who followed him, this seems to imply a more persistent and regular persecution than elsewhere. Prosecutions for seditious words, holding conventicles, and absenting oneself from church were very regular in the early 1660s. At the Denbighshire Great Sessions in 1660, forty-five people from Denbigh, 15 from Gresford, and over 50 from Wrexham were presented for 'depraving the Book of Common Prayer or absence from divine service, and 27 were presented at the Quarter Sessions at Ruthin.¹³³ At the Flintshire Great Sessions three 'reputed Quakers' were prosecuted for non-attendance.¹³⁴ Quakers, more than any other sect, suffered long periods of imprisonment and harassment in Wales as elsewhere because of their reputation for radicalism and disregard for social norms and conventions.

Sometimes their behaviour did much to attract this sort of attention.¹³⁵ In 1663 Bryan Sixsmith, a Wrexham draper, sent Quaker pamphlets to the vicar and curate of Wrexham to be 'read and considered' by them. The authorities evidently suspected him of distributing more pamphlets, and of possessing more than those that were confiscated with him, but the sheer affront of attempting to convert the vicar and curate did not help his

¹³² Philip Henry described the widespread imprisonment of dissenters in 1663 and 1665, and 1683. He was imprisoned and examined on all of these instances. He also chronicled the harassment of nonconformist meetings and of individuals. His daughter Sarah described being pelted with stones and abused as 'Factious & Seditious' in 1686, although it is not clear precisely where she was at the time. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, pp. 74, 76, 77, 148-9, 173, 175-6; CRO, Z Basten/8: Diary of Sarah Savage, 1686-8; Richards, *Wales Under the Penal Code*, pp. 3, 14, 16-17.

¹³³ W. Jacob, 'Part II: 1660-1780', in N. Yates (ed.), *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603-1920* (Cardiff, 2007), p. 65.

¹³⁴ NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fo. 230v.

¹³⁵ R. Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 211-12; Harris, *Restoration*, pp. 301-3; B. Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (1985), pp. 105-6.

cause. A note at the bottom of the examination record states laconically, ‘Bryan Sicksmith is in prison’.¹³⁶ Due to their small number, most dissenters were known to the authorities, and were prosecuted repeatedly. Many of these were from former parliamentary families. Sharon Howard’s argument that the Restoration regime became more secure in the mid-1660s, however, is deeply flawed. Basing her argument on prosecutions for seditious words, she avers that the disloyal were marginalised and nonconformity suppressed by the mid-1660s, with the failure of the ‘Puritan revolution’ demonstrated by the small numbers and geographical range of dissent in North-East Wales. Although Howard’s book has a terminal date of 1730 she does not revisit prosecutions during later scares, for example the alleged Presbyterian plot of 1680 or the Rye House Plot of 1683.¹³⁷

More importantly, the successful repression of dissent was not manifest for the justices of the peace, Deputy Lieutenants, or ecclesiastical authorities of the region. The small number of dissenters was not as important as their potential intentions, or their ability to destabilise society should another rebellion succeed. Similarly, while dissenting numbers were small, they were committed to their cause. The imprisonment of Presbyterians, Quakers, and Baptists tended to result in feelings of vindication, passive suffering, or pity for the unenlightened rather than conversion to conformity, as did their extra-judicial harassment by the Anglican gentry.¹³⁸ While the range and numbers of Protestant nonconformists was

¹³⁶ The examining Deputy Lieutenants, Francis Manley and Robert Price, were both committed royalists and Anglicans in the Interregnum, and appear to have read the pamphlets prior to the examination. The phrase ‘for thy false Church and Worship’ was underlined in one of the pamphlets, providing a small insight into the concerns of Sixsmith’s interrogators. NLW, Chirk F 11538: Examination of Bryan Sixsmith, 21 Nov. 1663; Chirk F 11539: *Catechism for Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Doctors, Vicars, Curates and all Prelaticals for Them to Read in the Fear of the LORD GOD, and with a meek and quiet Spirit.* (1662); Chirk F 11540: *An Expostulation with the Bishops in England Concerning their Jurisdiction over the People of God, called QUAKERS.*

¹³⁷ Howard, *Law and Disorder in Early Modern Wales*, pp. 158-9.

¹³⁸ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, passim*; FRO, D/HE/494: William Cook to Elizabeth Edwards, Chester, 13 July 1674; D/HE/497: R. M. to Mrs Edwards, n.p., 11 Aug. 168; CRO, Z Basten/8: Diary of Sarah Savage, 1686-8.

small, this did not equal security in the minds of contemporary gentlemen or for national government.

Many of the Flintshire and Denbighshire justices were Anglican zealots and royalist veterans, such as the Denbighshire JPs Sir Geoffrey Shakerley and Sir John Robinson. This meant that, unlike English counties in which one active persecuting JP could be problematic for dissenters, there were more enthusiastic persecutors to share this role. In both counties there were few, if any, on the Bench who were disposed to aid dissenters or to soften the blows against them, as was commonplace in parts of England.¹³⁹ That these active JPs were resented by dissenters for the regularity and severity of their actions is plain from their diaries, notebooks, and almanacks. Philip Henry noted gleefully when severe persecutors died, as did Robert Salesbury of Henllan. In relation to one Vaughan of Llwydiart Henry wrote in 1661 that he was ‘a leper, & his name will rott’, of Mr. Bostock who had prosecuted ‘conventiclers’ in Llanrwst in 1663, that ‘God had cut him off, so let all thine enemyes perish’. Sir Evan Lloyd, described by Henry as ‘the first wheel... in our late trouble’ died in October 1663, with Henry’s avocation that ‘Verily thou art a God that judgest in ye earth’. Upon Sir John Salusbury’s death in 1684, Robert Salusbury noted ‘*Sic transit gloria mundi*’ while Mutton Davies occasioned the thought ‘Verily every man at his best state is altogether vanity’ in the same year.¹⁴⁰ In the vast majority of cases, the small dissenting population had few helpful kinship ties to aid them in times of difficulty. In Brecon, Henry Maurice was able to secure his release from prison with the aid of his North Welsh gentry family, but few nonconformists had kindred from such an ancient and

¹³⁹ Hutton, *The Restoration*, p. 210; J. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991), p. 55; Tapsell, *Personal Rule of Charles II*, pp. 71-2; Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, pp. 139-40; Holmes, *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire*, pp. 229-30.

¹⁴⁰ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, pp. 97, 144-5, 149; DRO, D/GA/1054: Almanac of Robert Salusbury.

powerful clan.¹⁴¹ Often tradesmen or minor gentry, their social status did not allow them to overcome the threat and stigma posed by their religious faith. The ‘ties of sociability’ that saved nonconformists elsewhere were much weaker in North-East Wales, and even when individual dissenters were well-established within local society their religious practices sometimes outweighed the impact of their lineage.¹⁴² In 1664, for example, Luke Lloyd, a gentleman of ancient family in Flintshire, was reported by Sir Thomas Hanmer to the authorities for his demeanour and behaviour in relation to the parish church.¹⁴³ A few individuals were able to petition influential friends and contacts like Bishop William Lloyd or Sir John Trevor for the release of fellow dissenters but this was seldom a success. More frequently it was only possible to pray for individuals and hope for better times – this is mentioned many times in letters from dissenters to friends and supporters.¹⁴⁴

Persecution clearly intensified at times of national crisis. It meant periods of imprisonment for any local nonconformists, rather than harassment, or financial or religious penalties. This reflected the depth of conservative fears about potential revolution or rebellion by dissenters. As Mark Goldie has argued, the Tories believed Catholicism would never pose a fundamental threat to so Protestant a nation.¹⁴⁵ Puritans, on the other hand, had proven by the Civil Wars that they did pose such a threat, and continued to do so in radical plots and with their hopes for further reformation of the Church.¹⁴⁶ Events such as Venner’s rebellion (1661), the Farnley Wood plot (1663), the Dale-Buffett plot (1665), the Presbyterian Plot (1680) or the Rye House Plot (1683) were, therefore, the necessary spur

¹⁴¹ R. Tudur Jones, ‘Relations between Anglicans and Dissenters: The Promotion of Piety, 1670-1730’, in D. Walker (ed.), *A History of the Church in Wales* (Bridgend, 1976), p. 82.

¹⁴² Tapsell, *Personal Rule of Charles II*, p. 78.

¹⁴³ NLW, Bettisfield 24: Sir Thomas Hanmer to Sir Job Charlton, Hanmer, 12 Mar. 1665.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. Bodl., MS Eng. letters e.29 fos 2-3: Philip Henry to Bishop William Lloyd, n.p., 25 Mar. 1682; FRO, D/HE/476: ‘R. H.’ to Elizabeth Edwards, n.p., 11 Aug. 1683.

¹⁴⁵ Goldie, ‘Politics and Religion in the Era of the *Entring Book*’, p. 4.

¹⁴⁶ G.S. de Krey, ‘Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-1682’, in D. B. Hamilton and R. Strier (eds), *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Restoration England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 232, 242.

to more concerted judicial action rather than evidence of an *increase* in anti-Puritan sentiment. News from London of the meetings of multitudes of nonconformists added further grist to the mill of Anglican JPs. In 1662 Henry Bodvel described gatherings of ‘anapablist, quakers & prisbitters factious & turbulent people’ in London, culminating on the Sabbath with another unauthorised gathering of the ‘giddie multitude’ whereby ‘many of these silly wretches beeing gathered to gather against authoritie & seuerall warninge given them, greate many of them appeard, where the soulders fell upon them and did cut & beate greate many of them’.¹⁴⁷ The very numbers involved in these gatherings prompted great anxiety about their seditious nature, particularly in London, the source of so much radicalism in the early 1640s. That so many were present also denoted an attack on the established Church.¹⁴⁸ This did not mean that anti-Puritan sentiment was any the less virulent amongst individuals at times of relative peace and calm. When they were not trying to prosecute dissenters, the North-East Welsh gentry demonstrated their discomfort in other ways. They denounced the behaviour of nonconformists in correspondence, mocked them, and a minority insulted or assaulted those they came across. In Flintshire some individuals took the harassment of nonconformists personally. Roger Puleston, for example, drew his sword on Philip Henry and his friends in January 1661, ‘& would needs fight saying wee were Traytors, swearing desperately’.¹⁴⁹

The ‘Presbyterian Character’

A brief case study of the treatment of Presbyterians reveals much about the persistence of anti-Puritan feeling in Restoration North-East Wales. Mark Goldie has described how in 1680s Tory polemic dissenters were associated with the outbreak of the Civil Wars, and in

¹⁴⁷ NLW, MS 9066E no 2355: Henry Bodvel to Maurice Wynn, n.p., 2 Sept. 1662.

¹⁴⁸ R.L. Greaves, *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1662-1677* (Stanford, 1990), pp. 126-7.

¹⁴⁹ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 75

using the term 'Presbyterian' as a slur, they intended to 'attach to the Whigs the indelible stain of inherited guilt for the bloodshed and anarchy' of the 1640s. Although the Presbyterians had actually fought for the restoration of the King in 1660 they were depicted as dangerous fanatics by Cavaliers from that point onwards.¹⁵⁰ The Presbyterian involvement in the parliamentary cause in the First Civil War, and the rewarding of several prominent Presbyterians for their part in the Restoration, caused long-lasting resentment amongst royalists who felt that the constancy of the Cavalier had not been rewarded. That Presbyterians themselves attempted to remind the nation of their contribution only exacerbated resentment.¹⁵¹ There was also frustration that those Presbyterians like Philip Henry, who vowed loyalty to the Crown and wished to be comprehended within the Church, became nonconformists rather than obey the Church. Presbyterians were blamed more, therefore, as moderates for causing the religious divisions within England than more radical nonconformists. Despite Henry's happiness at the Restoration, prayers for Comprehension, and attempts to negotiate with the episcopal authorities, he remained excluded from the Church.¹⁵² Although they were the most moderate of nonconformists, Presbyterians were the focus of particular ire nationally and in North-East Wales. In 1663 Sir Evan Lloyd, governor of Chester castle, outlined the reasons that the Anglican gentry had for fearing the Presbyterians in particular:

[they had become] necessitous & desperate in their fortunes, & were ever extremely malicious to the Cavaliers, & of such obstinate natures as not to be persuaded or gain'd by any Compliance with the Ecclesiasticall power in England these firebrands have such power not only over the Common sort of people of their persuasion... that they can lead them to what they please, & what they are like to doe is easily to be imagined.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Goldie, 'Politics and Religion in the Era of the *Entring Book*', pp. 6, 153-5.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

¹⁵² Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 84.

¹⁵³ CRO, ZCR 63/1/47/5: 'The importance of the City and Castle of Chester &c in 1663 by Sir Evan Lloyd, Bart., the governor of the Castle'.

Throughout the period North-East Welsh commentary on Presbyterians was unrelentingly negative. Only a month after the Restoration, Sir Richard Wynn wrote to his mother enclosing a pamphlet intended to show ‘how great an enemy Jack Presbyter is to the Government of the Church of England’, bemoaning his inability to enclose another, ‘the Presbyterian Character’, which was so popular that he could not obtain a copy.¹⁵⁴ Roger Puleston hung the Lords’ order to burn the Presbyterian covenant prominently in Worthenbury parish church in June 1661, apparently intending to bait his Puritan adversaries.¹⁵⁵ In February 1674 Thomas Mostyn’s anonymous North-East Welsh correspondent wrote sarcastically about Shaftesbury’s Bill for Comprehension, denouncing the several bishops who supported it as ‘Comprehension men’, and arguing that ‘Noe wonder if ye Geneua discipline thriue, when the Hierarchy it selfe is for it’. In his eyes, ‘[t]his Bill is to excuse them from renouncing their Darling Covenant; and taking from them Assent and Consent at our Prayers, when they come to Church; It being Baxters Great Maxime; That hee neuer says Amen to any thing hee reads in the Common Prayer’.¹⁵⁶ That the loyalist press characterised Baxter and his like as ‘the remnants of an Oliverian clerical caste’, alongside the references to the Covenant in this letter underlines the extent to which memory fortified anti-Presbyterian feeling.¹⁵⁷ William Salesbury referred to Samuel Butler’s satirical anti-Puritan and Presbyterian polemic *Hudibras* in his mocking of the attendees at the funerals of ‘Presbiterian holderforths’ Venning and Janeway in March 1674. Indeed Mark Goldie observes this as a tendency of Cavalier responses to dissent – to see ‘the people of 48’ as both ‘dangerous and defunct’.¹⁵⁸ In a lengthy dialogue written in the early 1680s Edward Lloyd traced the perfidy of the

¹⁵⁴ NLW, MS 9066E no 2240: Sir Richard Wynn to Lady Grace Wynn, n.p., 23 June 1660.

¹⁵⁵ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 89.

¹⁵⁶ MH, MS 9088 no 54: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 21 Feb. 1674.

¹⁵⁷ De Krey, ‘Reformation in the Restoration Crisis’, p. 246.

¹⁵⁸ M. Goldie, ‘The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England’, in O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel, and N. Tyacke (eds), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), p. 332.

Presbyterians back to the Long Parliament, characterising them as ‘fanaticks’ and ‘whisps’.¹⁵⁹ Mutton Davies wrote approvingly of his drinking companion’s toast (with the King) against Presbytery as much as popery in 1680, while Samuel Edgeley expressed his surprise that a 1687 Presbyterian address of thanks for James II’s Declaration praised it for ‘restoring God to his power over the Consciences of men... as if the stablished Lawes had hindred his Empire over the iudgement & Conscience’.¹⁶⁰ Even Bishop William Lloyd, who until the Rye House Plot was prepared to debate and negotiate with dissenters, wrote disparagingly in late 1682 of the aged Vicar of Wrexham that he ‘was a Presbyterian in the late times, & still halts on that foot’.¹⁶¹ The gentry of North-East Wales were in turns mocking and fearful of Presbyterians. They blamed them for undermining the Church, and satirised them as ‘Disciplinarians’ – those who were too ‘precise’ for their own good. The news they received only confirmed their opinion. They condemned Presbyterians from the 1640s onwards, and continued to do so even at times of anti-Catholic hysteria, harkening back to the threat they had posed during times of Civil War.

Persecution or education?

Neither the Church of England nor its gentry supporters saw their treatment of Protestant nonconformists as persecution. Grant Tapsell has described their ‘shared mental framework that was profoundly historical, and which put a particular premium on the “primitive purity” of the early Church’. As the early Church had been persecuted, persecution was wrong, and evidence of ‘popish’ or tyrannical behaviour.¹⁶² At least by the 1680s, the dominant strand in theological thinking on this issue was that religious coercion was ‘a justifiable and effective instrument of education and persuasion’. The secular

¹⁵⁹ NLW, Sweeney A4: Letterbook of Edward Lloyd.

¹⁶⁰ NLW, MS 6272C: Copy letter, Mutton Davies to Thomas Edwards, n.p., 12 Mar. 1680; MS 1551E no 22: Samuel Edgeley to ?Robert Davies, Acton, 11 May 1687.

¹⁶¹ Bodl., MS Tanner 146 fo. 33: Bishop William Lloyd to Archbishop Sancroft, n.p., 24 Nov. 1682.

¹⁶² Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II*, p. 66.

magistrate was the ‘helpmeet’ of the Church, rather than an arbitrator in matters ecclesiastical. Those who proposed this idea used the writings of Augustine as an authority, and Augustine gave legitimacy to civil coercion for spiritual sanctions. The prosecution and harassment of dissenters, therefore, was a form of habit-breaking, a charitable act to correct those who held sincere but mistaken views, through family, their social milieu, or their education.¹⁶³ Clearly dissenters or tolerationists did not agree. Occasionally the use of debate and persuasion by the clergy and the hierarchy gives an insight into the basis of such arguments in North-East Wales. Thomas Edwards, engaged in a debate with Dr. David Lloyd of St. Asaph about conformity and church government in 1685, accused the Church openly of collaborating with secular authorities to persecute dissenters:

you are for delivering dissenters up to the secular power & soe thinke to escape the charge of being persecutors, but I thinke it will noe more free you from it then the High Priests giving up Christ to Pilate & by rendring him as an enemy to Caesar, to make him obnoxious to the fury of the people, & the unjust judgment that befell him.¹⁶⁴

Edwards was responding to a letter of Lloyd’s. Lloyd had evidently claimed that compliance to the Church’s rules was necessary, and that people such as Edwards should not dabble in issues so significant as religious division. Edwards took issue with Erastian arguments regarding ‘things indifferent’, and the importance of complying with the civil authorities in those ‘things’. He argued that ‘what difference (as to consequence) is there betwixt saying Rulers may enjoyne us to worship an idol, & it belongs onely to Rulers to judge what is an idol?’¹⁶⁵ He described the ‘blind zeale’ common amongst those with whom he discussed religion, in telling him to conform to the strictures of the Church. When he disagreed, they ‘forthwith exclaime against us, as proud, wilfull, schismaticall, seditious, they represent us & reproach us as people unworthy to live’. Edwards portrayed this

¹⁶³ Goldie, ‘Theory of Religious Intolerance’, pp. 334, 337, 346-7.

¹⁶⁴ FRO, D/HE/502: Draft letter of Thomas Edwards to Dr. David Lloyd, Rhual, 11 Aug. 1685.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

argument as the result of a desire to prove themselves true sons of the Church by giving to the Church ‘a transcendant, Magisterial, uncontrollable power as Jesus Xt never invested her with’. This gives an important insight into the way that dissenting gentlemen were treated in North-East Wales.¹⁶⁶ Persuasion and debate were attempted first, before frustration rapidly emerged. It also demonstrates that action against nonconformists was not just limited to the courtroom. High churchmen in North-East Wales, therefore, debated with their nonconformist foes using the arguments and references of the divines engaging in that debate on the national stage. What is significant in Edwards’s case is that there were very few other nonconformists in his region for him from whom he could seek support, and many Anglican Tories to try and persuade him that he was wrong. Edwards, grandson of the royalist and Anglican Evan Edwards of Rhual, was very much in a minority amongst the gentry for attacking the behaviour of the Church. The only other gentleman that described the Presbyterians, for example, as ‘persecuted’ was the Country peer Lord Herbert of Chirbury, writing a quip to his brother-in-law Sir Richard Wynn in 1662 – although even he was prepared to use it as an insult, declaring in 1664 that Mounsier Myddelton was ‘growne a more dammed Presbiterian then euer & a most ill natu’d Wretch’.¹⁶⁷

Puritans and Protestant nonconformists were more vulnerable to ill-treatment than any other group in North-East Wales. Unlike other regions, their persecution seems to have been relatively frequent, and they were the source of significant fear and panic during moments of crisis. They were very much in the minority, and while that was true in many

¹⁶⁶ Philip Henry experienced similar treatment in the early 1660s at the hands of the Hanmers. This sort of experience was not confined to the gentry – John Morgan of Argoed in Flintshire was prosecuted in the Great Sessions of 1660 for assaulting one Robert Evans ‘by throwing a cup of drinke in his face for refusing to drinke accessive healths and for calling the said Robert a fenaticke knaue’. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 94; NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fo. 232.

¹⁶⁷ NLW, MS 9066E no 2348: Lord Herbert to Sir Richard Wynn, Llysin, 5 June 1662; NLW MS 9067E no 2403: Lord Herbert to Sir Richard Wynn, Keven-y-Werne, 26 June 1664.

other areas, Puritans generally lacked the local roots and connections that their fellow believers found so useful elsewhere. There was a dearth of powerful gentry or noble supporters, and they were only infrequently connected via kinship to conformist families who could protect them. Memories of the Civil War and Interregnum, of ‘foreign’ invasion and religious instability, only fuelled this estrangement. While local Catholics were not seen as a foreign element operating within local society, Puritans were, and their political and religious proclivities were the focus of a deep mistrust. This dated back not just to the Civil War, but to a centuries-long mistrust of those imposing power from the outside on local authorities.

IV: Conclusion

The religious attitudes and behaviour of the North-East Welsh gentry were complex, and interwoven intimately with their approach to kinship and politics. They tended to be tolerant of practices which were ancient or long-established. They were as reluctant to persecute Catholics for their religious practices as they were to enact orders that went against tradition in the political sphere. While that was the case, they were also extremely loyal to the Church of England as an institution. The gentry protected its rituals and they personnel, and supported parish churches and cathedrals. This was partly due to a desire to maintain (or re-establish) the stable and ordered society described in chapter one. A desire to protect this balanced society, and the Church’s place within it, is visible at key points throughout the seventeenth century. When pushed to decide whether the Stuart monarchy or the Church was more important, the gentry reluctantly chose the Church. The Church was seen as a Welsh institution, and promoted by the Welsh as such. This historic connection between the Welsh and the Church of England helped to establish a distinct identity for them within the Three Kingdoms. It made protection of the Church even more vital.

Unlike other regions, Catholics fared better outside of the Interregnum. If they belonged to a gentry family or their immediate dependents, they were protected by their Protestant kindred. If they did not, it does not seem like the authorities made concerted efforts to find them out or prevent their worship. The frustration of central government at the slow progress in North-East Wales in relation to recusancy is consistent throughout the period. Catholics (wherever they existed on the spectrum of recusant, occasional conformist, or church papist) were part of the community, and continued to maintain relationships with the Protestant families of the area. They maintained normal family relationships, socialising and arguing frequently. It was only at times of political crisis that they were under threat, and even then this was mitigated by their Protestant allies, and the worst of the impact softened. This was not generally the case with Puritans or Protestant nonconformists. There were very few Puritan gentry, and those that existed were either minor gentry or families who had recently moved into the region. They lacked the family connections or heritage to minimise the impact of persecution. Puritan sects were also viewed as a political threat locally in a way that Catholics tended not to be. In the eyes of the gentry they were responsible for the worst events and policies of the 1640s and 1650s, and their repression was ultimately necessary to create stability.

Religion in Wales was deeply influenced by historical perception and narratives, Welsh identity, and a mistrust of any potential destabilising forces. In their mid to late-seventeenth-century religious behaviour the North-East gentry attempted to navigate their way through turbulent seas. They did this by protecting what they saw as the core of their religion, and their kindred. The region began the period as one strongly supportive of a traditional and conservative Church, and ended it even more convinced of the value of those beliefs and that institution.

Chapter 3: Political life, culture, and good governance in North-East Wales

North-East Welsh political culture in the period 1640 to 1688 emphasised continuity, conformity, social coherence, and order. It aimed to perpetuate the strongly territorial, patriarchal and kin-based system that had survived in varying forms since the medieval period, with ‘ancestral patriotism’ a core motivating force.¹ It was strongly localist, reacting to national events, mostly when they threatened to impinge on the way of life in the region, but was also reliably loyal to the monarchy in general and to the Stuarts specifically. Their political values caused the North-East Welsh gentry to react differently to the seventeenth-century politico-religious crises than many in England – more uniformly, frequently in a less politically partisan manner, and generally in a highly conservative way. Throughout the seventeenth century the North-East Welsh gentry protected their language, culture, and heritage, and fought to prevent changes to their traditional political structures. This was not motivated by an ethnically-driven anti-Englishness. Wales had a separate identity but the North-East Welsh gentry saw it as being complementary to, and part of, a wider ‘England’ or as we would say now, ‘Britain’.

This culture of continuity had an overwhelming influence on politics in North-East Wales from 1640 to 1688. It meant that electoral practice lacked the conflict visible in English local politics after the Long Parliament, and that partisan politics did not develop meaningfully in the region within the period. North-East Welsh political culture led to a nearly uniform allegiance to the king in the First Civil War, and the remarkable survival of royalism during the Interregnum. Whereas national events in the late 1670s and 1680s led to political division in neighbouring Cheshire, the reaction in North-East Wales was

¹ S. Evans, “‘To contynue in my bloud and name’: Reproducing the Mostyn Dynasty, c.1540-1692’ (Univ. of Aberystwyth PhD thesis, 2013), p. 9.

significantly more muted. Only when local harmony and political traditions were threatened, such as in 1686-8, did the North-East Welsh gentry react sharply. As in 1642, they acted in order to protect the existing situation in local governance and religion, rather than to push for change. Unfortunately in 1688 this meant the temporary fall of one of the main pillars of Welsh political ideology: loyalty to the Stuart monarchs. Although the North-East Welsh gentry hoped that James II would change course rather than be deposed, the level of Jacobitism in the area after 1688 indicated that even this temporary diversion in the cause of self-protection was the cause of regret.

This chapter will examine the political actions, ideas, and material culture of Welsh politics. It will explore North-East Welsh electoral practices, and their actions and reactions in the period 1640 to 1688. In examining political ideas and material culture, the chapter will also consider the expression of North-East Welsh politics. In doing so, it will provide insights into a strongly conservative and conformist localist political culture and consider reasons why such a political culture survived throughout the upheavals of the seventeenth century.

I. Elections, partisans, and professions of loyalty

Elections in North-East Wales

In North-East Wales elections were a question of selection, and contests were extremely rare. As such, they largely conform to the pattern observed by Mark Kishlansky. His argument was that before 1640 English elections were not genuine contests involving a political choice. The contests that occurred happened only when something had gone wrong. Otherwise gentlemen accorded one of their peers a social honour by choosing them as MP, a reflection of community solidarity.² After 1640 in England, there were more

² M.A. Kishlansky, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 15-19.

contested elections, the electorate became broader and more independent, and candidates were forced to vie for public support. According to David Zaret, national perspectives on politics weakened the electorate's traditional deference to local elites.³ There is no question that selection was also the norm in North-East Wales up to 1640, or that the gentry agreed that one of their number would be given the honour of representing their county or boroughs. A.H. Dodd declared that he knew of no contested elections before Elizabeth's reign, and that they were 'exceptional for a century after that'.⁴ This is where the similarities end. North-East Wales breaks from the English pattern established by Kishlansky in that contested elections did not increase from 1640 onwards. None of the North-East Welsh seats were contested in the elections of 1640, and only the 1679 Flintshire and Denbigh borough elections appear to have raised any contest after 1640.⁵ Neither does it appear that the region's traditional deference to the local elites was weakened. Historians have contended that local issues relating to precedence, pride, and a touchiness regarding local domination were at stake in these rare contested elections – not national politics.⁶

An examination of election-related correspondence makes it clear why there were so few contests. As discussed in chapters one and two, community solidarity in North-East Wales remained strong until the end of the seventeenth century. Although family feuds were relatively common, parliamentary elections were occasions to display community cohesion. If the majority of the gentry families supported one candidate, they were chosen before the

³ D. Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton, N. J., 2000), pp. 77-9.

⁴ A.H. Dodd, *Studies in Stuart Wales* (Cardiff, 1957), p. 178.

⁵ *HOP 1660-1690*, I, 510-13; A.H. Dodd, 'Flintshire Politics in the Seventeenth Century', *FHSP*, 14 (1954 for 1953-4), pp. 43-4; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished articles on Denbigh Boroughs, Denbighshire, Flint Boroughs, and Flintshire for 1640-60 section. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see these articles in draft.

⁶ Dodd, *Studies in Stuart Wales*, p. 178; J.K. Gruenfelder, 'The Wynns of Gwydir and Parliamentary elections in Wales, 1604-40', *WHR*, 9 (1978), p. 121; P.D.G. Thomas, 'Parliamentary Elections in Brecknockshire', *Brycheiniog*, 6 (1960), p. 100; P.D.G. Thomas, 'Wynnstay versus Chirk Castle: parliamentary elections in Denbighshire, 1716-41', *NLWJ*, 11 (1959), p. 105.

election. The broad process was as follows: news or rumours of an election arrived in Wales; interested individuals considered whether to stand; their allies either tried to persuade them to stand or to support other candidates; families allied to each other pledged to support one candidate; a meeting of the gentry was called to decide on the chosen candidate. If a candidate was not chosen then, the rounds of negotiations between family ‘interests’ would continue until one individual was selected. In Flintshire, for example, the Davieses of Gwysaney were allied with the Mostyns, and had the support of the powerful earls of Derby behind them. In 1661, Derby wrote to his tenants and the gentry of Flintshire asking them to ‘hearken to my advice in disposing of your votes in the choyce of Members to serve for your Country in the next parliament.’ He recommended that they ‘appeare at the Election and bestow your votes as Robert Davis esq the late High Sheriffe of your County shall direct, and for such persons as he shall nominate’.⁷ In 1675 Mutton Davies refused to support Sir Roger Whitley or Sir John Trevor against the Mostyn interest in the rumoured election, and undertook to persuade his connections to do the same.⁸ At Chirk in the same year, the steward was ordered to ‘neglect noe opportunity to engage as many of the Countrey freeholders as you can’. Six prominent gentlemen had already been engaged for Chirk, and answers awaited from two more.⁹

There was an element of speed involved in the construction of alliances. As a result, correspondents sought to send the freshest election news to their allies as quickly as possible. News of election writs and the death or promotion of elected members, or conjecture based on foreign events, was sufficient to cause intense negotiations.¹⁰ Even if

⁷ NLW, Gwysaney 13: The earl of Derby to his tenants and ‘frends’, Chester, 8 Apr. 1661.

⁸ MH, MC vol. I no 38: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, Leeswood, 23 Dec. 1675; MC vol. I no 37: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 30 Nov. 1675.

⁹ NLW, Chirk E 6090: Peter ffoulks to Thomas Prichard, London, 23 Dec. 1675.

¹⁰ For example: NLW, Chirk E 6097: Robert Werden to Sir Thomas Myddelton, London, 4 Feb. 1679; Chirk E 6145: Sir Thomas Myddelton to Thomas Prichard, n.p., 30 Nov. 1675; MS 9069E no 2731: Dorothy Wynn

families had long been pledged (by kinship or alliance) to support each other, it was possible for others to engage their loyalty if they asked quickly, or if they were slow to declare their intention of standing. Thus in 1678 Edward Petre wrote to apologise for not being able to provide Thomas Mostyn with more support, since ‘all the neighbours are already engaged to Mrs DAVIS, who as we hear stands for Sir John Hanmer, and Sir John Conway’. He explained his failure as follows: ‘I am hartlye sorrye Sr Roger or you had not appeared sooner, then your freinds could haue beene more actiue & prosperous in your seruice’.¹¹ Speed was important because once a gentleman’s interest was engaged for one candidate, it was very difficult to persuade him to change his mind. It was extremely shameful to withdraw from an electoral alliance. As Thomas Bulkeley wrote in 1675, for a gentleman to do so (in this case his brother Lord Bulkeley) was to ‘violate his promise’, and would be a source of guilt and shame.¹² A gentleman could seldom bestow his vote and interest if he was already engaged by someone else. Only in rare circumstances was such a withdrawal honourable. Sir John Trevor thanked Evan Edwards for standing by his son, ‘when so many of his frindes fayled him’ in April 1660.¹³ The Trevors had been keen participants in Interregnum politics. It is unsurprising, therefore, that their allies withdrew their support at the same time as they were removing intruded ministers and prosecuting clergyman who refused to use the Prayer Book.

A meeting of the gentry was generally requested before an election. Robert Davies presented such events as ‘no way thought of so amicable, as a meeting before the Election, and I beleive euery body will approue of that method’.¹⁴ They were also a method by which

to Lady Grace Wynn, n.p., 4 Dec. 1675; MS 9066E no 2265: Sir Thomas Myddelton to Sir Richard Wynn, n.p., 24 Nov. 1660.

¹¹ MH, MC vol. II no 22: Edward Petre to Thomas Mostyn, n.p, n.d.

¹² MH, MC vol. II no 39: Thomas Bulkeley to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 30 Dec. 1675.

¹³ FRO, D/HE/478: Sir John Trevor to Evan Edwards, n.p., 5 Apr. 1660.

¹⁴ NLW, Chirk E 1081: Robert Davies to Sir Richard Myddelton, Llanerch, 8 Dec. 1688.

the promise of an interest could be acknowledged and thanks given in person, no doubt with food and drink.¹⁵ This type of meeting was referred to by Mutton Davies as a ‘convention of the states of that Country’ in 1675.¹⁶ Davies’s metaphor is highly appropriate here, as these gentry meetings were viewed as a way for the principal men of the ‘country’ to discuss problematic decisions and to prevent a contest. Contested elections were expensive and troublesome. They created unnecessary friction, and meetings were one way to prevent them.¹⁷ After the fractious Denbighshire election of 1681, in which Sir John Trevor had used a legal loophole to prevent Richard Myddelton standing, the Crown was determined to prevent another occasion for division. James II ordered Trevor and Myddelton to compose their differences in 1685. Beaufort, acting as the king’s messenger, made his own feelings plain on the matter – he who thought to oppose the king on this matter was neither a ‘good subject, a good Brittan nor a good Christian’.¹⁸ The focus of election discourse was on creating consensus – even if ultimately only one candidate could be chosen, this was to be achieved with the minimum of discord.

It is interesting that this system of electoral alliances remained active even in the Interregnum. Patrick Little and David Smith argued that electoral choice became more ideologically driven in the Interregnum than before the Civil Wars but this does not appear to have been the case in North-East Wales.¹⁹ In all of the Protectoral elections the candidates were selected for their social status or connections to gentry families, despite the Instrument of Government’s ban on delinquents voting.²⁰ Supporters of the several candidates nevertheless tried frantically to solicit the votes and interests of the royalist

¹⁵ NLW, Add MS 469E no. 1: Thomas Myddelton to Sir Richard Wynn, n.p., 25 Mar. 1660.

¹⁶ MH, MC vol. I no 38: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, Leeswood, 23 Dec. 1675.

¹⁷ NLW, Chirk E 1084: Eubule Thelwall senior to Sir Richard Myddelton, Ruthin, 3 Dec. 1688.

¹⁸ NLW, Chirk E 51: Duke of Beaufort to Sir John Wynn, n.p., 1685.

¹⁹ P. Little and D.L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Interregnum* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 49.

²⁰ S.R. Gardiner (ed.), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1889), p. 318.

gentry notwithstanding their awareness of the restrictions imposed by the Instrument. In 1654 John Peck wrote to his master Sir John Trevor that ‘the Cavileares that hath benne in armes here had moste of there tenantes in armes with them and there fore wilbe fearefull to vote for feare of the acte in that Case provided’.²¹ Nevertheless, Peck made significant effort to solicit the votes of the almost exclusively royalist county elites for his patron’s son. He wrote to the friends and family of key individuals to ask them to use their influence, for example in this case against Sir Roger Mostyn: ‘I doe intend to wright unto my lady Moston to lay hir Comands upon the Cononoll hir sonne in case shee hath anie intereste in him: as alsoe hir other frinds’.²² He used the same approach with the Hanmer, Conway, Eyton, Hope, Edwards, and Lloyd families. Peck used his patron’s kin connections, money, and influence to persuade these families to back his candidate.²³ This election was conducted in a similar way, therefore, to those before and after the Interregnum – driven primarily by the interest of the gentry families. The candidates were all politically ‘sound’ in the eyes of central government, but behind the scenes the traditional ruling gentry chose the successful MP. This pattern appears to have repeated itself in 1656. Roger Mostyn and Robert Davies, for example, kept the Mostyn-Gwysaney alliance alive, agreeing to ‘goe both one way hand in hand about this Election of Parliament men’ in 1656.²⁴ Geraint Jenkins argued that the lack of controversy in the 1656 election was due to fear of the ‘sword’ of the Major-Generals breeding loyalty and obedience – in fact this evidence suggests that what actually caused electoral calm was the resort to the traditional system of gentry electoral alliances.²⁵

²¹ FRO, D/G/3276 no 90: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 7 Feb. 1654.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ FRO, D/G/3276 no 93: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 24 Feb. 1654; D/G/3276 no 92: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 15 Feb. 1654; D/G/3276 no 97: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 1 July 1654; D/G/3276 no 98: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 29 July 1654.

²⁴ NLW, Gwysaney 42B: Sir Roger Mostyn to Robert Davies, Gloddaeth, 12 July 1656.

²⁵ G.H. Jenkins, *The Foundations of Modern Wales: Wales, 1642-1780* (Oxford, 1987), p. 35.

The continuity of some aspects of the medieval Welsh kinship and territorial system, discussed in chapter one, created a strong desire for conformity and a great degree of cohesion. The heads of each kindred, estate, and (in the case of elections) county would meet together and make a decision as to who would serve them in the coming parliament. Until the end of the seventeenth century, the office of MP would circulate between the dominant families of the region, seldom providing an opportunity for outsiders to compete. When this broke down into a contest, the fight was bitter and costly, and it usually led to lengthy and often futile litigation. Vitally, this kin-based system helped to minimise the impact of party politics, as the political beliefs of an individual candidate were subordinated to his family's ability to mobilise their kin and neighbours in his favour. There are no hints of party politics in North-East Welsh elections, at least in terms of the wearing of coloured ribbons (e.g. green to support the Whigs). This is not to say that ideology or political ideas were absent from North-East Wales. Where ideology emerged, however, it was in the determination to fight off the 'court' favoured candidate, for example in Denbighshire in 1681. Local independence was valued above party politics.

Partisanship and party politics

Partisanship is viewed by historians as a national, rather than a metropolitan, phenomenon from the late 1670s onwards, as relevant to the localities as London.²⁶ Although North-East Welsh gentlemen were certainly not ignorant of party politics, they have left only limited explicit traces of supporting either party. This did not result from the existence of a moderate party, as identified by Miller in Restoration Norwich.²⁷ As discussed above, North-East Welsh MPs continued to be selected and unity was favoured over partisan

²⁶ Although others dispute this and emphasise continuity within local politics rather than the rapid development of partisanship. G. Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 198; M. Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005), p. 3; P. Gauci, *Politics and Society in Great Yarmouth* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 130, 152.

²⁷ J. Miller, 'Containing Division in Restoration Norwich', *EHR*, 121 (2006), pp. 1046-7.

contests. A North-East Welsh gentleman was not chosen to represent his county or borough because he *thought* a particular way or had certain opinions, unless to resist an externally imposed court candidate. Why, then, were party politics so slow to develop? Two principal interconnecting factors help to answer this question. First, the region did not develop partisan politics because only one ‘side’ had sufficient political foothold. Although there were Whigs (and dissenters) in North-East Wales, they were vastly outnumbered by those who disagreed fundamentally with their ideas. The interests of this group were much more sympathetic with the Tories. It is much more apparent that there was a Tory or conservative spectrum in North-East Wales than that there was a Whig/Tory divide. When negative opinions were expressed, they targeted the luxury and greed of the courtiers or the trouble-making tendencies of the Green Ribbon Club or the Whigs. The first criticism related to the impact on their finances – the North-East Welsh gentry resented paying taxes raised, in their minds, to fund the extravagances of the Court. This was a long-standing complaint. Sarah Wynn, for example, described courtiers as ‘greedy cormorants... neuer well but when they are sucking the blood of the common wealth’, in relation to a proposed (but thwarted) land tax in 1669.²⁸ Dislike of Whig or proto-Whig activities tended to be more straightforwardly related to national political or religious issues. Partisanship needed two effective groupings in order to thrive, and this was not the case in North-East Wales.

Second, local traditions and culture emphasised order and stability, continuity and heritage, at the expense of change. If these traditions survived the Civil Wars and Interregnum, there would need to be a seismic shift in opinion for them to fade in the Restoration. If anything, the events of 1640 to 1660 had made Welsh conservatism more, rather than less,

²⁸ NLW, MS 9068E no 2577: Sarah Wynn to Sir Richard Wynn, Gwydir, 28 Feb. 1669.

entrenched. The Civil Wars and Interregnum confirmed for the North-East Welsh gentry that any divergence from tradition in politics, religion, and society led to chaos and disorder. Although there was a very strong interest in national political affairs, therefore, there was little impetus for implementing change in the region itself, which remained overwhelmingly localist in its politics. Indeed it is ironic that the possession of information relating to political change in London could be used to reinforce the traditional order in Wales. Those with access to fresh news were the traditional elites, who used their knowledge to reinforce their authority within their social circles. A well-connected gentleman with access to the ‘treasure’ of fresh news could, as Mutton Davies wrote in 1677:

entertain my neighbours yet a fortnight for news like fashions may be fresh in the country though stale at London, and an act of Parliament cry’d in euery street with you, may make me passe for a man of intelligence here.²⁹

The weakness of party politics was further reinforced by an enthusiasm for conservative political values nurtured by the Crown rather than its opponents. This was expressed consistently in a language of loyalty aimed at conforming the reputation of the Welsh as the Crown’s most loyal subjects.

The language of loyalty

The North-East Welsh gentry prioritised loyalty to the Stuart monarchs, their country, and their peers above all other political values. Loyalty was referenced in letters, poems, proclamations, and narratives from 1640 to 1688. It was frequently used as a rhetorical tool, but also featured in more personal reflections. As a significant expression of loyalty, royalism was woven into the fabric and society of North-East Wales – in the sense of ‘loyalism’ and ‘royalism’. In the more general sense of political ‘loyalism’, the functioning of

²⁹ MH, MC vol. II no 5: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Apr. 1677.

the conservative and ‘vertically-integrated’ system depended on the existence of local, regional, and national patriarchs.³⁰ If the monarch was at risk, so was the power and authority of those beneath him. If that was in question, so was the maintenance of order and the public peace.

Loyalty was a powerful rhetorical device. It was increasingly used in bardic poetry from the mid-sixteenth century, and was seen as part of ‘good virtue’. If a Welsh gentleman was a good subject, he would be loyal to the monarch, and would enforce loyalty on his dependents in order to maintain a stable society. If he was of good virtue he would inspire loyalty towards himself from his tenants and kindred, perpetuating a strong dynastic community. This rhetoric combined ancient Welsh values of dynastic rule and community stability with the demands of the post-Acts of Union political climate – loyal service to the Crown.³¹ Peter Lord described loyalty to the monarch as a ‘central pillar of Welsh self-perception’.³² Given the cultural capital invested in loyalty, therefore, it is unsurprising that it became a vital part of Welsh self-representation before the Civil Wars. From 1642 Charles I used loyalty as a central rhetorical feature of his speeches, letters, and proclamations to all of his subjects. He contrasted the ‘loyalty & affections’ of the royalists with the treacherous malignancy and ‘cunninge practices’ of the opposition.³³ This created a binary opposition between open, honest, and loyal royalists and sneaky, treacherous and dishonest parliamentarians that was to become a mainstay of royalist propaganda and poetry. There are signs that Charles tailored his approaches to the Welsh in order to appeal to their self-proclaimed loyalty to the Crown and Church. In a letter to the sheriffs of

³⁰ Lloyd Bowen uses the term ‘vertically-integrated’ to refer to Welsh communication processes, but it is equally applicable to the system of governance. L. Bowen, ‘Information, Language, and Political Culture in Early Modern Wales’, *Pe&P*, 228: 1 (2015), p. 128.

³¹ J.G. Jones, *Concepts of Order and Gentility* (Llandysul, 1992), pp. 52, 75, 77.

³² P. Lord, *Words with pictures: Welsh Images and Images of Wales in the Popular Press, 1640-1860* (Aberystwyth, 1995), p. 45.

³³ FRO, D/DM/271 no 1: Charles I to gentry of ‘these two counties’, c. Aug. 1642.

North-East Wales Charles appealed to Welshmen affronted by parliamentary propaganda, arguing that ‘such as conscientiously remember there loyalty to me there soueraine are reviled, persecuted, and declared traytors’. He described those who defended the Prayer Book and Church as suffering similar treatment, aiding in the creation of a narrative of patient suffering that was nourished by royalists during the Interregnum.³⁴ Their affection and fidelity, he wrote later, would be ‘at all tymes remember to there advantage’, and the Civil War county military association between Denbighshire, Flintshire, Chester, Shropshire, and Montgomeryshire praised as a ‘great expression’ of loyalty.³⁵ It is unsurprising that Welsh royalist leaders echoed this language in their own official documents, including the petition to the king in 1642 and the North Welsh ‘Protestation and oath’ tendered to all in parish churches.³⁶

This prioritisation of loyalty was a constant whenever North-East Welsh gentlemen addressed the monarch, either in person or in written form. In 1681 Mutton Davies, upon meeting Charles II, thanked him for his care with the Irish Cattle Bill, saying ‘the loyallest part of the Kingdom were infinitely oblig’d to his Majesty’.³⁷ North-East Welsh loyal addresses took pains to stress just how loyal the king’s subjects were in the region. In one address from Flint in 1681, the gentry professed themselves ‘most Dutiful and Loyal’, as acknowledging the importance of ‘the most constant Loyalty to our Prince’, and ‘they Humbly and Loyally profess’ their satisfaction with the Declaration and the Irish Cattle Bill, and signed it ‘Your Majesties most Dutiful, Loyal, and Obedient Subjects and

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ D/DM/271 no 47: Charles I to the gentry of Flintshire, Derby, 15 Sept. 1642; D/DM/271 no 54: Copy letter of Charles I to High Sheriff of Flintshire, Oxford, 27 Dec. 1642.

³⁶ BL, Harley 1980 fo. 76v: The Humble Petition of the Gentry and Ministers and freeholders of the County of flint; Add MS 46399A fo. 78: A Protestation and oath to be taken by the Inhabitants of the Sixe Counties of Northwales.

³⁷ NLW, Gwysaney 41B: Mutton Davies to Thomas Edwards, n.p., 12 Mar. 1681.

servants'.³⁸ Clearly the public profession or display of loyalty was the object behind such addresses. As Mark Knights has observed, loyal addresses were part of a national culture in which boroughs and counties were expected to participate visibly – a way of making political loyalty measurable.³⁹ There were at least three other occasions when North-East Welsh counties made such addresses – abhorrences against Shaftesbury's Association in 1682, after the Rye House Plot in 1683, and at the accession of James II in 1685. In 1682 the address referred back to the 1681 document, aiming to reinforce a sense of the continuing loyalty of the county. Using the hyperbolic language typical of these documents, it abhorred the 'intended hellish Association', and pledged the service of Flintshire, 'who as ever addicted to the Service of Your Father, the Royal Martyr, so are always ready to attest the same, when Your Commands should call us to it'. The Flintshire and Denbigh addresses of 1682, and those of 1683, harkened back to the 1650s as the source of the possible consequences of 'Traiterous Conspiracies' and 'rebellion', including 'modelling Old Covenants into new Associations'.⁴⁰

These are termed 'inherently electioneering texts' by Knights.⁴¹ The language is notable for mirroring earlier professions of loyalty. Welshmen had been declaring since 1642 that they would lay down their lives and estates for their monarch: not just directly to the king, or publicly, but also in private letters and in poetry. If it was rhetorical hyperbole, it was certainly consistent across the entire period. The later declarations of loyalty were closely connected in terms of phrasing and vocabulary to those presented before the First Civil

³⁸ *Vox Angliae: or, The Voice of the Kingdom* (1682) 2nd pag., p. 11.

³⁹ Knights, *Representation or Misrepresentation*, p. 136.

⁴⁰ *London Gazette*, 4-8 May 1682, p. 3; *London Gazette*, 1-4 May 1682, p. 4; *London Gazette*, 25-29 Oct. 1683, p. 1.

⁴¹ While this may be true, none of the North-East Welsh texts mention returning loyal MPs, as was common elsewhere. Perhaps, as discussed above, the assumption was that they would. Knights, *Representation or Misrepresentation*, p. 144.

War. While every county was declaring its loyalty in the 1680s, it had long been an integral aspect of Welsh self-representation.

Welsh gentlemen made loyalty professions to their political superiors – the Lord Lieutenants – and received them from their dependents, particularly those seeking financial aid. Robert Davies III of Gwysaney was complimented by the Earl of Derby in 1661 for his ‘loyaltie to his Prince’, as was Robert Davies IV by Beaufort in September 1688. Davies had been removed from his local positions as Justice of the Peace and Deputy Lieutenant because of his negative answers to James II’s Three Questions survey in early 1688.

Hoping to woo Davies back to local government, Beaufort praised ‘the Loyall & hearty expressions you made mee att Ludlow of your readiness & Zeale to serve his Majestie’.⁴²

Indeed loyalty was seen as a dynastic attribute as much as a personal value, within Welsh families and when they approached others. In 1684 Sir Roger Mostyn attempted to persuade Beaufort that Peter Pennant rather than Thomas Whitley should be appointed Militia Captain for Mold and Hawarden, on the basis of ‘his Grandfather haveing been a Maijor under mee all the warr in the Late King’s Services, of a Loyall family, and a worthy Gentleman’.⁴³ Notably it was Pennant’s family’s dynastic loyalty that was prioritised over his individual worth, as it was in Welsh praise poetry and elegies of the period. While they mourned the deceased, they praised the next generation and referred back to the distant past, connecting the lineage together and associating it with their primary values. Elegies to Hugh Wynne, William Salesbury, and William Wynne referred to their loyal and brave service to Charles I, but also mentioned their children and their ancestors.⁴⁴ Loyalty

⁴² NLW, Gwysaney 15: Earl of Derby to his tenants and friends, Chester, 8 Apr. 1661; Gwysaney 13: Duke of Beaufort to Robert Davies, Badminton, 28 Sept. 1688.

⁴³ BL, Add MS 38175 fo. 104: Sir Roger Mostyn to Mr. Crow, Mostyn, 5 July 1684.

⁴⁴ MH, *Cynyddau ac Awdlau*; NLW, Add MS 263B: Poetry of ffoulk Wynn.

cemented North-East Welsh society, and expressions of loyalty acknowledged and perpetuated its importance.

II. Political actions and reactions in North-East Wales

The deeply-held conservative political values of the North-East Welsh gentry were vital in persuading them to support the king militarily from 1642, and continued to be extremely influential after the royalist defeat in 1647. Throughout the period 1642 to 1660 their ideas and behaviour were those of ‘extremists’ or ‘ultra-royalists’. They were apparently quick to join the king’s side in the early 1640s and to be ready for war in 1642. These values inspired the North-East Welsh gentry to resist the Commonwealth and Protectorate, and to support the policies of the restored Charles II from 1660. Although there was only a limited visible reaction to the crises of the latter years of Charles II’s reign, there are no signs that North-East Welsh loyalty was strongly tested until James II decided to promote and then impose religious toleration. As explored in the introduction to this thesis, it is almost impossible to separate the political and religious features of seventeenth-century life and beliefs. As a consequence, while the two are discussed separately here in chapters two and three, the interactions between them are recognised as crucial, continuous, and extremely complex.

The development of seventeenth-century Welsh royalism, 1640-1647

While some historians view Welsh royalism as a commonplace, there has been no detailed exploration of where Welsh royalism came from historically or intellectually, what Welsh royalists believed, or royalism’s impact on events in Wales in the seventeenth century.

Accepting Welsh royalism as a given means that its features and complexities have largely remained unexamined. The North-East Welsh gentry, however, provided a political justification for their royalist support in a number of formal and informal documents.

While this does not amount to a coherently expressed political ideology, it does indicate where North-East Welsh royalists stood politically in relation to others across the kingdoms. There are strong themes within this evidence: the sacred nature of the king's person and power; the king as protector of the Church, laws, liberties and estates of his subjects; the king as their bounden overlord and master; and the king as preserver of law and order. Sir Thomas Salusbury made it clear that the potential for a political and religious breakdown of order was crucial to his decision to join the king at York in June 1642.

The arguments my reason suggest unto mee are grounded upon the diuers inconveniences allreadie growne & like daily more to increase since, & by this Gouverment, the multitude of schismes crouded, not crept, allreadie into the Church giue us too iust a cause to feare what an Amsterdam or Pantheon of all religions wee are like to make in a little more time nor is it to bee hoped that euer the crackt peace of this Kingdome may bee soderd or peeced together if the Regall Power bee rent & diuided into soe many peeces; In one mans breast can bee noe faction, In two there may, but in a multitude it is scarce possible but there must as long as men continue to bee of seuerall opinions.

Taking Germany and the Low Countries as his example, he argued that those territories were brought to disaster by resisting their anointed king. Using that example Salusbury predicted the ongoing conflict and the potential for resistance to any other form of government:

if a King bee opprest by force or the defection of his people, it is an iniurie that can neuer bee forgotten, & they that use that force against him haue need to bee very strong to keepe him under by the same force, for they must looke for great & frequent attempts which will neuer bee wanting as long as there is any sparke left in the hearts of the people of respect to Royall Majestie.⁴⁵

If Salusbury's letter had been written in the late 1640s it could stand as a statement of 'ultra-royalism', and indeed mirrors the vitriolic arguments of Edward Lloyd of Llanforda in the late 1640s and 1650s.⁴⁶ It was an accurate prediction of the behaviour of many in North-East Wales until the Restoration.

⁴⁵ NLW, MS 5390D pp. 251-3: Sir Thomas Salusbury to Lady Ursula Lloyd, n.p., 27 June 1642.

⁴⁶ This term is more frequently used in relation to an extreme form of French royalist support, but has been employed by, for example, Jason McElligott and Geoffrey Smith to refer to the more fanatically devoted

Salisbury was not alone in the way that he conceptualised sacred royal power and its stabilising influence. Expressions of the king's 'sacred person... iust power and prerogative' appeared in the Flintshire petition to Charles I in 1642 alongside acknowledgements of the protection, peace and stability provided by the king. They were also present in the loyalty oath administered in parish churches across North-East Wales.⁴⁷ The 1642 Flintshire petition and Holt's Protestation return of February 1642 both cast the signatories as 'bounden' to the king. The loyalty oath swore every individual to uphold a similar bond.⁴⁸ A hatred of 'faction', misappropriated power, and disorder in the kingdom were core concepts of Welsh gentility. Their allegiance partly reflected a desire to resist this division and disorder. A feeling of personal loyalty, the sacred nature of kingship, and the king's place in the hierarchical order of society lent itself to a positive commitment rather than one made solely in fear or out of opposition to change. The assertion of genealogical links between ancient Welsh elites and the Stuart monarchs further reinforced this sense of a personal bond, of the king as the ultimate *pencenedl*. This made the defence of the Stuart monarchs part of the ancestral duty of each North-East Welsh gentry house. When Charles was attacked, so by implication were his Welsh gentry 'kin'.

An intense royalism formed part of the Welsh character as perceived by both the English and the Welsh themselves. Since the sixteenth century the stereotypical Welshman was 'enthusiastically loyal' to the monarch, filled with 'poetic rage, loved music, dancing, and

Cavaliers in the 1650s and early Restoration. J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 134, 141; G. Smith, *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies* (Farnham, 2010), p. 143; Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 131: Edward Lloyd to Anon., n.p., n.d.

⁴⁷ BL, Harley MS 1980 fo. 76v: The humble Petition of the Gentry Ministers and freeholders of the Countie of Flint; BL, Add MS 46399A fo. 78: A Protestation and Oath to be taken by the Inhabitants of the Sixe Counties of Northwales.

⁴⁸ BL, Harley MS 1980 fo. 76v: The humble Petition of the Gentry Ministers and freeholders of the Countie of Flint; Parliamentary Archives, HL/PO/JO/10/1/83, unfol.: Protestation return of Holt, Feb. 1642.

was devoutly religious, talking much of the greatness of England and Wales'.⁴⁹ He was depicted on the stage as brave, if foolish, in generally positive comic roles. This stereotype became increasingly overtly politicised and negative in the proto-parliamentarian press from 1641.⁵⁰ Alongside this characterisation, the context of the 1630s makes it easier to understand why the Welsh were attacked in print at such an early date. Although some North-East Welsh gentlemen had expressed doubts about the king's policies during Personal Rule of 1629 to 1640, these tended to mirror previous complaints about the financial burdens placed on the poor counties of the region. Lloyd Bowen has convincingly demonstrated that Ship Money was paid consistently (if not promptly) in the principality. He linked this with a culture of conformity and obedience, and subsequently the political allegiance of the Welsh in 1642.⁵¹ Caroline religious policies were implemented widely and generally without protest, as discussed in chapter two. As Bowen points out, the Welsh increasingly articulated pro-episcopacy and other 'moderate' religious opinions from late 1641, another facet that marked them out as an oppositional group to the dominant faction within parliament.⁵² North-East Wales sent the required number of troops to take part in the Bishops' Wars of 1639 and 1640, complaining only about the difference in quota between itself and its neighbouring counties.⁵³

The North-East Welsh reaction to the anti-Welsh pamphlets showed that their barbs were received and understood in Wales. A petition ostensibly from the whole of Wales in February 1642 angrily addressed the 'ludibrious contempt' shown to the Welsh, and

⁴⁹ W.J. Hughes, *Wales and the Welsh in English Literature: From Shakespeare to Scott* (1924), p. 35.

⁵⁰ L. Bowen, 'Representations of Wales and the Welsh during the Civil Wars and Interregnum', *Historical Research*, 77 (2004), pp. 363-5; M. Stoye, 'Caricaturing Cymru: Images of the Welsh in the London Press, 1642-6', in D.E.S. Dunn (ed.), *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 163-5.

⁵¹ L. Bowen, *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c.1603-1642* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 197-9.

⁵² Bowen, *Politics of the Principality*, p. 240.

⁵³ A.H. Dodd, 'The Civil War in East Denbighshire', *DHST*, 3 (1954), p. 45.

requested that parliament acted to tame the press.⁵⁴ Mark Stoyle argues that the anti-Welsh pamphlets, and the Welsh reaction to them, were crucial in forming ‘Cambro-Royalism’. He describes this as a popular ideology that combined loyalty to the king with a concern to defend Welsh ethnicity, an important factor in mobilising the Welsh in 1642.⁵⁵ His principal argument that the English Civil War had ‘awoken the ancient hostility between the English and the Welsh’ and that it was a ‘quasi-national conflict’ between the two nations hugely simplifies and over-states this case. On the other hand, Stoyle’s general belief that there was something distinctive about Welsh royalism is much more plausible. His opinion that Welsh royalism involved the marrying of a broader royalist desire to defend the king with a specifically Welsh element has evidential support. Where Stoyle and this thesis diverge is that he contends that the Welsh aimed specifically to defend their *ethnic* identity.⁵⁶ The Welsh certainly maintained strong political, cultural, and linguistic traditions that differentiated them from most of their neighbours over the border. However, by the seventeenth century the North-East Welsh gentry did not generally locate those traditions in opposition to England and the English, particularly in relation to the modern definition of ‘ethnicity’.⁵⁷ For one thing, the North-East Welsh gentry sprang into action early in the First Civil War to protect the city of Chester, and worked effectively with their English colleagues on the other side of the border. So if Charles I did harness an ‘ancient vernacular ideology’ it was not one that formed a challenge to everything that English governance stood for, but one that aimed to protect Welsh institutions, traditions, and culture while working within the system of English (or, indeed, British) governance.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ *The Humble Petition of Many Hundred Thousands, inhabiting within the Thirteene Shires of Wales* (1642), p. 3.

⁵⁵ M. Stoyle, *Soldiers and Strangers: An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (New Haven, 2005), p. 27.

⁵⁶ Stoyle, *Soldiers and Strangers*, pp. 27, 31.

⁵⁷ Indeed Stoyle’s references to ethnicity and ethnic conflict are used much more in the modern ideological sense of ‘race’, rightly cautioned against by John Kerrigan as historically anomalous. J. Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford, 2008), p. 36.

⁵⁸ Stoyle, *Soldiers and Strangers*, p. 27.

The print reaction to the Welsh petition was the complete opposite of what it intended: parliament and its supporters saw little point in wooing the Welsh or addressing their concerns. Instead the Welsh continued to be portrayed as an alien, idiotic, and feminised ‘other’, used to bolster parliamentary morale against the prediction that the martial and hot-tempered Welsh nation would entirely support the king. Welsh royalism was depicted as the result of blind ignorance.⁵⁹ The Welsh themselves had long embraced their reputation as enthusiastic supporters of the Crown. The aforementioned Welsh petition of 1642 stated that ‘we especially have always shewn our loyalty to his Majesty’ arguing that the derision of the parliamentary pamphleteers was a ‘scorning detestation to our known fidelity’.⁶⁰ Bowen and Stoye go too far in arguing that the anti-Welsh pamphlets were part of the motivation for Welsh royalism.⁶¹ It is not implausible, however, that the much vaunted Welsh loyalty, when mocked and derided, became foregrounded within the pantheon of Welsh gentry values, and that Civil War royalism was partly the result of an attack on those values.⁶²

The North-East Welsh gentry showed support for the king and his officers against parliamentary leaders from early 1641. This manifested itself initially in correspondence. The gentry discussed the events of 1640 to 1642 in letters between family, neighbours and agents in London, and those at home in Flintshire and Denbighshire. Those opposing episcopacy were described as a ‘faction’ or ‘factious party’, a greatly loaded word in early modern debate.⁶³ In the North-East Welsh petitions of 1642 this term is echoed, describing

⁵⁹ Most notably *The Welshman’s Last Petition and Protestation* (1642). Bowen, ‘Representations of Wales’, pp. 361, 364-5.

⁶⁰ *The Humble Petition of Many Hundred Thousands*, p. 4.

⁶¹ Bowen, *Politics of the Principality*, p. 243.

⁶² Although to claim that it created a national and ethnic conflict between England and Wales is to ignore many aspects of Welsh motivation and actions in the war itself. Stoye, ‘Caricaturing Cymru’, p. 175.

⁶³ NLW, Lleweni 175: Sir Thomas Myddelton to Sir Thomas Salusbury, n.p., 23 Jan. 1641.

those who derided the Welsh and who aimed to overthrow episcopacy.⁶⁴ Strafford's trial in the first four months of 1641 was related with fascination, as indeed it was across the Stuart kingdoms, but unusually most North-East Welsh correspondents favoured Strafford as an able administrator and servant of the Crown.⁶⁵ Other royal servants facing parliamentary censure were described in favourable terms, or with distinct sympathy, for example 'Cottington poore man is questioned in ye upper house' and Judge Berkeley, who 'was taken off the Bench upon ffryday last by Maxfeild in a very disgracefull manner before all the Courte and is Comitted to the sherriffes of London, att his parteing from the bench taking leave with his bretheren hee wept very bitterly'.⁶⁶ At a time when future moderate royalists supported the reforms being constructed by the parliamentary leadership, the North-East Welsh gentry were consistently critical of change or supportive of its principal victims. This continued as the breakdown of relations between parliament and the king escalated.

The Welsh were perceived as yearning for a war to settle the argument between king and parliament. In early August 1642 Sir John Trevor's steward Samuel Wood wrote to his master of the difference in attitude towards a potential war between the Welsh side of the border and the English. The Welsh were 'violently bent for warre thother side not'.⁶⁷ This casts the Welsh as 'extremists', driving the country into war instead of negotiating for a solution, but is it an accurate assessment of the Welsh position in August 1642?⁶⁸ It does appear to represent the actions of the majority of the Welsh gentry. From summer 1642 the gentry of North-East Wales met several times, much as they did before elections. They

⁶⁴ *The Humble Petition of Many Hundred Thousands*, pp. 2-3.

⁶⁵ NLW, MS 9063E no 1681: Maurice Wynn to Owen Wynn, 30 Mar. 1641; Lleweni 181: John Wynn to Sir Thomas Salusbury, Six Clerks' Office, 16 Feb. 1641.

⁶⁶ Maxfield was a member of the Lords staff. NLW, Add MS 467E no 1686: Maurice Wynn to Owen Wynn, n.p., 8 June 1641.

⁶⁷ FRO, D/G/3275 no 72: Samuel Wood to Sir John Trevor, Trevalyn, 6 Aug. 1642.

⁶⁸ D.L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640-1649* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 106.

assembled to decide the political direction of their region, organise petitions, recruit and fund armed units, and to hear the speeches of Charles I and Lord Strange.⁶⁹ As with elections, they emerged with a near unanimous voice. Richard Lloyd of Esclusham declared by June 1642 that Sir Thomas Myddelton was ‘the single exception’ to an otherwise uniform royalist allegiance amongst the gentry of North-East Wales, while Sir Thomas Salusbury wrote that the gentry had decided to support the king ‘more unanimously then subscribed (especially Flintshire) to defend his Majesties person, honour & legall prerogative together with the protestant Religion, the libertie of the subject, & known priviledge of parliament against all powers & persons that shall oppose’.⁷⁰ Whereas groups of gentlemen elsewhere (for example in neighbouring Cheshire, in Staffordshire, Lincolnshire and Norwich) attempted neutrality pacts, or aimed to keep the fighting out of their counties, the North-East Welsh gentry were quick to volunteer to fight - to defend their territory, neighbouring counties, or engage in far-afield battles such as Edgehill.⁷¹ As the anonymous author of a Welsh narrative of the war triumphantly noted, the First Civil War ended in Wales, with the fall of Harlech in March 1647.⁷² North Wales held out to the last against parliamentary forces, aided by its terrain and the determination of its commanders and troops.⁷³ The vanquished royalist forces disbanded. Their commanders either went into exile, or returned to their homes. The region finally faced a situation

⁶⁹ NLW, MS 9063E no 1711: Sir Thomas Salusbury to Thomas Bulkeley, 6 Aug. 1642; FRO, D/DM/271 no 9: Copy letter of David Pennant to JPs of Flintshire, 5 Feb. 1642; D/DM/271 no 49: Copy order of Charles I to High Sheriff and Commissioners of Array of Flintshire, Chester, 24 Sept. 1642; D/DM/271 no 56: Sir Thomas Salusbury to David Pennant, n.p., 29 Nov. 1642.

⁷⁰ Lloyd was not entirely correct – Simon Thelwall junior and Sir John Trevor of Trevalyn were both parliamentarians, although both were resident in London when the First Civil War broke out. Trevor never made his permanent residence in Wales. NLW, MS 9063E no 1711: Sir Thomas Salusbury to Thomas Bulkeley, 6 Aug. 1642; A.H. Dodd, ‘The Civil War in East Denbighshire’, p. 48.

⁷¹ J. Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War 1630-50* (Harlow, 1980), pp. 37-8.

⁷² NLW, Chirk A 14: A breife Description of the war in Northwales.

⁷³ This thesis is not a military history of the Civil War and will not, therefore, explore the machinations between rival senior royalist military commanders or the organisation and movement of troops, money, and arms between North-East Welsh counties, Shropshire, and Cheshire.

familiar to royalists everywhere else in England and Wales: sequestration, compounding, and a form of internal exile – from political office.

North-East Welsh royalism from defeat to Restoration, 1647-60

Aside from their involvement in elections (as discussed earlier in this chapter), the bulk of the gentry remained in self-imposed political isolation during the 1650s. Their responses to this situation were varied. They included exile overseas, an involvement in plots, seditious words, cultural royalism, or a complete retreat to their estates to concentrate on rebuilding their fortunes. A.H. Dodd argued that because of this apparent retreat the traditional ruling gentry were ‘passively acquiescent’. This can only be accepted if one ignores the many plots and intrigues with which they were involved, and if the gentry’s aloofness from the Interregnum governments is viewed as complicity rather than a form of opposition. It is clear from surviving evidence that the changes wrought by the First Civil War were not accepted quiescently, and that signs or gestures of resistance, no matter how small, were crucial in maintaining royalist morale. To confine oneself to a consideration of plots as the principal way of detecting or assessing royalist support would be to misunderstand the nature of much royalist behaviour in the period 1647 to 1660.

It is arguable that a retreat from local office was as much a political act as was involvement in plotting and conspiracy. English central government was unusual in the extent to which it relied upon voluntary service by the local gentry, for which they were rewarded with increased status and standing in their communities.⁷⁴ It was vital to the image of the Welsh gentry – positions on the Council of the Marches, the Bench, in parliament and as Deputy Lieutenants were ‘a primary means of publicly demonstrating an image of power,

⁷⁴ Tapsell, *Personal Rule of Charles II*, p. 50.

leadership and status'.⁷⁵ As Michael Braddick and John Walter have argued, the image of authority was central to the maintenance of power, resting less on repression than consent. While they are discussing the governmental structures before and after the Interregnum, it is interesting to apply this argument to 1650s Wales, where the image of authority still rested with its former governors while the power rested with others. If the values, image and appearance of social status and gentility of these 'fathers of their counties' were so crucial it is no wonder that Interregnum initiatives like the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales were unsuccessful.⁷⁶

Throughout Britain in the early years of the Commonwealth 'delinquents' were kept out of office purposely, yet after 1653 in many places some former royalists made an accommodation with the authorities and began to take on local offices and responsibilities.⁷⁷ Coleby notes this in relation to JPs, jurymen and sheriffs in Hampshire, although he also observes that it did not necessarily mean these appointees were loyal to the regime.⁷⁸ Dodd identified a few important county families recruited to county committees in Merionethshire and Montgomeryshire.⁷⁹ It is difficult to find straightforward examples of this in North-East Wales. Many elite gentry families remained more or less aloof from local Interregnum politics, depriving the regional committee of most of the experienced JPs, for example, for the entire period. They immersed themselves in a royalist social world, working for change when it seemed plausible, and attending to public business rarely – and often then only when it affected their families or estates. Some

⁷⁵ Evans, "To contynue in my bloud and name", p. 160.

⁷⁶ M.J. Braddick and J. Walter, 'Introduction: Grids of Power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society' in *idem* (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 13-15, 27.

⁷⁷ D. Underdown, 'Settlement in the counties 1653-8' in G.E. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (1972), p. 179.

⁷⁸ A. Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 19-21.

⁷⁹ Dodd, *Studies in Stuart Wales*, p. 146.

prominent individuals, for example Robert Davies of Gwysaney, show no evidence of having taken the Engagement, even to participate in legal proceedings and with the king's approval. Combined with their other actions, it is difficult to see this retreat as anything other than a political statement, a withdrawal of cooperation for a system that they viewed as lacking legitimacy and authority. The full and wholehearted participation of the North-East Welsh gentry in local affairs from 1660 is further evidence of this form of politics – a politics of non-engagement.

There were very few North-East Welsh gentlemen who made a straightforward journey from active and politically committed royalist support in the First Civil War to full cooperation with the various Interregnum governments. This is not to deny A.H. Dodd's point that some collaborated to varying degrees. Furthermore, some individuals who can be described as reconciling with the Commonwealth or Protectorate, for example Sir Gerard Eyton and Francis Manley, were clearly deeply involved with royalist activism throughout the period.⁸⁰ The general meeting of the Denbighshire gentry described by Dodd as having 'pledged its loyalty to parliament and determination to resist its enemies' was largely composed of the few long-term local parliamentarians and those of humbler social status. Only Thomas Ravenscroft and Humphrey Dymock originally supported the king, and they changed sides during the war – plausibly examples of the reluctant royalist. The only representatives of the dominant gentry families were Roger Hanmer of Gredington, John Salesbury of Bachygraig, and Owen Salesbury of Rug. Hanmer was the uncle of Sir Thomas Hanmer of Hanmer and head of the cadet branch of the Hanmer family, and he had supported parliament since the outbreak of Civil War. Salesbury of Rug was alienated from his ultra-royalist father, partly as a result of his new allegiance. No

⁸⁰ Dodd, 'Civil War in East Denbighshire', pp. 73-4, 79, 82.

explanation has been found for the presence of the former royalist Salesbury of Bachygraig in the lists of Interregnum commissioners and the ‘well-affected’ in 1647 and 1648. He was a determined royalist in the First Civil War, named as a knight of the Royal Oak in 1660, and there is no evidence of his active involvement in committees or mention of him after December 1648 in parliamentary committee records.⁸¹ This attests to the problems of discussing side-changing in and after the First Civil War. Due to factional differences within ‘sides’, the need for self-legitimation, and tendencies towards passive obedience to authority, it is difficult to tell when side-changing was a genuine political choice, a label imposed by others, or evidence of a desire to get on with life rather than resisting new regimes.⁸² In North-East Wales, these ambiguities are less openly in evidence. Although former royalists often appeared to live peacefully under the Commonwealth or the Protectorate, many of them were involved in royalist plotting to some degree, or were at least uninvolved in local government activities.

Several royalists (or at least non-parliamentarians) were chosen as High Sheriff in North-East Wales during the 1650s. Sir Owen Wynn was selected as sheriff of Denbighshire, appearing to serve as an alternative to being sequestered, while prominent royalists such as Robert Price of Giler, John Jeffreys of Acton, and Sir Thomas Powell of Horsley acted as High Sheriffs of Denbighshire in the period 1655 to 1658. Serving as sheriff has been portrayed as a sign of accommodation with the regime, but this is not supported when considering the individual biographies of the three men above. Furthermore, gentlemen pricked for sheriff prior to the Interregnum often did what they could to avoid the office –

⁸¹ Bodl., MS Tanner 57 fos 52-3: Declaration of the ‘Well-affected’ of the Counties of Denbigh and Flint, 9 May 1648; C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (3 vols, 1911), I, 979, 1247; Dodd, *Studies in Stuart Wales*, pp. 127-8, 140; T. Richards, ‘Flintshire and the Puritan Movement’, *FHSP*, 13 (1952-3), p. 56.

⁸² Andrew Hopper highlights all of these problems and ambiguities, but does not explain how he will resolve them within his monograph. Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegades*, pp. 8-10.

unless selected at election time, when their control of the election writs could be useful. Otherwise they used all their influence and patronage connections to ensure someone else was chosen to fill the role. Aside from times of clear instability or threat to the Puritan governments, it is hard to see why the situation would be different in the Interregnum.⁸³ Former royalists had less access to powerful contacts who could help them to avoid the office, and so would be more vulnerable to being pricked. In Warwickshire between 1647 and 1658 only four of the fourteen sheriffs were identifiable parliamentarians, and in Kent there were sheriffs who had been royalists.⁸⁴ When central government conducted an enquiry in 1664 it was not former royalists who were named amongst the committeemen, but those whose names appeared on warrants, letters, and orders throughout the 1650s.⁸⁵

A number of devoted Welsh royalists either chose exile or accepted it as a part of their articles of surrender. These included Sir Richard Lloyd, John Robinson, Roger Whitley, Kenrick Eyton, Hugh Wynne, and Sir Thomas Hanmer. Five out of these six gentlemen would certainly qualify as ‘militants’, with Sir Thomas Hanmer the only possible exception – and this is more to do with his actions after 1651 to facilitate his return home than any sign of fluctuating allegiance before that point. There were many more than this in exile, judging from the biography of the Carmelite nun Margaret Mostyn which describes the ‘great part of a regiment’ of Charles II’s adherents quartered in Liege, ‘many distressed gentlemen, almost famished for want, having nothing to support themselves withal but the charity of some good people’.⁸⁶ In common with English royalists, not all of these exiled

⁸³ Indeed Andrew Coleby notes the unpopularity of the office in Hampshire, giving the example of one gentleman who hid when the Rump’s order arrived. Coleby, *Hampshire 1649-1689*, p. 21.

⁸⁴ S.K. Roberts, ‘Local Government Reform in England and Wales During the Interregnum’, in I. Roots (ed.), *Into Another Mould: Aspects of the Interregnum* (Exeter, 1981), p. 56.

⁸⁵ TNA, E 113/3: Answers to Exchequer Bills, 1664; SP 23/27: Correspondence of the Committee for Compounding, 1654-5; LPL, MS 1027: Sequestered livings in Wales, 1662; NLW MS 9064E no 1901: Commissioners for the General Composition to the collections of the same in Denbighshire, 11 Oct. 1649.

⁸⁶ E. Bedingfield, *The Life of Margaret Mostyn, mother Margaret of Jesus* (1878), p. 237.

Welsh royalists remained abroad from 1647 to 1660, and many Welsh royalists either returned permanently or briefly in the Interregnum. It is apparent that they remained in contact with each other even when living in different regions, or experiencing exile in different ways, aiding in the memorialisation of the period and their sacrifices.

Those who did not experience exiled life on the Continent lived through a form of political ‘internal exile’.⁸⁷ North-East Welsh royalists who remained in the region responded to defeat by drawing closer together. Those who appeared consistently on Interregnum lists of suspected royalists, in accounts of arrests, articles of surrender, or royalist lists of potential plotters can also be traced socialising together, attending christenings of each other’s children, or going to potentially subversive events such as regional horse-races or cockfights. These were often the same individuals, from the same families, throughout the entire period 1646 to 1660. Financial accounts show Welsh royalists meeting together in towns such as Wrexham, or socialising at each other’s houses. The Edwards family of Stansty, for example, met with Davieses of Gwysaney, Breretons, and Manleys in 1657. Sir Richard Grosvenor spent time at his uncle Sir Roger Mostyn’s house, also playing at tables with Col. Broughton and Mr. Dutton, at dice with Lord Herbert, and cards with Sir Thomas Powell. He also gambled at Eyton, and Cadogan.⁸⁸ All of these were staunchly royalist families, persistently involved in royalist plotting. Even if their meetings were merely gatherings of comrades-in-arms, friends, or kin, they demonstrate the close networks that were perpetuated in the 1650s. Rather than seeking the most socially influential godparents, former Civil War royalists instead chose their closest family and neighbours that shared their views. Sir Roger Mostyn, for example, chose Lord Bulkeley,

⁸⁷ P. Major, *Writings of Exile in the English Revolution and Restoration* (Farnham, 2013), p. 101.

⁸⁸ Sir Richard appears to have been either extremely unlucky or terribly unskilled, as his losses were seldom apparently balanced by winnings. FRO, D/GW/1928: Accounts of an Edwards of Stansty, 1657-1660; D/M/351: Accounts of Sir Richard Grosvenor of Kinnerton, 1650-1666.

Lady Mostyn of Gloddaeth and John Mostyn to stand godparents to his eldest son Thomas in 1651. He chose John Mostyn, Lady Wynn, and Major Hugh Pennant for his third son John in 1655. For other children David Pennant, William Salesbury of Rug and various Coetmor cousins fulfilled the role – all staunch royalists or from royalist families.⁸⁹ After the Restoration, the pattern reverted, with the most influential possible godparent being sought, often alongside a close relative.

Regional cockfights were clearly events on a grand scale. They involved gentlemen from across North Wales, and were intensely competitive. Matches could be local, regional, or even national – one letter from March 1652 sought urgent help on the grounds that ‘we are to expect the strengts of Southwales against us’.⁹⁰ A match in February 1652 between Roger Mostyn and Robert Davies was made ‘for much monies’, and the best birds were obtained from the best cockmasters.⁹¹ They were also the scene for large-scale meetings of royalist gentlemen: an opportunity for them to come together, be festive in the face of government disapproval, and engage in subversive activities. These cockfights involved gentlemen from the Bulkeley, Mostyn, Davies, Pugh and Wynn families, who all participated in the Anglesey Rising of 1648 and were suspected of planning other engagements throughout the 1650s.⁹² They were clearly regarded as political events by the Protectorate, and were banned in 1656 to prevent the kind of plotting that led to Penruddock’s Rising in 1655. Indeed already in 1653 the local authorities were highly suspicious of the activity, particularly in Wrexham. Hugh Pennant reported the concerns of the authorities to his opponent and friend John Wynn:

I hope you have received a letter I sent unto on Saturday was senight to decline our match by reason the Comanders of these parts thought our meetings inconvenient as it apeares by a letter from Wrexham to London where in that

⁸⁹ Mostyn family prayer book.

⁹⁰ NLW, Bodewryd MS 82: John Pughe to ?John Wynn, Bathavern, 2 Mar. 1652.

⁹¹ NLW, Bodewryd MS 70: Roger Mostyn to ?John Wynn, Mostyn, 11 Feb. 1651.

⁹² NLW, Bodewryd MS 54: Robert Bulkeley and Roger Mostyn to John Wynn, Mostyn, 22 Feb. 1651.

malignants are asperth to have congregated lately with desinges; to prevent al suspicion it is unsafe for us to meete others apprehensions being not soe in great as our one.⁹³

North-East Welsh cockfights were perceived as a cover for plotting, and the attention of the authorities was unwelcome – an indication that the North Wales committee were correct to suspect the meetings as having alternative, subversive purposes. Much of this social activity was routine and, in a national sense, apolitical before the early 1640s. From 1642 onwards, however, it formed part of a politics of gesture and defiance, particularly in the Interregnum.

The celebration of drinking and excess was central to this aspect of cavalier identity. It was a common trope of royalist poetry and prose to talk in glowing terms of drinking, or to drink someone's health. Marika Keblusek has termed this a royalist 'cult of drinking', arguing that in royalist texts 'the image of the drinking Cavalier contained a host of meanings: a blissful retreat from daily sorrows and depressing thoughts; a way to overcome the sense of general defeat of the Stuart cause; a means to defy and ridicule the puritan government; and an attempt to reaffirm the royalist identity.'⁹⁴ Although Keblusek was writing specifically about exiles, this representation or self-representation of the 'merry Cavalier' is also visible at home in England and Wales. A 1656 verse by Sir Roger Mostyn, despite its pledge to stop drinking, demonstrates its importance for keeping company, and for fellowship. Dedicated to fellow drinkers 'Hugh Pennant, ye Muffter & Grono', Mostyn promised to stick to 'small beare and a sober diett' in order to 'sauē my old body from sinking'.⁹⁵ Sir Thomas Hanmer wrote to Sir Richard Browne that he drank 'your health in good white wyne' from Angers in 1647. Both these gentlemen evoked a sense of drinking

⁹³ NLW, Bodewryd MS 81: Hugh Pennant to John Wynn, n.d., n.p.

⁹⁴ M. Keblusek, 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Experience, 1642-1660' in A. Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 55, 60.

⁹⁵ Bangor, Baron Hill 137: Roger Mostyn to Piers Lloyd, Mostyn, 16 Feb. 1656.

as shared fellowship, of consolation, and mirth. These aspects took on strongly political overtones in the atmosphere of the late 1640s and 1650s. More overt gestures could lead to the risk of prosecution. In 1649 John Peck, in attempting to prove his anti-royalist credentials to his parliamentary master in London, reported his attempts to prosecute one gentleman who had drunk a toast to Charles II. According to Peck, ‘one Ursellay Powell unkell unto Sir thomas Powell... had in Compeny spoken unfitting words: and like wise dranke a health unto King Charles the Second saing how he affected kingly govermente and the like words’. Although Powell evidently escaped prosecution, he took a risk in so openly declaring both a toast and his political opinions.⁹⁶ Edward Lloyd went further than Powell, and in doing so strayed into the realms of blasphemy. To Lloyd,

each health to be drunke, shall be to a distressed person, & be as it weare so many short prayers, for restauration, redemption & preservation, so that the Alehouse once the Devills Chappel, hath now purer devotion, then most of Gods Churches, since the ruine of Episcopacy.⁹⁷

This argument, however facetiously made, combined three key desires of the devoted royalist: the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, the preservation of the royalists’ estates, and the return of episcopacy.

Making merry, keeping Christmas and other festive traditions, was another way to test loyalty to the royalist cause. Eating plum broth or minced pies became a sign of royalist (or at least non-Puritan allegiance). Marginalia in one Flintshire Welsh Bible associates plum broth with loyalty: couplets declared that ‘We may not say and speake the troth/That Courtney and Wynne had good plum broath’, and ‘I lyke them well that loue plum broth/The sword wth arme defends the troth’.⁹⁸ Edward Lloyd referred to mince pies as

⁹⁶ Powell escaped prosecution apparently due to factional infighting within the Committee. FRO, D/G/3276 no 17: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 22 Mar. 1649.

⁹⁷ Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 99: Edward Lloyd to John Hanmer, n. p., n.d.

⁹⁸ Hugh Courtney and Edward Wynne were two members of various parliamentary committees. Marginalia on a copy of the Salusbury Testament, private collection.

‘Christ pies’ and argued that Christmas was a time when ‘we ought to celebrate the Natiuitie at this time with holie mirth & religious Reuells’, urging his cousin to ‘conforme your selfe to this sacred & lawdable Custom: at least, till another set time be set apart for this holie mirth by an universal-general-assemblee’.⁹⁹ Along with backgammon and dancing, Lloyd was prepared to argue for these traditions formerly approved of by the Church. In common with cockfights, drinking, and socialising, these activities drew together groups of likeminded people, provided good fellowship at times of political despair, and provided a political menace for the authorities.

This chapter has referred repeatedly to the involvement of North-East Welsh royalists in plotting and subversion. There is consistent evidence from throughout the period that the principal families of the region, as well as those of lesser status, were involved in real or attempted plots to rebel or in other ways attack the Interregnum authorities. Local or regional royalist correspondence and official documents from 1648, 1651, 1653, 1655 and 1658 all demonstrate this. The records of the Commonwealth and Protectorate government and intelligence services show that much more was suspected, and from the various activities described above, it would be far from surprising. Central government and its informers were particularly suspicious in 1654-5. One correspondent warned Secretary Thurloe of ‘the danger likely to fall upon the nation by the unsettlement of Wales’, while another bemoaned the absence of ‘persons here being in power to apprehend’ plotters.¹⁰⁰ This conspiracy was described somewhat picturesquely as being like a ‘rat running behind stooles, which although seene plainly, yet a full blow cannot be made at him’. The same

⁹⁹ Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 133: Edward Lloyd to ‘Cosen Thom’, n. p., n. d.

¹⁰⁰ T. Birch, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.* (7 vols, 1742), III, 216-17, 298. This is supported by Major-General Berry who although generally not too condemnatory of the Welsh did feel that ‘Though the mountains of Wales be somewhat smooth, yet it may not be amisse to keepe it from being quite levelled; and to that end here and there a castle will doe well; and to keepe them from contempt.’ Birch (ed.), *State Papers*, V, 242; E. Parry, *Royal Visits and Progresses to Wales and the border counties of Cheshire, Salop, Hereford and Monmouth...* (1851), p. 396.

letters mention many names repeatedly: Eytons, Broughtons, Ravenscrofts, Kynastons and Lloyds. These and many other prominent North-East Welsh gentry families appeared in Roger Whitley's list of royalists in 1658.¹⁰¹ Many Welsh royalists were sporadically imprisoned. Roger Mostyn was taken prisoner in 1648 and 1658, David Pennant imprisoned in Chester in 1651, and Robert and Mutton Davies arrested in 1658.¹⁰² The continuing involvement of Roger Whitley in the region, Derby's encouragement, as well as the preponderance of former royalist officers, helped this to persist.

The royalist opposition was not, however, militarily organised, possessed of strong leadership or funding. Apart from the Anglesey Rising of 1648 and Booth's Rebellion of 1659, none of the major plots came to fruition. Although individual North-East Welsh gentlemen joined Charles II at Worcester in 1651, or corresponded intensely at key points with the king and his agents, there was no effective rising in the region. On the one hand, this could be seen as evidence that the gentry leaders of North-East Wales were unwilling to risk their lives and estates for Charles II. If so, they had much in common with royalists across England and Wales. The potential penalties for those involved in royalist conspiracy increased after June 1650. Delinquents were ordered out of London, an emergency High Court of Justice set up, and the military were kept in a state of readiness. The executions of senior royalists in 1651 (especially the earl of Derby), and the confiscations in 1651-2, alongside the existing strains of sequestration and compounding, made royalist conspiracy a high stakes endeavour.¹⁰³ Realistically, a North Welsh rebellion would have stood little chance of making a permanent impact unless other regions had risen at the same time, and the gentry were already financially affected by compounding and the monthly assessments.

¹⁰¹ Birch (ed.), *State Papers*, III, 298; Bodl., MS Eng. hist. e. 309: Roger Whitley's proposal for a royalist rising, 1658.

¹⁰² NLW, MS 9064E no 1955: David Pennant to Sir Owen Wynn, Bighton, 27 June 1651; Dodd, 'Flintshire Politics', p. 38.

¹⁰³ Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 36, 55, 57.

The signs are that the North-East Welsh gentry acted, as other royalists did, when they believed the rebellions stood a chance of success. At all the major flash points of tension, there were plots planned or put into action. Royalist associational culture and the Cavalier identity adopted in the actions, literature, and material culture of the North-East Welsh royalists helped to perpetuate a desire for restoration between these plots and after their failure. The cult of Charles the Martyr, with its semi-mystic overtones and romantic longing for the lost monarch, formed another point around which emotional responses to the Interregnum could coalesce. When a plausible opportunity presented itself the Welsh royalists turned out in force, as they did in 1659.¹⁰⁴ It is vital to remember that although modern historians have the power of hindsight, Booth's Rebellion resulted in apparent disaster for the Welshmen involved – capture, confiscation, severe financial penalties, and (for some) exile from their region. Their risk was a real one, and should not be underestimated.

North-East Welsh royalism and loyalism 1660-85

For royalists the need for secrecy and conspiracy disappeared as soon as Charles II was invited to return on 8 May 1660. The memories of the 1640s and 1650s remained strong, however, and were crucial in explaining the attitudes of those who returned as JPs, Deputy Lieutenants, and High Sheriffs in 'a miraculous resurrection from the grave', after being 'civilly dead' for thirteen years.¹⁰⁵ Their desire to demonstrate loyalty and to regain their rightful role saw the North-East Welsh gentry scramble to obtain offices which they previously would have disdained. Sir Roger Mostyn, for example, competed for the office of High Sheriff in 1660, when his family had previously devoted significant time and energy to avoiding being chosen in that position. He held the office in 1665-6 for

¹⁰⁴ An in-depth examination of the Welsh role in Booth's Rebellion would yield valuable insights into the composition and motivation of the uprising.

¹⁰⁵ FRO, D/HE/483: John Roberts to Evan Edwards, Llanrhaeadr, 23 July 1661.

Flintshire.¹⁰⁶ Their behaviour in these roles has been explored in chapter two – the North-East Welsh gentry ranged themselves against former Puritan officeholders, soldiers, and religious radicals, raising ‘volunteares all ould Royalists’ to defend their region and the Crown.¹⁰⁷ These groups were perceived as a highly political as well as religious threat. The North-East Welsh counties were constantly on the alert for potential plots, despite the limited number of nonconformists in the region – they apparently initially believed the Great Fire of London to be a plot (as, indeed, did many in London itself), and made surveys into the strength of their militia in preparation for defending themselves.¹⁰⁸ Religious radicalism was a threat to the state, particularly the established Church of England as part of that state.

For the North-East Welsh gentry the memory of their service and loyalty in the dark days of the Interregnum was central to their self-representation and actions after the Restoration. Even after the generation that directly experienced the 1650s gradually died off in the 1680s, their sons and grandsons continued to mould their dynastic identity around the actions of their forebears in the Civil Wars and Interregnum. Geraint Jenkins argued that the Interregnum left a ‘legacy of bitterness and recrimination’.¹⁰⁹ There were certainly wounds left unhealed in 1660: fears of a return to religious radicalism and political instability, the preventative targeting of Puritan dissenters, and the lack of reward for those who had risked and lost so much for the Crown from 1642 to 1660. To brand this as bitterness, however, casts in an entirely negative light what the North-East Welsh gentry saw as a desirable return to stability – a stability they were prepared to defend. As explored

¹⁰⁶ Evans, “‘To contynue in my bloud and name’”, pp. 169-70.

¹⁰⁷ TNA, SP 29/44 fo. 94: James Hicckes to Secretary Nicholas enclosing a letter from Thomas Baker, Wrexham, 11 Nov. 1661.

¹⁰⁸ TNA, SP 29/171 fo. 96: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Secretary Williamson, Chester, 12 Sept. 1666.

¹⁰⁹ Jenkins’ charge that former Puritan governors were sneered at ‘in a spirit of jealousy and vindictiveness’ does not seem grounded in an objective understanding of the royalist experience in the previous decade. Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, pp. 133-4.

below, the material culture of the Restoration continued to bear these marks, and the funerary monuments of many Welsh officers made their military and civil service for Charles I and II the principal basis of their epitaphs.

North-East Welsh royalists worked consistently to keep their cause alive in the 1650s. Like many English royalists, they hoped their hard work and sacrifice would be rewarded upon the return of the king. The Order of the Royal Oak was intended to be a public way for Charles II to acknowledge their contribution. The oak was highly symbolic for the dynasty – it was the ancient symbol of the Stuarts, but was also laden with the symbolism of Charles II's escape in 1651.¹¹⁰ Philip Jenkins has depicted the Order as 'especially designed for the loyalist hard-core', identifying 'the family pro-Stuart activists of long service' within a spectrum of pro-royalist expressions.¹¹¹ Antii Matikkala argues that one of the purposes of the Order was to strengthen the government, quoting Thomas Clifford's proposal that it should be 'an impregnable Royall ffort' to service 'in the future against any of the hurtfull impressions'.¹¹² Of Jenkins' three Welsh categories of royalists/Tories, parliamentarians/Whigs, and 'moderates', the proposed knights of the Royal Oak were firmly in the first category. Seven Denbighshire gentlemen and seven Flintshire gentlemen were nominated. Individuals from the houses of Mostyn of Mostyn and Talacre, Hanmer of Hanmer Hall and Fenns, Davies, Salesbury of Bachymbyd, Myddleton, and Salusbury of Lleweni all appear on the list.¹¹³ Of these, only the Myddeltons could be placed in the 'moderate' category by the 1680s, and even then Sir Richard Myddelton tended towards a

¹¹⁰ Interestingly it was also a key device within Welsh bardic poetry, used alongside other images to connote strength, firm leadership and virtue. M. Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1720: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013), p. 35; Jones, *Concepts of Order and Gentility*, p. 48.

¹¹¹ P. Jenkins, 'Wales and the Order of the Royal Oak', *NLWJ*, 24 (1986), p. 339.

¹¹² The other proposed purpose was to raise money for the Crown because of the high fees that would be charged. A. Matikkala, *The Orders of Knighthood and the Formation of the British Honours System, 1660-1760* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 69, 74.

¹¹³ Jenkins, 'Wales and the Order of the Royal Oak', pp. 344-5.

cautious toryism or independent conservatism. The Order was never established, but the pride of those nominated can be seen in one case in the ownership of one of the medals designed for its members.¹¹⁴ For many the reward of being nominated for a proposed, but ultimately non-existent, chivalric order was not sufficient. Some were rewarded with baronetcies, for example Sir Roger Mostyn and Sir Thomas Myddelton III, while others gained lucrative positions. Sir Kenrick Eyton, Sir Roger Whitley, and Maurice Wynn all established themselves in financially rewarding official posts after the Restoration.¹¹⁵

There was a perception amongst some, however, that rewards were going to the wrong people. Richard Wynn wrote from London to his mother of,

his Majesty being now so busied with Knighting young gallants and rewarding some persons for their new merritts that the old Caveleer seems in some measuer discontented. the Honour of Knighthood being hitherto conferred upon no person that was in Actuell Armes for the late King save only Sir Roger Mostyn.¹¹⁶

Exhortations that the king ‘Trust Caualeer’ rather than ‘Putt too Much Confidence in them that did what seemed Good in their Own eyes dewringe his absence’ issued from former royalist officers.¹¹⁷ A North-East Welsh petition signed by eighty-eight North Welsh gentlemen was presented to the king in 1660 intended to prevent former parliamentarians gaining office. Professing themselves ‘not able to digest that detestable & horrid Murther of your Royall father our once most gracious Sovereigne’, they encouraged the king to trust in those who had supported him in the Interregnum.¹¹⁸ These calls increased at times when

¹¹⁴ Private collection.

¹¹⁵ HoP biographies for Eyton and Whitley. Wynn’s appointment as Receiver-General for North Wales was documented in his correspondence, e.g. NLW MS 9066E no 2268: Kenrick Eyton to Maurice Wynn, Clement’s Lane, 4 Dec. 1660.

¹¹⁶ NLW, MS 9066E no 2240: Richard Wynn to Lady Grace Wynn, n. p., 12 June 1660.

¹¹⁷ For example: TNA, SP 29/41 fo. 3: Thomas Baker to Henry Bishop, Wrexham, 2 Sept. 1661; SP 29/44 fo. 94: James Hicke to Secretary Nicholas, enclosing letter from Thomas Baker, Wrexham, 11 Nov. 1661; SP 29/59 fo. 38: Thomas Baker to Secretary Nicholas, Wrexham, 7 Sept. 1662; NLW, Sweeney MS A4: fo. 93: The true narrative of Capt. Edward LLoyds Actions & sufferings in & for his Maties service, 1660.

¹¹⁸ NLW, MS 9066E no 2272: Address by the lords, knights, and gentlemen, inhabitants of North Wales, to Charles II on his Restoration, 1660.

rebellions had been discovered elsewhere, and were accompanied by denunciations and arrests of local nonconformists. However, despite their despair at the continued influence of former parliamentarians, and the neglect of the Cavaliers, the North-East Welsh gentry continued to serve loyally. Their opportunities to prove their constancy often came in the guise of offices to hold, or radicals to defeat. Their tendency to memorialise and enshrine their service continued unabated.

Local reactions to national political or religious controversies, 1660-85

There is little remaining evidence of the North-East Welsh reaction to the fall of Clarendon in 1667, the Popish Plot or the Exclusion Crisis from 1678 to 1681. What remains indicates conservative Anglicanism and a fear of instability. The news of Clarendon's fall brought comparisons of his impeachment with that of the earl of Strafford in 1641. John Wynn wrote to Sir Richard Wynn that 'All the Gowne men & presbiterians are violently for him & those that were engaged to the height in the Lord Straffords impeachment will not heare It mentioned for a president in this coniunction'.¹¹⁹ He condemned the hypocrisy of those individuals, accusing Clarendon of far greater crimes than Strafford had ever committed. While the accusations against Strafford, therefore, were depicted as a vendetta by one party in Parliament, those against Clarendon, who had already fallen from favour, were not. The role of Puritans or Presbyterians in both accusations help to understand the different responses to these two impeachments. Chapter two explored the strength of anti-Presbyterian feeling in North-East Wales and in Clarendon's case this extended to those seen as favouring Presbyterians as hypocritical and dangerous. Clarendon's preparedness to countenance the relaxation of strictures against Presbyterians, and his support for moderation in the Restoration religious settlement, made

¹¹⁹ NLW, MS 9067E no 2521: John Wynn to Sir Richard Wynn, Westminster, 29 Oct. 1667.

him less popular amongst Anglican Royalists. His stance in the early 1660s was remembered long after the fact, and the virulent anti-Presbyterian feelings expressed by some in North-East Wales make their support for his fall more understandable.

The North-East Welsh gentry were not uninterested in the controversies of the 1670s and 1680s, or ignorant of their implications. Their library catalogues and booksellers' bills show how fascinated they were by contemporary events, and correspondence demonstrates that possessing the freshest information and ideas was considered of paramount importance. Families like the Mostyns, Myddeltons, Hanmers and Wynnes ordered subscription newsletters, diurnalls, and received private letters of news from kin and connections close to government.¹²⁰ Parliamentary speeches, theological debate, and political pamphlets formed a significant part of Welsh gentry collections.¹²¹ This stretched back into the 1640s – the Penbedw library, for example, held twenty-three volumes of 'pamphlets written in 1640, 1641, 1642, 1643 &c', while other catalogues identify volumes of tracts bound by year or topic.¹²² The pamphlet catalogue for Penbedw library, apparently written in the late 1730s, identified 'Romish Controversies' as a whole separate category, and another as 'Controversies in Church and State'. Llanerch's catalogue refers to 'Various Publications against Popery from 1677 to 1689' as well as 'Tracts against Dissenters' from 1683. Mostyn's library retains copies of eight volumes of 'Tracts against Popery'.¹²³ The national issues of Exclusion and 'popery' more generally were of great interest, therefore, but were apparently not matters to be discussed in letters, aside from a couple of brief but telling

¹²⁰ For example, MH, MC vol. II no 33: Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.; MN vol. I no 46: Subscription newsletter, 6 Jan. 1674; NLW, MS 9068E no 2594: Subscription newsletter, 30 Aug. 1670; W.M. Myddelton (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts, A.D. 1605-1666* (St. Albans, 1908), pp. 96, 100; NLW, Bettisfield 61: Kenrick Eyton to Sir Thomas Hanmer, Clement's Lane, 20 Nov. 1660.

¹²¹ MH, MC vol. 1 no 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1676; NLW, Chirk A 29: 1704 Library Catalogue; Chirk E 10597: Bookseller's Account, 1671; Peniarth MS PB1: Penbedw Library (c.1692) and Pamphlet Catalogue (c.1740); MS 17126D: Llanerch Hall Library Catalogue, 1778.

¹²² NLW, Peniarth MS PB1: Penbedw Library Catalogue, p.14.

¹²³ NLW, MS 17126D: Llanerch Hall Library Catalogue, p. 30.

comments. Roger Mostyn, the younger brother of Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaeth, wrote disparagingly of the Green Ribbon Club as ‘a company of silly malcontents’ in 1677, while the Caernarfonshire gentleman William Griffith hoped for ‘a wise secure Moderation’ from parliament in 1681. Griffith had earlier prayed for God to ‘blesse all the great Body King, lords and Commons in perfect unity, that all (though numerous) distractions may bee removed, and our poore distressed nation bee restored to its ancient glory and settlement, and that loyalty may bee encouraged and such as are otherwise suffer what they meritt’.¹²⁴ This implied that the issue of Exclusion was one such ‘distraction’, and that those questioning the succession were not amongst the loyalists described by Griffith.

Attempts to assess the reaction of the North-East Welsh gentry to Exclusion are, however, complicated by the way their MPs voted in 1679. Thomas Mostyn, as MP for Caernarfon Boroughs in 1679 and 1681, voted for Exclusion, although his argument was that the Duke of York’s status and position encouraged the plot, rather than York personally. He argued that the Duchess of Richmond was as much of a danger as York, and despite his vociferous objections and pleas of familial and personal loyalty, was removed temporarily from his local offices in the 1680 purge of Commissions of the Peace.¹²⁵ Tim Harris has outlined several interrelated anxieties forming the basis of the Exclusion Crisis – the fear of popery and arbitrary government; what would happen in England in the future if a Catholic king came to the throne; Charles II’s style of government; and the current international situation – especially regarding the actions of Louis XIV of France.¹²⁶ Judging

¹²⁴ MH, MC vol. II no 8: Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n. d., c. 1677; MH, MC vol. II no 59: William Griffith to Thomas Mostyn, Cefnamwlch, 25 Jan. 1681; MC vol II no 73 William Griffith to Thomas Mostyn 14 Dec. 1680.

¹²⁵ Dodd’s argument that this was due to Beaufort’s influence is persuasive. The other gentlemen purged in 1680 were either firm supporters of dissent or Whigs. HoP bio; A. Grey (ed.), *Debates of the House of Commons* (10 vols, 1763), VII, 139; B.E. Howells (ed.), *Calendar of Letters Relating to North Wales*, p. 177; A.H. Dodd, ‘“Tuning” the Welsh Bench’, *NLWJ*, 6 (1950), p. 251.

¹²⁶ T. Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (2006), p. 139.

from Mostyn's later attempts to persuade his father to resist the commands of the king and to answer negatively to the Three Questions, it appears he came early to the position that the Duke of York could not be trusted either to support the Established Church or to resist the attempts of his Catholic followers to gain power.¹²⁷ Mostyn certainly had a strong interest in foreign news, ordering foreign newspapers and corresponding with a contact with similar concerns.¹²⁸ His comment on the Duchess of Richmond suggests that fear of Court Catholicism was one powerful driver behind his vote. With few other indications of Mostyn's political beliefs, aside from an obsessive interest in contemporary debates, it is difficult to ascertain if he can be ascribed a neat party label. A hatred of popery was as much a feature of Tory beliefs as those of the Whigs.¹²⁹ Correspondence from John Fell, bishop of Oxford, reveals that Mostyn was a strong supporter of the Church of England.¹³⁰ He was certainly no friend of dissenters, and displayed no sign of supporting Monmouth at any point from the 1670s onwards. His father and his son were both Tories, as was the Flintshire Boroughs MP Sir John Hanmer.

While Mostyn's friend Mutton Davies appears a Tory in every other matter, and was classed 'vile' by Shaftesbury, he also voted for Exclusion in 1679. On the other hand Sir Roger Whitley, who was to show such prominent Whiggish support for Monmouth in 1682, abstained from the vote. Sir Thomas Myddelton III (MP for Denbighshire) was absent for the vote, though possibly opposed to exclusion, as was Sir John Salusbury, the MP for Denbigh Boroughs.¹³¹ This voting pattern complicates the fragmentary evidence

¹²⁷ MH, MC vol. V no 25: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Mostyn, 15 Dec. 1687, with Mostyn's reply.

¹²⁸ For example, MH, MN, vol. 1 no 25: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 12 Oct. 1673; MN, vol. 1 no 43: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 29 Dec. 1673; vol. 2, no. 2: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 13 Apr. 1680.

¹²⁹ G. Southcombe and G. Tapsell, *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture: Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke, 2010), p. 81.

¹³⁰ MH, MC vol. I no 4: Bishop John Fell to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 23 Nov. 1672 (?); vol. I no 10: Bishop John Fell to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Jul. 1674.

¹³¹ *HOP 1660-1690*, III, 125, 385.

elsewhere of strong loyalism, though statements from both Davies and Salusbury elsewhere indicate that they were generally loyalists. Mostyn was able sufficiently to divorce his loathing for popery from his evidently affectionate relationship with his Catholic wife, and help for his Catholic relatives. Furthermore, a 'Mr. Mostin' made the offer to Beaufort to raise forces to oppose the landing of William of Orange in 1688.¹³² It is impossible to know, therefore, whether Mostyn and Davies's votes were the result of personal inclination, an agreement to vote together on certain issues, or an overwhelming fear of political or international popery. Dodd and Jenkins have argued that party mattered little in Wales, in election contests or beyond. If Welsh constituencies (and the MPs they elected) did really value independence beyond ideology, then personal inclination or family alliances may indeed have caused the North-East Welsh MPs either to support Exclusion or abstain from the vote.¹³³

Where national events had a local impact, there are more indications of the North-East Welsh attitude. In September 1682, during Monmouth's visit to Chester and the North-West, Sir George Jeffreys wrote to Secretary Jenkins telling him of the 'dayly applications made to mee about the outrages comitted in that citty' in Wrexham. Jeffreys expected this 'clamor' to continue when he arrived at Holywell. The outrages he described included 'most of the honest mens windows broke'.¹³⁴ The implication was that those at the Welsh assizes wanted Jeffreys and the authorities to act promptly against Monmouth and his supporters – if true, this would be unsurprising. Although the North-East Welsh gentry definitely tended to have strong Tory leanings, there was not a high level of partisanship for either party in the region itself. Indeed the only mention of a resident Welsh gentleman

¹³² Dodd, "'Tuning' the Welsh Bench", p. 253; HMC, *12th report part IV*, pp. 110, 114; HMC, *7th report*, pp. 347-8.

¹³³ Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, pp. 161-2; Dodd, 'Flintshire politics in the Seventeenth Century', p. 43.

¹³⁴ TNA, SP 29/420 fo. 106: Sir George Jeffreys to Secretary Jenkins, Wrexham, 16 Sept. 1682.

during Monmouth's visit was of Thomas Whitley of Aston, Sir Roger Whitley's nephew.¹³⁵

While Whitley was at this point firmly in the Whig/Monmouth camp, his nephew took a different view. Peter Shakerley recounted a story of Whitley at Wallasey races:

Tom Whittley of Aston, Coll: Whittley's elder Brother's son (who has not the Fortune of soe great an estate as ye Collonell, but a much honester man) being at Wallesy was drunk to the Duke of Munmouth's Health which he readily pledged; and immediatly drank to the same person ye Duke of York's Health; which he refusing to pledge says Tom to him if thou'l not take my Duke take thou thine gain; & soe putting his Finger in his mouth threw him out upon him.¹³⁶

Shakerley's step-mother was a Dolben of Segrwyd, a Denbighshire royalist family, and Shakerley's father lived at least part of the time in Gwersyllt. He would have had an awareness of North-East Welsh political views and individuals, but in his letters mentioned nobody other than the Whitleys in connection with Monmouth's visit.

Ultimately the North-East Welsh gentry were extremely interested in the politico-religious controversies of the later seventeenth century, but only expressed strong opinions on them (at least on paper) when these controversies affected local affairs. Their localist tendencies led them to resist interference from outside, for example where even local gentlemen were seen as 'court' candidates in elections, and when they were commanded to implement laws of which they did not approve. They resented paying taxes to fund extravagance, although this fits into a much more long-standing pattern of attempts to reduce or avoid taxes. The North-East Welsh gentry maintained a strongly loyal stance in relation to political and religious instability, however, and continued to pride themselves on the nature of their

¹³⁵ One list identified a 'Sir John Guildham of Flintshire' as being present, but a subsequent document states that it was thought that the 'Sir John Guilliams whom som think to be Dick Cromwell went not to Wallesy but stay'd in Chester'. I have not identified an individual of that name in Flintshire in this period, but equally it is dubious (to say the least) to agree that Richard Cromwell attended Wallasey in disguise. TNA, SP 29/420 fo. 88: Account of Monmouth's reception in Chester, 11 Sept. 1682; TNA, SP 29/420 fo. 110: Peter Shakerley's list of those waiting on Monmouth, 16 Sept. 1682.

¹³⁶ TNA, SP 29/420 fo. 153: Peter Shakerley to Secretary Jenkins, Chester, 23 Sept. 1682.

allegiance to the Crown. This was to be truly tested during the reign of James II, and temporarily broken.

Loyalty tested: The North-East Welsh gentry and James II

Although James II's reign was initially approached with optimism, his policies were to provide the greatest test for the loyalty of the North-East Welsh gentry. From the Three Questions Survey of 1686, the Declaration of Indulgence in 1687, to the trial and imprisonment of the Seven Bishops in 1688, James's determination to introduce religious toleration set him on a collision course with many of his formerly most loyal subjects. As for many English gentlemen, the local political and religious implications of James II's attempts to achieve toleration for Catholics were the cause of much consternation and anxiety among the Protestant North-East Welsh gentry. Although the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis were moments of crisis in London, and the occasion for many newsletters and urgent messages to be sent to the country, it was James II's policies that were greeted with true alarm in North-East Wales. Alarm bells began to ring with the purging of the corporations in England. A correspondent of Thomas Mostyn's described this process as 'against the laws', and urged him to let those on the new list of Catholic sheriffs 'know they are not the most... considerable men in the county'.¹³⁷ When Sir John Trevor was rumoured in February 1688 to have advised the King to bring Quo Warrantos against all the corporations in Wales, he was charged with 'Impudence' and 'mischief' against 'his native country'.¹³⁸ This was a point at which religion and politics were indivisible, and every political action became a matter of conscience.

¹³⁷ MH, MC vol. V no 3: Philip Fowke to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

¹³⁸ Sir John Trevor's reputation had long been poor in his homeland, but this period represented its nadir. Thomas Mostyn described him as 'so justly hatefull to all mankind' in relation to his actions in 1688 and his attempts to stand for election in Caernarfonshire. MH, MC vol. V no 29: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 2 Feb. 1688; vol. V no 30: Thomas Mostyn to Anon., Gloddaeth, 11 Feb. 1688.

The projected elections of 1688 were viewed as a battleground where this conflict would be played out. Thomas Mostyn correctly characterised the elections as part of the King's fight to repeal the test, and as a result argued that the gentry were 'bound indispensibly by our duty to God (whose Religion is in so much danger) to ye establisht government (which is in no less) & to our neighbour whose life liberty & estate is at stake, & by our own interest ye care we owe to our families & posterity'.¹³⁹ Despite this strongly worded opposition to the King's policy, it is clear the gentry hoped that the level of opposition to his toleration project would change his mind, and that he would see the error of his ways. As Speck has argued, few of those that James II alienated were converted to theories of resistance, and only a minority believed they should actively oppose him.¹⁴⁰ Indeed in the Revolution itself, there are no signs that the North-East Welsh gentry supported William, and Thomas Mostyn even volunteered to raise troops to repel the Dutch invasion.¹⁴¹ This partially explains the strong current of Jacobitism in the region after the invasion of 1688 – after the immediate threat to the Church and their local power had passed, many of the gentry reverted to Stuart loyalism.¹⁴² To support the removal of the rightful King had never been their intention, and the hope that James would be forced into a more sensible position remained despite all the evidence to the contrary.

A more locally specific incident typifies the extent of the struggle between loyalism, religion, and territorial instinct. In 1687 James II travelled to the shrine at St. Winifred's Well in Holywell, Flintshire, to pray for an heir. This led to further, unwanted, royal

¹³⁹ MH, MC vol. V no 30: Thomas Mostyn to Anon., Gloddaeth, 11 Feb. 1688.

¹⁴⁰ W. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolt of 1688* (Oxford, 1988), p. 73.

¹⁴¹ Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, p. 147.

¹⁴² Aside from documentary evidence in correspondence collections and Jacobite club records, there is consistent material evidence in North-East Welsh gentry houses of this allegiance. P.D.G. Thomas, 'Jacobitism in Wales', *WHR*, 1 (1962), pp. 287-8, 279; C.D. Wood, 'The Welsh Response to the Glorious Revolution of 1688', *JWRH*, new ser., vol. 1 (2001), p. 24.

interest in the Well.¹⁴³ In May 1687 the Queen granted the chapel adjoining St. Winifred's Well to the Jesuits, despite the chapel belonging to the Mostyns of Mostyn. Sir Roger Mostyn sought the advice of his son, Robert Davies of Gwysaney, Piers Pennant, and the Bishop of St. Asaph, before obeying the commands of the Queen. Thomas Mostyn's reply reveals the odium in which he held the Jesuits – partly because of the nature of their claim, a territorial one that he feared would be just the start of further problems for gentry landowners. Mostyn depicted his father as standing between the gentry and future Jesuit claims, 'they make choice of you to stand between them & the law and at present to receive all the hatred & scandal that must necessarily attend this action'. For him the incident represented 'but a sorry return of your kindness to them, but very suitable to the gratitude of Jesuits'. This demonstrates the degree to which the Mostyns had previously been aware of, and even protected, Jesuit activity in the area, but also the fact that agreeing to the King's commands would not reflect well on Sir Roger. Mostyn ended by appealing to his father's sense of family honour:

It has pleasd God to bless you with a long & happy life, a plentyfull estate & a Good reputation, & therefore for this sake, your owne, & for the sake of your family, do not do any thing that may impaire that reputation, bring you into trouble or shame, or disquiet your conscience hereafter, but shew to those little fellows at Holywell... (still preserving all the respect due to the great name they abuse) that comtempt that every gentleman & good Christian ought to have for them.

The struggle between the desire to preserve respect for the 'great name' (the Queen) that the Jesuits used to achieve their aims, and the abhorrence of the implications for conscience and family honour is clear. Ultimately Sir Roger Mostyn opted for loyalism, and wrote to his son that the other gentlemen he had spoken with had approved of his action. In response to his son's evocations of family honour he protested that, 'if I shall be liable

¹⁴³ A. Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2011), p. 198.

to the censure of the Country, my Loyalty must beare the blame'.¹⁴⁴ Mostyn and his friends continued to write of the twin importance of standing firm in both religion and loyalty but as James persisted with his pro-Catholic policies that loyalty was to prove an immensely difficult and thorny problem.

Sir Roger's response to the Three Questions survey was to prove even more agonising. The North-East Welsh gentry conformed to the pattern of other regions in either being absent, or providing negative or evasive answers to James II's 'Three Questions' survey of 1686. As many as fifty-two per cent of the Flintshire gentlemen summoned by Beaufort to Ludlow in 1686 were absent, and although Denbighshire saw the largest number of gentlemen attending the summons from any Welsh county, forty per cent were still missing from the meeting. Mostyn pleaded age and illness as reasons for not attending at Ludlow, but wrote a letter to Beaufort explaining his answers. Again, he asked for advice from his son on a draft of the letter. Thomas Mostyn advised that for the sake of conscience and duty his father should reply in the negative to all of the questions 'according to the example of all the Gentlemen of the Nation'. He believed that the consequence of this unanimous negative would be that the King would realise that toleration was 'a baffl'd fayl'd project', and that amongst all of the negatives Mostyn would not be picked out for either silence or a negative response.¹⁴⁵ Mostyn believed that the Duke of Beaufort was 'not so much in earnest in this matter', having managed to wriggle out of meeting the Papal nuncio.

The outcome of the Three Questions survey was that many of the traditional ruling families (including the Mostyns) were, as in 1647, removed from the Bench and from positions as Deputy Lieutenant. They were replaced by Catholics, nonconformists, and

¹⁴⁴ MH, MC vol. V no 13: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Mostyn, 16 May 1687, with Mostyn's reply; MC vol. V no 14: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 18 May 1687.

¹⁴⁵ MH, MC vol. V no 25: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Mostyn, 15 Dec. 1687, with Mostyn's reply.

those who had indicated in the survey that they would agree with the King's policies. Many of those who were absent, particularly in Flintshire, had either fought for Charles I or, if younger, were from families who had devoted much money and effort in sustaining the Stuart and Anglican cause.¹⁴⁶ The affront to the loyalists of North-East Wales was clear. It seemed that loyalty to the Church could no longer be compatible with loyalty to the King. James II failed to appreciate the depth of belief and the importance of history that sustained the North-East Welsh gentry's loyalty to the Crown, and this caused them to desert him. The combination of threats to their religion, local power, and ordered society, as in 1641, was too much for them to bear. The loyalists of North-East were forced to adopt a temporary oppositional position in order to sustain their principles.

The response to the Dutch invasion itself, and the conduct of the North-East Welsh gentry during the period of Revolution, remains enigmatic. North-East Welsh responses to the Glorious Revolution of 1688-9 are recorded in some detail, but there are very few remaining indications from within the period of confusion. What survives is indicative of reaction to events rather than participation in them. There was only minimal anti-Catholic action taken in North-East Wales, and that was after the Revolution rather than before or during, unlike many places in the Midlands and the Marches.¹⁴⁷ There are no signs of North-East Welsh gentlemen going over to William as the momentum behind his cause built, unlike in England. Equally, there is only limited evidence of support for James.¹⁴⁸ Sarah Savage, the daughter of the Presbyterian Philip Henry, wrote in her diary of the Dutch invasion. As a fervent dissenter her sympathies were clear. She recorded 'great hurries in Public affairs, many joynd with the Prince of Orange... I trust God will bring good out of our Thursday post, newes of a great revolt from the King to the Prince'.

¹⁴⁶ Bodl., MS Rawlinson A 139A: Beaufort's return to the Three Questions survey, 1686.

¹⁴⁷ T. Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (2006), p. 294.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

Although Savage wrote of the participation of many Cheshire men in the aftermath of the invasion, there is little sense of what the Welsh gentry were doing at this time.¹⁴⁹ It appears that the normal means by which they received news were somewhat disrupted, to judge by Bishop Humphrey Humphreys's letters to Thomas Mostyn in early December. Unable to obtain news due to 'having lost all my Correspondents since the inuasion', Humphreys begged Mostyn for the latest updates.¹⁵⁰ Despite this, it is likely that the invasion was unwelcome to many of the North-East Welsh gentry. Sir Robert Owen of Clennennau and Brogyntyn and Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaeth both volunteered to raise troops in support of James II, despite having suffered as a consequence of the king's policies at different points in his reign.¹⁵¹ Flintshire was a stronghold of Jacobitism after the Revolution, indicating at the very least unease with the events of November and December 1688. From Humphreys's letter, the support for James following the invasion rested on his status as an anointed king. Humphreys write that 'I haue not the same notion of princes you haue, I think them of the same make with other men & that as there are some bad there are likewise some just & good among them'. He was prepared to support William in order to rid the country of 'ye diuels own imps...spit out of his mouth' – the Jesuits.¹⁵² Yet to judge from their behaviour before and after December 1688, the North-East Welsh gentry continued to see the anointed king as the rightful monarch, no matter how provocative his policies or actions.

IV. North-East Welsh material culture: Memory, hope, and preservation

Material objects can help to reveal political tendencies that are harder to find within archival documents. They demonstrate the ways that the gentry chose to represent

¹⁴⁹ CRO, ZBasten/8: Diary of Sarah Savage, 28 Nov. 1688.

¹⁵⁰ MH, MC vol. 5, no 47: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 2 Dec. 1688.

¹⁵¹ Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, p. 147.

¹⁵² MH, MC vol. 5, no 49: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

themselves in a form of visual rhetoric, and married with their actions and expressed political ideals they help to build a more effective picture of the political culture of North-East Wales from 1640 to 1688. The surviving gentry houses of North-East Wales reveal that the experience of the Civil War, and the memory of serving the royalist cause, were vitally important to the generation who lived through the 1640s and 1650s. Although these artefacts now act as mere souvenirs of the past, for the North-East Welsh gentry royalists who preserved them they were a central part of their and their family's identity well beyond the Restoration in 1660. These surviving material artefacts there are evidence of three main themes: a contemporary desire to preserve morale, and hopes for a future restoration; the memorialisation of a traumatic and formative act of service; and acts of preservation. These themes demonstrate that it is important to consider the biography of such objects, and that their meaning and purpose changed over time – even within the lifetime of their initial owners or producers.¹⁵³ Used in conjunction with archival and literary evidence, objects in North-East Welsh houses demonstrate the political tendencies of the region. They were another way in which Welsh royalists resisted Interregnum regimes in the 1650s and preserved their cause in a different way after the Restoration.

A desire to maintain the royalist cause is evident in seventeenth-century North-East Welsh material culture. Miniatures, snuffboxes, and books were designed to reinforce a royalist associational culture, provide a private boost to morale, and thumb their noses at the opposition. The Stuart allegiance and the centrality of the image of the monarch were fundamental to both the literary and the material collections in North-East Wales. Seditious or 'treacherous' objects in North-East Wales generally consisted of images of the king, either Charles I or Charles II. Royalist medals, sold in London since the early 1640s,

¹⁵³ C. Gosden and Y. Marshall, 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology*, 31 (1999), p. 169.

are evident in several gentry houses, including Mostyn Hall.¹⁵⁴ They are mounted with a surround and a fixture by which a royalist could wear such a medal around his neck – an item with the potential to be both private and public. Miniatures of varying quality serve a similar purpose – small and concealable, yet with the potential to be revealed to fellow travellers if safe, such as those at Gwysaney in Flintshire. In one case, such an object was used as part of a gentleman’s funeral. After Sir Richard Wynn’s death in 1649, Maurice Wynn wrote to his brother that ‘I haue a Medall of ye K & Q pictur in siluer wch I will leue to yor howse as a memorial that hee was a seruant to both’. This was Sir Richard’s medal, a token of his royalism, but also a way in which his service was to be remembered in the long-term.¹⁵⁵ Another particularly iconographically rich object belonged to Sir Thomas Hanmer. It is a royalist medal set in an engraved silver surround as a snuffbox. It also served the function of remembering and commemorating royalist service. Produced after the execution of Charles I in 1649, it depicted the late king as a martyr, the sword, sceptre and scales of justice broken, and the Prayer Book open and discarded on the floor.¹⁵⁶ The king, the protector of the liberties, laws, and Church of England, was dead – and this object mourned what royalists felt they had lost. In private, royalists could use such portraits to remember the King. When revealed, they could act as similar Jacobite artefacts did, as a means of ‘forming a “corporate identity” with like-minded souls through shared recognition and use of such objects’.¹⁵⁷

Larger portraits could serve as a more public sign of allegiance, and Welsh gentry houses appear to have retained portraits of Charles I and II long after their reigns, in a way that they did not for any other monarch. Several portraits of Charles I or II were on the walls at

¹⁵⁴ BL, Harley MS 164 fo. 325v: Diary of Sir Simonds D’Ewes; private collection.

¹⁵⁵ NLW, MS 9064E no 1895: Maurice Wynn to Sir Owen Wynn, 7 Aug. 1649.

¹⁵⁶ Private collection.

¹⁵⁷ N. Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 5.

Mostyn, Hanmer, and Gwysaney. Otherwise, the choice of artist for family portraits could have political overtones – portraits, for example, in the style of Van Dyck and Lely at Gwydir and Mostyn made an implicit connection to the court and the Stuart monarchy.¹⁵⁸ This was the environment in which most gentry royalist socialising took place – amongst objects and images that recalled Charles I and his cause. Sometimes books and their bindings could act as a political statement. A parish register presented to Whitford parish church by Sir Roger Mostyn in 1657 featured the Stuart coat of arms on the cover. Shaun Evans’ argument that this shows an attempt by the Mostyns to control the parish is a strong one, in view of the dynastic authority of the Mostyns in the parish and region.¹⁵⁹

Another important theme within material culture is an intense desire to memorialise an individual’s service and actions from 1642 to 1660, in their lifetime and after death. Suffering, sacrifice, and its memorialisation were important values for the North-East Welsh gentry. Just as loyalty was tied to the memory of past deeds and the expectation of future rewards, so suffering was connected to an expectation of its memorialisation. This was evident particularly in funerary monuments. Some royalist monuments, such as the table tomb of Captain Edward Wynne at St. Dyfnog’s, Llanrhaeadr-yng-Nghinmeirch, relate to death in service during the Civil War – although the inscriptions appear to have been placed there at some point after the end of the war. Wynne’s inscription, for example, states that he ‘dyd in the defense of Denbigh Castle when besieged by Oliver Cromwells army’, perhaps suggesting the tomb was inscribed after the end of the war when Cromwell’s political importance had become more evident. Others, however, were made long after the Civil War. John Robinson died in 1680 and was buried at All Saints Church,

¹⁵⁸ For example, those at Downing and Mostyn. T. Pennant, *The History of the Parishes of Whiteford and Holywell* (1796), pp. 8, 70.

¹⁵⁹ Evans, “To contynue in my bloud and name”, p. 167.

Gresford. His heraldic memorial plaque is almost all devoted to describing his faithful service:

Heir lyeth ye Body of Coll: Iohn Robinson late of Gwersilt in this parish who faithfully served King Charles ye first during all ye late wars, for wch haueing lost his Estate, & being in danger of his life he was forced to go beyond ye seas, where he lived in Exile wth ye present king Charles ye second for ye space of twelve years. After his Majesties' most Happy Restauration; Being then Restored to his Estate he married Margeratt daughter of Coll: Edward Norris of Speke.¹⁶⁰

His narrative is one of loyalty and suffering, and in taking the traditional form of a funerary plaque with his arms and lineage displayed alongside the inscription, links his heritage to his actions. The 1662 monument of Lieutenant-Colonel John Dolben tells a similar story, of how 'as a Major and afterwards Leiuftenant Collonell, Faithfully and valiantly serv'd King Charles the I. After the Martyrdome of that Blessed Prince, he had his estate twice sequestered, and bore his sufferings with the same courage and magnanimity as he had done his sword'. Sir Richard Lloyd, former Governor of Holt, and the Chief Justice of Wales, received the following inscription: 'a loyal and devoted subject and servant of the Royal Martyr Charles'.¹⁶¹ Other monuments seek to tell a tale of penitence and a return to loyalty. Sir Thomas Myddelton (1586-1666) was commemorated by his grandson, also Sir Thomas, with a carved marble tomb and twin busts of himself and his second wife. Richard Haslam described the resemblance between Sir Thomas's bust and that by Van Dyck of King Charles I, which given the inscription on the tomb, excusing Myddelton's parliamentary allegiance and declaring his proud royalism and commitment to the Restoration, is perhaps not surprising.¹⁶² These were not ephemeral or fleeting sentiments, but inscriptions that were meant to last for generations. The epitaphs chosen are, therefore, hugely indicative of the importance placed on the actions and loyalties they

¹⁶⁰ Memorial plaque in Gresford Church, Denbighshire.

¹⁶¹ N. Tucker, *Denbighshire Officers in the Civil War* (Denbigh, 1964), pp. 33, 64.

¹⁶² R. Haslam, 'Baroque Tomb Structure: An introduction to the Myddelton monuments in St. Mary's Church, Chirk', report from a talk given at the Cambrian Archaeological Association meeting, Easter 2014.

commemorated. They were reminders of the dynastic nature of the service paid, and had significance far beyond 1660, and beyond the lifetimes of those who remembered the Civil Wars and Interregnum.

Portraits and material objects also acted as testament to individual war service. Family collections preserve seventeenth-century armour and weapons used in Civil War action. The Davieses of Gwysaney kept the sword and helmet of their close kinsman Sir Gerard Eyton, and the Mostyns of Mostyn preserved the cannon used at the siege of Chester. More curiously Sir Roger Mostyn had his new baronetcy and the coat of arms of Tudur Trevor cast into a mortar shell used in the Civil War.¹⁶³ This was a highly visual and material display of the triumph of the ancient Welsh gentry over the vicissitudes of the previous twenty years. These are souvenirs of a crucial period in the history and self-representation of each dynasty, as well as a physical and material reminder of the unstable and violent past. Royalist service was also commemorated in family portraits – full sized and miniature. A portrait of Sir Roger Mostyn, commissioned by him in 1652, shows him wearing a long wig, an armoured breastplate, sword, red sash and baton of office.¹⁶⁴ Aspects of this iconography feature in several other contemporary portraits of North-East Welsh royalists: including those of John Robinson and Sir Gerard Eyton.¹⁶⁵ Robinson appears both in a full-sized portrait with long flowing hair and armour, while Eyton, a more stolid and substantial soldier, poses with his red sash, moustache, armour and staff. A miniature of Sir Geoffrey Shakerley showed him with long hair, a sash, and armour, while Colonel Hugh Wynne and Major-General Sir John Owen were painted in a battle ready pose, with armour, staff and long flowing hair.¹⁶⁶ All of these representations fit the

¹⁶³ Evans, “To contynue in my bloud and name”, p. 168.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

¹⁶⁵ Private collection.

¹⁶⁶ Tucker, *Denbighshire Officers*, plate no. 5; N. Tucker, *North Wales in the Civil War* (Denbigh, 1958), plate 1.

‘standard version of loyalist masculinity’ set by Fairthorne and Dobson’s depictions of Prince Rupert. Dobson’s portraits of royalist soldiers accentuated their hair and armour, as do the images of North-East Welsh cavaliers.¹⁶⁷ The investiture of the self, commented on by Jones and Stallybrass, is evident in such portraits. The sitters have chosen to clothe themselves in the identity of a royalist, positioning themselves in the own worlds purely from the standpoint of a royalist. If clothes are the ‘material establishers of memory’, the ‘bearers of identity, ritual, and social memory’, then for future generations Mostyn, Robinson, and Eyton had all chosen to be portrayed as royalist soldiers.¹⁶⁸ These material memorials were supported by scribal and printed accounts of North-East Welsh military service. Dr David Lloyd’s *Memoires* are best known for their pen portraits of royalist heroes, but they also memorialise many Welsh royalist officers who contributed to the king’s cause. The author’s life as a North-East Welsh clergyman explains the space he devoted to those who would have remained relatively anonymous in the national context. Thus the ‘loyal service’ of Cols. Robert and Edward Broughton, Sir Evan Lloyd, Anthony Thelwall, Sir Thomas Salusbury, Col. William Salesbury and Col. William Wynne is recorded alongside the great and the good of the royalist elites.¹⁶⁹

Finally, there was an element of the elegiac preservation of sacred objects. It is impossible to say definitively whether the possession of portraits and miniatures were evidence of the cult of Charles the Martyr, as few such depictions come with a reliable or highly specific date provenance. Despite this there are a number of indications that the North-East Welsh gentry viewed Charles I as a royal martyr. Several objects acted as relics: sacred ‘things’ touched, worn, or stained with the blood of Charles I. A red silk cap, embroidered with

¹⁶⁷ J. de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004), p. 101.

¹⁶⁸ A.R. Jones and P. Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 5, 11, 49.

¹⁶⁹ D. Lloyd, *Memoires* (1668), pp. 660-61, 665-6.

leaves and fruit, was apparently sent to Colonel William Salesbury by Charles I on the eve of this death in recognition of his dogged and loyal service. This became a treasured item. Similarly a handkerchief said to be dipped in the blood of the martyred king is still at Mostyn Hall with a collection of other royalist *objets*.¹⁷⁰ Lady Bridgeman, wife of the Cheshire lawyer and judge Sir Orlando, also possessed a handkerchief obtained after the execution, reportedly telling the father of a scrofula sufferer about its miraculous properties.¹⁷¹ Nalson reported many witnesses of the execution rushing forward to dip handkerchiefs or scraps of material in the king's blood, to be used afterward as touch-objects or souvenirs for those who 'wished to keep alive the memory of the martyr king'.¹⁷² Portraits of the king, whether in the frontispiece to the hugely popular *Eikon Basilike*, as medals, or in painted form, have also been depicted as a 'thing of power, akin to a crucifix, a religious icon or a medal depicting a patron saint: both the image and the relic, by their sheer materiality, were "incarnational"'.¹⁷³

Royalist words support the argument that the cult of Charles the Martyr was extremely successful in Wales. Memorials to former Civil War soldiers mentioned their service to the 'Royal Martyr', and Edward Lloyd of Llanforda referred to Charles as 'our martyr'd master' in 1650.¹⁷⁴ An anonymous poem jotted in the Denbigh Quarter Sessions records its author's feelings on the post-1649 fast days:

The scripture bids for sin to fast & pray
 Why giue you thanks then for a bloody day
 o hypocrits is this yor round head pranks
 to slay yor soveraigne & then giue thanks
 Leauē off for shame & trouble god no further

¹⁷⁰ Private collection.

¹⁷¹ A. Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 61.

¹⁷² Lacey, *Cult of King Charles*, pp. 62, 64.

¹⁷³ Guthrie, *Material Culture of the Jacobites*, p. 47; H. Pierce, 'Artful Ambivalence? Picturing Charles I in the Interregnum', in J. McElligott and D. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 72-3.

¹⁷⁴ Bodl., MS Ashmole 1825 fo. 149: Edward Lloyd to 'Cousin Evans', n.p., 31 Mar. 1650.

ffor hee expects noe thanks for doeing murther.¹⁷⁵

Long after the Restoration Humphrey Humphreys's autobiography referred to his father as an 'old Cavalier and an officer in the Army of King Charles the Martyr from the beginning of the war to the end of it'.¹⁷⁶ Welsh and English language poetry mourned and condemned the regicide in the strongest terms, and continued to do so after 1660. Huw Morys's elegy for William Owen of Llangollen, buried on 30 January 1678, referred to the anniversary of 'the bitter pang' and exhorted mourners to remember Charles I alongside his partisan, Owen.¹⁷⁷

There is little distinctively Welsh about the individual royalist material objects found in Denbighshire and Flintshire. The pervasiveness of the interest in the image of Charles I is, however, striking. There were few gentry houses in which portraits, objects, or relics did not dwell. It formed part of a broader associational culture in which it was crucial to be recognised as a royalist, and in which self-presentation was almost entirely royalist. This was not confined to the 1640s or 1650s, but helped to form the longer-term memory and identity of the region. The presence of royalist 'things' aided in the absorption of royalism within the cultural pantheon of Welsh identity, and was perpetuated over the centuries.

V: Conclusion

Welsh political culture was permeated with loyalty and royalism. Concepts of Welsh gentility created a culture that thrived on consensus and continuity rather than change, and this affected everything from elections to the objects they bought. The North-East Welsh gentry socialised in royalist rooms, clothed themselves as royalists, and defined themselves

¹⁷⁵ NLW, Chirk C 1: Book of Orders, 1647-62, Denbighshire Quarter Sessions.

¹⁷⁶ Bangor, Penrhos MS A4: Pedigrees and Biography of Humphrey Humphreys.

¹⁷⁷ Jenkins, *Foundations of Modern Wales*, p. 134.

as such even after death. Loyalty, a core concept of Welsh gentility, was a driving force in their reaction to events throughout the period. Only religion and localism were stronger – the forces that finally drove the North-East Welsh gentry to resist James II in 1688. Yet even considering that limited and short-lived resistance, the vexed question of loyalty was ever present, and the withdrawal of their support for James’s policies did not mean support for his removal. Welsh royalism had its roots in a long-established social and political culture. The instability and disorder that the North-East Welsh gentry witnessed from 1640 to 1660 only served to confirm the importance of both royalism and loyalism. It was not for reasons of self-interest alone that the gentry rushed to occupy local positions of authority after 1660 but to restore order and hierarchy, peace and equilibrium, and the Church of England.

Chapter 4: Case Studies

North-East Wales abounds with individuals whose religious, political, and cultural outlooks would supplement the previous chapters' thematic discussions in fascinating and complex ways. There were, therefore, many potential exemplars of Welsh identity, religion, and royalism who could have formed the basis of these three case studies. Sir Thomas Salusbury of Lleweni (1612-43), for example, was a committed supporter of the Church and the Crown, and explained his reasons for his allegiance in detail. Sir Roger Mostyn (c.1620-90) exemplified military and dynastic loyalty to the Stuart monarchs, while Robert Davies of Gwysaney could equally have been chosen for his fondness for manuscripts and book collecting as for his royalism. Sir Thomas Myddelton (1586-1666) provides a fascinating case study for all three themes, particularly in the light of his changing political allegiance from 1642 to 1660.¹ Lady Grace Wynn (d. 1679), widow of Sir Owen Wynn of Gwydir (1592-1660) and niece of Bishop John Williams, could afford a fine example of the use of Welsh traditional forms of patronage and kinship connections to exert power and influence. As a counterpoint, the case studies could have focused on atypical examples in order both to illuminate the typicality of the majority and to emphasise that the unified approach of the region, while strong, was not absolute. Robert Salesbury of Henllan (b.1626), for example, was a Puritan who celebrated the misfortunes of his High Anglican religious opponents. Equally Thomas Edwards of Rhual (1649-1700), a nonconformist religious controversialist, could have furnished an illuminating study of Puritan responses to Restoration religious policies. Andrew Ellis of Althrey (c.1624-72) and Luke Lloyd of Bryn (c.1608-95) were steadfast parliamentarians in a region overwhelmingly dominated by royalists, and Sir John Trevor (1596-1673) was inclined towards puritanism and was

¹ Myddelton will be the subject of a future journal article.

atypically non-resident. This approach would, however, have followed the previous historiographical tendency to favour the minority of parliamentarians and Puritan radicals in the region.

In the light of so many interesting possibilities, the three case studies below were chosen for several principal reasons: the amount and range of archival material extant for a given individual; their typicality or (in the case of Sir Thomas Hanmer) questionability in relation to the three chosen themes; the engaging nature of their example in relation to broader themes; and the need for the three case studies to cover the majority of the period from 1640 to 1688. The three case studies focus on Thomas Mostyn (1651-92), Sir Thomas Hanmer (1612-78) and Robert Davies (1616-68). The Mostyn correspondence and newsletter collections have been used selectively by English historians of the Restoration and Glorious Revolution. They were the focus of a 2016 PhD as a case study through which to examine the impact of news on politics and society, and the continuance of the scribal format in terms of importance and modernity.² The wider Mostyn library has recently been explored by Mary Chadwick and Shaun Evans.³ Despite this, this significant collection has not been examined in relation to Wales and the Welsh. Like the better known Wynn letters, this rich archive tells the historian much about book-collecting, news, sociability, gender, and many other themes of current historical interest. While the Mostyn collection remains together, both as facsimiles in the archives of Bangor University and in the library of Mostyn Hall, the Davies archive is much more scattered. In contrast to the Mostyn material, neither the Davies or Hanmer collections have been used frequently. Unlike Mostyn and Davies, Sir Thomas Hanmer and his family produced printed and

² For example, S. Garland, 'News in Late-Seventeenth Century Britain' (Univ. of Bangor PhD thesis, 2016); S. Sowerby, *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.; 2013), pp. 104, 182, 214, 207; G. Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 92-3.

³ M. Chadwick and S. Evans, 'The Library of Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaith, c.1676-1692' in A. Bautz (ed.), *Collecting Texts and Manuscripts, 1660-1860* (forthcoming).

scribal books, giving evidence of their more developed and organised ideas in relation to contemporary events as well as of their immediate responses in correspondence. This self-expressive writing is particularly useful when considering the theme of religious affiliation. Combined with diaries, notebooks, official documents and correspondence, it enables the historian to establish a more nuanced argument about the Hanmers' religious beliefs. The Davies collection ranges from book catalogues and letters to accounts and notebooks, including material objects and architectural plans. When considering Welsh royalism this is particularly important. It was not solely a written or literary phenomenon but was performative and material, and manifested itself in a number of ways that do not tend to emerge from letters alone.

Mostyn and Davies exemplify the aspects of (respectively) collecting and Welsh identity, and royalism. They furthermore reveal the broader social and political culture of North-East Wales, and demonstrate how the region's gentry interacted with trends and individuals beyond its borders. Mostyn's letters demonstrate that the interest in Welsh history was part of a broader and deeply imbedded tradition of historicised thinking.⁴ They reveal the ways in which the Welsh gentry lived in a paradigmatic past of lineage and power, applying the maxims of an earlier period to their contemporary and future actions. Thus manuscripts were solicited to aid with the writing of Welsh history, yet the same techniques and methods were used to obtain and assess contemporary news from London and abroad. The example of Davies shows similarly how royalism was strongly linked to a family's history and traditions, beliefs, and ideas regarding the organisation and priorities of Welsh society. The case of Hanmer, on the other hand, can be used at least partially as a counterpoint to the stereotypical religious image of a North-East Welsh gentleman. It

⁴ See chapter one, pp. 54-67.

appears he was not the archetypal Prayer Book supporting staunch defender of the Church of England, and the case study examines evidence that he was a conformist Catholic or 'church papist'. This allows both for a discussion of North-East Welsh Anglicanism and regional attitudes to Catholicism. Together Mostyn, Hanmer, and Davies demonstrate the interrelated nature of the three themes but also illuminate distinct aspects in depth.

I. Thomas Mostyn: Collections, historical writing, and Welsh identity

Collectors such as Thomas Mostyn or Robert Davies of Gwysaney presumed that the gentlemen from whom they sought fresh historical material would be interested in aiding in the study of Welsh history. If the emphasis had shifted from the Galfridian preoccupation with ancient 'British' origin myths, this does not mean that an interest in Welsh history was lost. Historical method had altered and, as within modern historiography, interests had changed. Mostyn collected news material and books as well as manuscripts. Although this was not all focused on Wales, it demonstrates the survival of two more aspects of Welsh social and political culture: the operation of kinship networks to achieve practical ends, and the ways that the North-East gentry bolstered their status and authority in the region. Chapter one of this thesis revealed the historicised culture of the North-East Welsh gentry, manifesting itself in the writing and preserving of histories (including genealogies), and the development of networks of gentleman collecting, studying, and swapping Welsh manuscript material. It also explored the social and political basis of North-East Welsh gentry territorial power and authority. This case study will explore the interests and actions of one North-East Welsh gentleman, Thomas Mostyn, in more depth. It will argue that Thomas Mostyn's collections and correspondence reveal the continuous importance of Welsh history to the gentry of the region. Welsh, or 'British' history, confirmed the source of their power, affirmed their lineage, and maintained traditions across generations.

Thomas Mostyn and the context to his collecting

The Mostyn family were steeped in Welsh tradition, territorial power, and ancestral patriotism. Thomas Mostyn (1651-92) was the eldest surviving son of Sir Roger Mostyn, patriarch of a family that had been regionally powerful for hundreds of years. Of all the families in North Wales, the Mostyns have received the most scholarly attention, due to the breadth of their influence and the survival both of the estate and many of its papers.⁵ This case study will build on the work of Shaun Evans and Mary Chadwick to argue that the Mostyn library was testament to the continuing interest in Welsh history and identity in the seventeenth century and beyond.⁶ It will contend Mostyn was part of a wider network of antiquarians and scholars across North Wales and beyond. Like his brother Richard, Thomas Mostyn interacted with fellow enthusiasts.⁷ Mostyn was not a stereotypical insular or ‘backwards’ Welsh gentleman much beloved of English representations throughout the early modern period. He had been on the Grand Tour while a young man. Mostyn had a wide range of interests, amongst which was a passion for domestic and foreign news, obtained from a network of very well-connected Welsh sources in London and Paris. Amongst them were friends he had travelled with in Continental Europe.⁸ He was comfortable spending time in London, and had many friends and acquaintances there. Mostyn sat as MP for Caernarfon Boroughs three times, in March and October 1679 and in 1681. He sought out and purchased tracts, plays, speeches, novels, foreign newspapers,

⁵ R.A. Charles, ‘Teulu Mostyn fel Noddwyr y Beirdd’, *NLWJ*, 7 (1951-2), pp. 74-110; D. Huws, ‘Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts’ in J.P. Carley and C.G.C. Tite (eds), *Books and Collectors 1200-1700* (1997), pp. 451-72; A.D. Carr, ‘The Making of the Mostyns’, *THSC* (1979), pp. 137-57; Garland, ‘News in Late-Seventeenth Century Britain’.

⁶ S. Evans, ‘“To contynue in my bloud and name”: Reproducing the Mostyn Dynasty, c.1540-1692’ (Univ. of Aberystwyth PhD thesis, 2013); M. Chadwick and S. Evans, ‘The Library of Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaith, c.1676-1692’.

⁷ N. Lloyd, ‘The Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn’, *FHSP*, 25 (1971-2), pp. 31-61.

⁸ MH, MS 9088, fo. 14: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 28 June 1673; no. 22: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 7 Oct. 1673; no. 32: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 1 Nov. 1673.

and pornography, as well as valuable Welsh and English manuscripts.⁹ His brother Richard, also a keen antiquary and a correspondent of Edward Lhuyd, wrote of his brother Thomas that ‘He who collected these MSS... had the best tast of books & learning of any country Gentleman that ever I saw in these parts, & while it pleas’d God to spare him to me, his family & country I must own I improv’d my selfe more by his conversation than by my reading’.¹⁰

Although Mostyn appears to have been most at home in Wales, therefore, he was no ignorant ‘Taffie’ or ‘Shenkin’. He made a deliberate choice to remain mostly within the borders of Wales, valuing and patronising Welsh bardic and manuscript culture, whilst remaining informed as to the freshest and most current of contemporary political news. His collections were, therefore, the result of a conscious decision to contribute to the study and preservation of the Welsh past, rather than a default position for one who did not know better.

Thomas Mostyn’s collections

Mostyn was a collector of many different types of material. Most of his collections are recognisable as typical of an English gentleman of this period, but they provide some insights into the Welsh historicised culture and identity explored in chapter one. Thomas Mostyn collected coins and medals, an interest that he shared after 1680 with William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph.¹¹ He was a passionate gardener, willing to send plants and trees to others who demonstrated an interest in gardening. Mostyn’s principal preoccupation,

⁹ MH, MC vol. I, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1676; MC vol. I, no. 34: John Mostyn, Weppra, to Thomas Mostyn, n.d.; MC vol. I, no. 25: William Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 4 Jan. 1675; MC vol. I, no. 2: John Fell to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

¹⁰ Transcribed in N. Lloyd, ‘The Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn’, pp. 53-4.

¹¹ MH, MC vol. IV, no. 52: Richard Jones to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 3 May 1686; vol. IV, no. 64: William Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 16 Nov. 1686.

however, was the written word. He consumed news material ravenously, and in as many forms as it was produced. His habits indicate a craving for the most contemporaneous or 'freshest' news.

News

Mostyn paid for manuscript newsletters from at least 1674, largely focusing on foreign and parliamentary news.¹² By 1688 he had a subscription with a newsletter writer named Wilkinson, whose information was seen by the Dean of Bangor as an improvement on the more famous Muddiman's letters. This was probably the same Christopher Wilkinson through which Mostyn acquired books and pamphlets from at least 1677.¹³ Across Europe, manuscript newsletters interacted with print, and have been seen as the precursor to printed newspapers.¹⁴ Indeed many of the Mostyn newsletters included either transcriptions of printed material or enclosed pamphlets.¹⁵ Of a standard format, anonymous, and compiling information from many European countries, subscription newsletters enabled the reader to keep abreast with foreign political and economic news, as well as any curiosities that their contributors picked up. They appealed to educated men, interested in humanist ideas and values relating to knowledge, education, and the instinct

¹² MH, MS 9088 fo. 69: Newsletter, 6 Jan. 1674; no. 49: Newsletter, 10 Feb. 1674.

¹³ By this point Muddiman was too closely identified with James II's regime, and his newsletters were viewed as suspect. Humphrey Humphreys wrote disparagingly that 'I send you my Muddyman for a sample of oratory & politics it is such a cocksome that I am weary of him long ago. & if you be pleased to let mee know Mr Wilkinsons terms I'll send for his for the future'. Wilkinson had been patronised by Mostyn and his father since at least 1674. MH, MC vol. V, no. 47: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 2 Dec. 1688; MC vol. I, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1677; MC vol. II, no. 74: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Dec. 1680; H.R. Plomer, G.H. Bushnell, E.R. McC. Dix, and A.W. Pollard (eds), *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725* (Oxford, 1932), p. 315; R. Hutton, 'Henry Muddiman (bap. 1629, d.1692)', ODNB.

¹⁴ Z. Barbarics-Hermanik, 'The Coexistence of Manuscript and Print: Handwritten Newsletters in the Second Century of Print: 1540-1640', in G. Kemp and M. Walsby (eds), *The Book Triumphant: Print in Transition in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 347-8.

¹⁵ Some are mentioned in the text of the letters, whilst others are visible via print transfer to the letters themselves. For example, MH, MS 9089, pp. 4-5: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 18 Apr. 1676; p. 21: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 1 July 1676; MS 9090, no. 95: Owen Wynne (?) to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 3 Sept. 1681; MS 9090, no. 104: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 1 Oct. 1681; no. 114: Owen Wynne to Thomas Mostyn, Whitehall, 17 Dec. 1681; vol. V, no. 6: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 15 Apr. 1683.

of curiosity. Such men used both manuscript and print. From the mid-seventeenth century, London was one of the major centres of news-writing in Western Europe.¹⁶ The permanent flow of the latest news was essential to the reader, and ‘helped them to interpret their own position in a wider context and to recognise simultaneous events and developments in their region and in the known world’. Readers ordered their first newsletter when they took up politics or made an important step in their career, or when they hoped to regain political influence.¹⁷ Although Barbarics-Hermanik discusses the period 1540-1640, this holds true in relation to Thomas Mostyn. In Mostyn’s case, it seems that he began subscribing to newsletters when he attained his majority, and began to think of a political career.

Thomas Mostyn purchased and collected printed domestic and international news as well as manuscript newsletters. He received the London Gazette from 1673, but also the ‘Amsterdam Gazette’ from 1675.¹⁸ Mostyn’s interaction with European news services, both manuscript and printed, places him within a wider continental network of news enthusiasts and producers, as those who purchased newsletters often used to provide information to newsletter writers in return when it came their way. Mostyn received personal letters of news at least every few days, judging from those that remain in his bound volumes of correspondence. It is clear that not every letter arrived, and that not all of them survive.¹⁹ Despite this Mostyn’s surviving news-related correspondence is significant. It was also significantly personal. The Mostyn newsletter volumes have traditionally been seen by

¹⁶ Barbarics-Hermanik, ‘Coexistence of Manuscript and Print’, pp. 360-1; P. Arblaster, ‘Posts, Newsletters, Newspapers: England in a European System of Communications’, *Media History*, 11 (2005), pp. 22, 28; A. Pettegree, *The Invention of News: How the World Came to Know About Itself* (New Haven, 2014), p. 116.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

¹⁸ MH, MC vol. I, no. 24: William Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 11 Oct. 1673; vol. I, no. 25: William Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 4 Jan. 1675.

¹⁹ MH, MS 9089 pp. 116-17: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 10 July 1678.

historians as a subscription newsletter collection.²⁰ A close reading of the content of the newsletters, however, reveals that many of them were personal letters to Mostyn from members of his family or close friends. One correspondent was Owen Wynne. Judging from the confidential content of the letters, and the individuals named within them, this was the confidential secretary to Sir Leoline Jenkins and undersecretary of State to subsequent Secretaries of State until 1690. His duties included receiving all domestic and foreign papers and letters, as well as their enclosures, and corresponding with the King's ministers abroad, so he was in an excellent position to provide confidential and contemporaneous news.²¹ He is known to have sent news to other North Welsh acquaintances including Sir Robert Owen, but his letters to Mostyn are jocular and highly salacious, and frequently refer back to friendships made while in Europe.²² Other regular correspondents included William Pyers. He was a lawyer, and a close friend of both Mostyn and at least one of his other correspondents, described by him as 'Honest Will Pyers' in a letter of October 1673.²³ He wrote of the danger of providing confidential news in a letter of 1676, yet continued to send Mostyn information on at least a weekly basis, as well as other goods via carrier.²⁴

Although many of the letters confined themselves purely to news, others contained information about mutual friends, purchases to be sent to Mostyn with the letters, and

²⁰ Garland, 'News in Late-Seventeenth Century Britain', pp. 8, 44; Tapsell, *Personal Rule of Charles II*, p. 92.

²¹ F.M. Greir Evans, *The Principal Secretary of State: A Survey of the Office from 1558 to 1680* (Manchester, 1923), p. 192.

²² For example, NLW, Brogyntyn MSS, Clenennau Papers and Letters 1042: Owen Wynne to Sir Robert Owen, n.p., 8 Nov. 1683; Clenennau Papers and Letters 1046: Owen Wynne to Sir Robert Owen, n.p., 20 Sept. 1688.

²³ It is likely given that Pyers and Mostyn were apparently peers, that Pyers was the 'William Pyers' called to the Bar at Inner Temple on 23 November 1673, and based in King's Bench buildings. If so, he was a contemporary of other North-East Welsh lawyers such as Sir Thomas Hanmer and Sir George Jeffreys. MH, MS 9088, fo. 38: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 28 Oct. 1673; C.V. Charlton (ed.), *A Calendar of Inner Temple Records* (9 vols, 1896), III, 94, 122.

²⁴ MH, MS 9089, pp. 9-10: William Pyers to Thomas Mostyn, London, 9 May 1676; p. 60: William Pyers (?) to Thomas Mostyn, London, 28 Nov. 1676.

reminiscences. Like subscription newsletters, they included printed enclosures, such as speeches and pamphlets, but unlike them they also contained libels and personal gossip.²⁵ These letters demonstrate that, even when seeking international information, or news from within the highest echelons of government, the system of Welsh kinship and obligation stood firm. One important consequence of the mistaken identification of these letters as impersonal subscription letters is that their context as the product of Welsh gentry relationships has been lost. This is a significant omission. Historians have seen the letters as demonstrating that even obscure Welsh gentlemen could receive the news. In fact, they show that being a Welsh gentleman actually facilitated the rapid transfer of confidential information.

Books

The surviving records of Mostyn's book purchases suggest that his taste in books was far from confined to antiquarian or scholarly tomes. In keeping with his interest in news, Mostyn aimed to obtain the most recent pamphlets and enjoyed satirical works, including scandalous material, and libels. This included Charles Cotton's *Scarronides*, Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, as well as a pasquil 'lately set up at Rome'.²⁶ In 1677 Mostyn bought, in French, Sebastian Bremond's *Hattige: or the amours of the king of Tamaran*, a novel published in Holland in that year which so transparently reflected on Charles II's actions that it was investigated for sedition.²⁷ Mostyn ordered a number of popular novels, commanding his booksellers to seek them out when they proved difficult to find. In 1677 *Clelia*, a novel by

²⁵ The materiality of the letters themselves show this, as there is very clear print transfer on many of them. Inclosures are also referred to in the content of the letters themselves. Some of the tracts referred to in the content of the letters are bound, and as yet unexplored, on the shelves of Mostyn Hall's library. MH, MS 9089, p. 70: William Pyers (?) to Thomas Mostyn, London, 9 Jan. 1677; MS 9089, pp. 82-3: William Pyers to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1677.

²⁶ MH, MC vol. III, no. 17: Philip Fowkes to Thomas Mostyn, London, 6 Jan. 1683;

²⁷ MH, MC vol. III, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1676; K. Loveman, *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008), p. 110.

Madeleine de Scudery, took Wilkinson some time to locate and was finally bought second-hand for 6s 3d. The books in the Mostyn library, mostly purchased by Thomas Mostyn, were valued at £175 in 1739.²⁸ He purchased pamphlets published in the latest politico-religious controversies, for example those by Andrew Marvell and Philip Fell which attacked Bishop Croft's *Naked Truth*, and Marchamont Nedham's attack on *A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country*. Often these were purchased after Mostyn was notified of controversy surrounding the pamphlets, or of debate on the issue in question. Regarding *Naked Truth*, Mostyn's secretary was informed that it 'hath startled our Clergy, because it argues for Comprehension and would haue the Presbyterians receiued within the bosome of the Church –It is well pen'd and as much said as the subiect it treats of is capable to bear – It is very much enquired of on all hands'.²⁹ Mostyn had a consistent interest in travel books and histories of foreign countries. Throughout his book-buying career he bought books on French, Ottoman, and Venetian history. He sought out travel literature and, no doubt in common with many others, narratives of other monarchies.³⁰ Of course, this is no proof that Mostyn read these books. It is notoriously difficult, other than by annotations and marginalia, or mentions in correspondence, to prove usage of books. Aside from the historical and theological works to be discussed below, the only book that Mostyn discussed at length was the pornographic novel *The School for Ladies*, which he shared with two of his Catholic kinsmen in 1676.³¹ Both Edward and John Mostyn critiqued the novel's contents, John Mostyn offering to share his collection of other such 'Itallian Boookes', hoping that 'though thire outside be poore and simple yett I hope you

²⁸ MH, Mostyn Library Inventory, 2 July 1739.

²⁹ MH, MC vol. III, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1676; MS 9088, fo. 166: Anon. to Rowland Thomas, London, 18 Jan. 1676.

³⁰ MH, MC vol. I, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1677; MC vol. V, no. 2, Isaac Littlebury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 15 Jan. 1687.

³¹ This work was published under the name of Aloisia Sigea, a sixteenth-century Portuguese woman famed for her humanist education, but was actually the work of Nicholas Chorier. Its female authorship was said to have rendered it more titillating for its audience. Many thanks to Mary Chadwick for this reference.

will find them well lined: I haue more of them but thay are att Holywell made upp in a trunk'.³² Even Mostyn's pornography, therefore, was shared amongst family networks, and offered to others to appreciate and read.

Some of the books that Mostyn is known to have bought or owned, however, were relevant to his collection and study of manuscripts relating to Welsh or 'British' history and religion. Some of these were polemical, others were narrative histories, and a number were printed versions of manuscript texts. Taken together, these volumes confute the argument that the 'British History' was dead, no longer an issue of interest for Welsh scholars.

Although they generally no longer accepted Geoffrey of Monmouth's arguments or Welsh origin myths uncritically, the interest in the early history of the Welsh as the 'ancient Britons' remained strong. Mostyn appears to have lent his 'printed Galfridus Monumensis & Gildas' to Humphrey Humphreys in 1686, for example, and purchased Aylett Sammes *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata* in 1676. This lavishly illustrated book, a narrative of British history up to the invasion of Kent, was principally known for arguing for the derivation of Welsh from the Phoenician language.³³ In the early 1680s Mostyn and Humphreys discussed the reception of a book by the high church theologian Henry Maurice, most probably *A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy* (1682), which included a section on the presence of 'British' or Welsh bishops at early conferences of the Church. Maurice was an Anglesey man, related to many North-East Welsh families, a client of Bishop William Lloyd, and chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft.³⁴ In 1684 Bishop

³² It seems that Mostyn's copy was one of the many Latin translations available in the late seventeenth century. MH, MC vol. I, no. 34: John Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Weppra, n.d.; MC vol. I, no. 58: Edward Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Talacre, 20 Nov. 1676; MC, vol. I, no. 62: Edward Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Talacre, 27 Dec. 1676.

³³ MC vol. IV, no. 46: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 12 Jan. 1686; MC, vol. I, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1677; G. Parry, 'Aylett Sammes. (c.1636-c.1679)', *ODNB*.

³⁴ E. Vallance, 'Henry Maurice (?1647-1691)', *ODNB*.

William Lloyd sent Mostyn a copy of his own book *An Historical Account of Church-government as it was in Great Britain and Ireland, when they first received the Christian religion*.

As in England, many antiquarians were also Anglican divines, and frequently others who were not were staunch defenders of the Church of England – although in Wales they were also motivated by pride in national heritage and customs, and the lineage of their own families rather than the defence of the post-Restoration Church.³⁵ Indeed, contrary to David Douglas's argument, Lloyd was not entirely concerned with arguments concerning episcopacy, as his correspondence shows, but with defending the role of the Welsh within the development of the 'British Church'.³⁶ These books were mentioned by Humphreys alongside loans of manuscripts on allied topics, or with instructions to Mostyn on how to interpret such manuscripts. They seem to have functioned either as secondary texts, or as arguments to debate. Additionally, Mostyn showed a tendency to purchase books by those with local origins or connections. These included the play *Wrangling Lovers* (1677) by Edward Ravenscroft, and *A New and Further Narrative of the State of New England* (1676) by Nathaniel Saltonstall. This is aside from the books he was given by friends or clients, particularly as authors.

Alongside his patronage of bards and collection of manuscripts, Mostyn's printed books reinforce the argument that the Welsh past, and the study thereof, was part of contemporary Welsh culture. The Welsh historicised culture was something that the North-East Welsh gentry encountered and took advantage of on a daily basis, but it was also a source of interest and pride, and a cultural identity. Although many of Mostyn's books on British history were in English, rather than Welsh, that does not diminish his

³⁵ D.C. Douglas, *English Scholars* (1939), pp. 18, 248-9; G. Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquaries of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 17-18.

³⁶ Douglas, *English Scholars*, p. 253.

‘Welshness’ nor the identity behind his concerns. Past generations of literary scholars and historians have discounted Welsh writing in English. As Elizabeth Edwards has argued in relation to eighteenth-century Welsh writing in English, it suggests ‘a partial, incomplete, and inferior “Welshness”, and became linked with a ‘sense of shame or trauma...haunted by a “cultural cringe”’.³⁷ Yet Mostyn spoke and read Welsh, and supported Welsh bardic and artisanal culture until his death in 1692. He clearly did not consider English-language material as something that diminished his national identity. It is possible with Mostyn to prove his linguistic competence in a way that is rare for other individuals, but it is highly likely that similar attitudes prevailed. A man could have more than one parallel and overlapping identity in seventeenth-century Wales, of which language was just a part.

Mostyn’s books, therefore, show him to be very much a man of the world, as well as a man of and within Wales. He was an avid reader, an historian, and one who thirsted after the most current information alongside artefacts of the ancient past. His prioritisation of Welsh historical material and culture within that range of interests demonstrated its significance.

Manuscripts

It is Thomas Mostyn’s manuscripts that most clearly show the depth of his interest in Welsh history and culture. The earliest evidence of Mostyn’s interest in acquiring manuscripts is in 1676, when he was promised a catalogue of Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt’s study by William Salesbury.³⁸ It is possible that this collection sparked Mostyn’s interest in collecting, but it seems unlikely given his parallel interests in other types of

³⁷ M. Wynn Thomas, ‘Anglo-Welsh Literature’, in J. Koch (ed.), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia* (5 vols, Santa Barbara, CA, 2006), I, 61; E. Edwards, *English-Language Poetry from Wales, 1789-1806* (Cardiff, 2013), p. 5.

³⁸ MH, MC vol. I, no. 47: William Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, Rûg, 13 Apr. 1676.

material seem to have begun earlier. From 1682 the amount of evidence relating to Mostyn's manuscript collection increases. Letters mention manuscripts he lent other enthusiasts, as well as those that he bought or borrowed. Daniel Huws has concluded that Mostyn's enthusiasm began in earnest in the 1680s, but this may be a misreading based on the survival of evidence.³⁹ From 1683 Mostyn was certainly lending manuscripts and relevant books to Bishop William Lloyd, for example, but by this point Lloyd seemed to acknowledge Mostyn as a reliable source of interesting material, rather than as a budding collector or amateur.⁴⁰ Similarly, Humphrey Humphreys was able to discuss his interpretation of letters between Owain Gwynedd and Thomas Becket with Mostyn in 1684 with a sense that Mostyn would understand and be able to add to Humphreys' ideas.⁴¹ Humphreys was to prove one of Mostyn's most reliable correspondents, borrowing and lending books and manuscripts for the rest of Mostyn's life. While some manuscripts may have been inherited by Mostyn, others were bought at auctions, transcribed from other collections, or made their way into Mostyn's collection as unreturned loans or strays from friends' libraries. Either way, it is difficult to argue with Huws that Thomas Mostyn was principally responsible for the size and quality of the Mostyn library and manuscript collection.⁴²

Thomas Mostyn collected Welsh, English, and foreign manuscripts. There were Welsh-language poetry, genealogical, and historical manuscripts in his library.⁴³ He owned documents in English or Latin that related to Welsh families, estates, and religion. There were also English medieval illuminated manuscripts, as well as a few Italian and French

³⁹ Huws, 'Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts', p. 457.

⁴⁰ MH, MC vol. III, no. 18: William Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 22 Feb. 1684.

⁴¹ MH, MC vol. III, no. 31: William Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 7 Dec. 1683.

⁴² Huws, 'Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts', p. 451.

⁴³ Welsh historians and contemporary collectors seem not to have made the same sharp distinction between genealogical and historical texts as those in England. J. Broadway, *"No Historie So Meete" Gentry Culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Manchester, 2006), p. 8.

manuscripts.⁴⁴ Most of the English manuscripts were purchased at auction or in private sales.⁴⁵ Historians have tended to focus on the particularly valuable or well-known Mostyn manuscripts in discussions of the library, yet Mostyn and his correspondents clearly found interest in a wider range of materials. Pedigrees and poetry were used to support or interrogate or substantiate other evidence, estate documents used to critique the history of local places, and accounts of the North-East Wales region swapped and compared. He possessed a rent roll of the St. Asaph bishopric from 1454, an extent of North Wales, the ‘Pontifical’ of Bangor, including two indulgences of Bishop Anian from 1279, and an interdict of 1224.⁴⁶ The Gloddaeth library included copies of *Brut y Tynwysogion* and *Brut y Brenhinoedd* previously owned by Simon Thelwall in 1660, three Welsh manuscript and an early modern vellum version of the Grail stories in Welsh (Pereddr fab Eurog), copies of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s work. He also commissioned bardic copyists such as Siôn Dafydd to make copies of Welsh poetic manuscripts.⁴⁷ Mostyn owned copies of Gildas and Nennius, possessed ‘Sir John Wynns booke or Welsh chronicle’ and a letter from Owain Gwynedd to Thomas Becket. Wynn’s ‘chronicle’ is likely to have been that sixteenth-century manuscript collection of Wynn’s antiquarian works purchased by the National Library of Wales in 1974 and referred to by Richard Mostyn in a letter to Edward Lhuyd of 1684.⁴⁸ This book encompassed local history, genealogical content, and notes for Wynn’s own memoirs. It included a copy of Wynn’s *History of the Gwydir family* that appears to derive from Bishop Humphrey Humphreys’s copy of that book, in an eighteenth-century hand.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Huws, ‘Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts’, p. 458.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 317-29.

⁴⁶ MH, MC vol. III, no. 31: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 7 Dec. 1683; vol. V, no. 7: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

⁴⁷ Huws, ‘Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts’, pp. 326-9.

⁴⁸ Transcribed in N. Lloyd, ‘Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn’, pp. 49-50.

⁴⁹ J.G. Jones, ‘Sir John Wynn of Gwydir and John Speed’, *NLWJ*, vol. 20 (1978), p. 256.

Mostyn's possession of the manuscript, possibly due to his father's close relationship with Sir John, and the interleaving of it with contemporary copies and related documents is testament to the active use of these materials rather than their value as collectible objects. Mostyn also had a copy of an unnamed manuscript by Sir Thomas Wiliems. Wiliems, a former clergyman turned recusant physician, was the author of a Latin-Welsh dictionary that became the basis of the more famous printed publication by Dr John Davies of Mallwyd. He was also, however, a copyist and collector of old manuscripts, and the apparent writer of an account of some aspects of local history later worked on by Sir John Wynn.⁵⁰ Given the context of Humphreys' and Mostyn's correspondence, it is more likely that the Wiliems manuscript related to Welsh local history rather than the 'Dictionary'. Humphreys also borrowed 'Mr Owen Salesburys book' of pedigrees, 'that chronology which hath Llyfr Manoch writ on the back' and 'such MS poems that are ancient' in Mostyn's library. Humphreys begged Mostyn's assistance and manuscripts in his 'more close consideration of our British history', and clearly believed that the Mostyn and Gloddaith libraries had sufficient material to be useful to him.⁵¹

The correspondence between Mostyn, Humphreys, and Lloyd, as well as Mostyn's brother's complimentary description of him demonstrate that Mostyn was building a collection, not solely for the purpose of ownership and status. At least for the Welsh material Mostyn was working with other scholars in using the manuscripts to discover more about the history of the region. Humphreys and Lloyd were engaged in defending the role of the Welsh within British history (long after historians have argued that it was deeply unfashionable to do so), and although there is no remaining evidence of Mostyn doing the

⁵⁰ MH, MC vol. III, no. 60: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 20 Nov. 1684; T. Pennant, *Tours in Wales* (3 vols, 1810) III, 116.

⁵¹ MH, MC vol. III, no. 60: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 20 Nov. 1684; vol. IV, no. 41: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 24 Nov. 1685; vol. IV, no. 46: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 12 Jan. 1686.

same, his shared interests and patronage of other forms of Welsh culture would make this fairly likely. Mostyn's work and collections were the result of a collective enterprise, a close network, and a shared preoccupation with Welsh history.

National implications: The significance of Mostyn's collecting and collections for Welsh identity and culture

Thomas Mostyn was not the only significant collector and antiquarian amongst the North-East Welsh gentry. He was certainly not the only gentleman engaged in serious intellectual, historical, or horticultural pursuits, or in the collection of scribal or printed news and books. Sir Thomas Hanmer wrote an eyewitness account of French government and society and was a nationwide authority on matters horticultural, who swapped manuscripts with Mostyn.⁵² Robert Davies had one of the finest collections of manuscripts in Wales, lending them out and corresponding with a wide network of antiquarians and scholars. Sir Thomas Myddelton had an abiding interest in news and spent hundreds of pounds on books. Unlike many others, however, Thomas Mostyn has left behind significant traces of his purchases, collecting and sharing habits, and usage. His papers reveal a network of gentlemen and clergy dedicated to Welsh history and culture, who used Welsh patronage networks and territorial power in order to advance their work.

Networks and sharing

Thomas Mostyn acted as the nexus for various, often overlapping, collecting networks. As a man of wealth, with a great range of well-connected contacts, he was well-placed to obtain information about the objects of his desire: whether news, books, or manuscripts. His newsletter correspondents sent him book catalogues, speeches, libels, 'pleasure

⁵² MH, MC vol. I, no. 43: Sir Thomas Hanmer to Thomas Mostyn, Bettisfield, 5 Apr. 1676; 'Sir Thomas Hanmer, Grandfather of the Speaker, his Account of France in 1648' in Sir Henry Bunbury (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart., Speaker of the House of Commons* (1838), pp. 245-319.

ballads', newspapers, and pamphlets that they thought he might be interested in.⁵³ He was able to engage a variety of agents to seek out specific volumes or pamphlets, whether amongst French booksellers in London or in the auction-houses. These 'agents' were sometimes highly specialised. He used the bookseller Isaac Littlebury particularly for French and other foreign-language books, for example, and the medical doctor Philip Fowke to seek out coveted volumes amongst London second-hand booksellers. Littlebury attended auctions and sales to locate such foreign books, for example the earl of Anglesey's sale in 1687. Fowke carried out Mostyn's orders generally in London booksellers, but also sent Mostyn news and catalogues of forthcoming auctions, for example that of the late bishop of Chester's library in 1686.⁵⁴ Christopher Wilkinson generally provided Mostyn with British volumes, as well as news and information.⁵⁵ Mostyn also lent or presented books to favoured institutions or individuals. He lent books to Humphrey Humphreys and Sir Richard Wynn, and in turn borrowed books off both men⁵⁶ Mostyn presented books to Ruthin School. In 1688 he purchased Plutarch's *Works* in Greek and Latin, and was sent a list of other books that the school needed, should he be minded to benevolence again.⁵⁷ When Fowke was mourning the death of his wife, for example, Mostyn sent him 'a box of excellent books', apparently including works of philosophy and theology, specifically early Christian apologists.⁵⁸ Mostyn and Fowke's relationship was friendly and reciprocal, yet not one of kinship.

⁵³ For example, MH, MS 9088, fos 8-9v: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 29 Apr. 1673; fo. 32: William Salesbury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 11 Oct. 1673; no. 48: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 22 Nov. 1673; fo. 57: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, n.p., 29 Dec. 1673; MS 9089, p. 16: William Pyers to Thomas Mostyn, n.p. 17 June 1676.

⁵⁴ MH, MC vol. IV, no. 65: Isaac Littlebury to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d; vol. V, no. 2: Isaac Littlebury to Thomas Mostyn, London, 15 Jan. 1687; vol. IV, no. 58: Philip Fowke to Thomas Mostyn, Salop, 3 Aug. 1686; vol. IV, no. 62: Philip Fowke to Thomas Mostyn, Salop, 9 Oct. 1686.

⁵⁵ MH, MC vol. IV, no. 42: Christopher Wilkinson to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 Feb. 1677; vol. V, no. 47: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 2 Dec. 1688.

⁵⁶ MH, MC vol. I, no. 13: Sir Richard Wynn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 4 Aug. 1674; vol. I, no. 18: Sir Richard Wynn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 20 Sept. 1674; vol. III, no. 56: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Kyffaillyfarch, 4 Aug. 1684.

⁵⁷ MH, MC vol. V, no. 35: Henry Price to Thomas Mostyn, Ruthin, 12 Aug. 1688.

⁵⁸ MH, MC vol. V, no. 4: Philip Fowke to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.; vol. V, no. 6: Philip Fowke to Thomas Mostyn, Salop, 11 Feb. 1687.

Mostyn's news correspondents were frequently kindred, however, often sending highly confidential information to Mostyn as a favoured and trusted correspondent. These included his brother Roger Mostyn, Owen and Robert Wynne, William Pyers, William Salesbury, and John Lloyd.⁵⁹ All had either minor or relatively senior office in the Court, legal system, or government. The news contained court affairs, appointments, foreign events, as well as occurrences business, or the pricking of sheriffs.⁶⁰ Mostyn returned the favour of this confidential information by attempting to anonymise the majority of their letters. He then passed on information to his trusted contacts in North Wales, such as his father Sir Roger, William Griffith, Mutton Davies, and Humphrey Humphreys.⁶¹

That Mostyn's news mania was part of a wider collecting habit is shown in the organisation of his newsletters and correspondence. The letters were grouped in chronological order, noted on the dorse. On the dorse of a letter of 10 July 1678, for example, Mostyn noted 'All that I can find of the year 1678' and one of 28 March 1676 was labelled 'January February & March 1678'.⁶² News was used as a currency with which to maintain patronage relationships or to show either respect for kin or status. By deploying information effectively, seventeenth-century gentlemen could foster relationships they thought important. John Lloyd, for example, described the news he sent from London as 'plunder', while Mutton Davies described how if 'warily and frugally mannag'd' Mostyn's information would help him to 'entertain my neighbours yet a fortnight for news like fashions may be

⁵⁹ e.g. MH, MC vol. II, no. 27: Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, Inner Temple, 16 Apr. 1678; vol. II, no. 24: Robert Wynne to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 9 Mar.; vol. II, no. 29: John Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, London, 3 Sept. 1679; vol. IV, no. 63: Robert Hookes to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 22 Apr. 1686.

⁶⁰ MH, MS 9089 p. 56: William Pyers (?) to Rowland Thomas, London, 14 Nov. 1676; MH, MC vol. III, no. 33: Robert Hookes to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 29 Dec. 1683.

⁶¹ MH, MC vol. II, no. 5: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Apr. 1677; vol. II, no. 73: William Griffith to Thomas Mostyn, Cefnamlwch, 14 Dec. 1680; vol. II, no. 74: Sir Roger Mostyn to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Dec. 1680; vol. V, no. 47: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 2 Dec. 1688.

⁶² MH, MS 9089 pp. 116-17: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 10 July 1678; MS 9089 pp. 2-3: Anon. to Thomas Mostyn, London, 28 Mar. 1676.

fresh in the country though stale at London, and an act of Parliament cry'd in euery street with you, may make me passe for a man of intelligence here'.⁶³ Although Davies may well have been exaggerating for comic effect, he was not alone in this type of description of news. As the nexus of much of this information, Mostyn was able to use traditional Welsh territorial power networks to obtain and share information. This information helped him to maintain his own status and add to his collections.

Kinship was also used to obtain manuscripts. Friendship networks amongst English antiquarians are known to have been a significant feature of their work, as was the use (for example in the case of William Dugdale) of positions such as herald to obtain material.⁶⁴ Similarly 'kinship, mutual advantage, and religious affiliation' all had a role for English local historians in the acquisition of material.⁶⁵ Welsh scholars, however, privileged the use of familial relationships in most instances. Prized volumes or documents were borrowed and copied by Mostyn's bardic copyists, obtained for Bishops Humphrey Humphreys and William Lloyd, or came to Mostyn's library through inheritance. Humphreys, for example, sought Mostyn's help when investigating the origins of the pilgrimage tradition at St. Winifred's Well. He asked Mostyn to enquire of his kinsman Pierce Mostyn if he had any indulgences granted to the votaries of St. Winifred or to pilgrims visiting the Well. As Pierce Mostyn was the head of the Catholic cadet branch of the Mostyn family, Humphreys felt that 'it is most likely the originalls of them are at Talacre nor can I doubt but old Mr Peter Mostyn had all that could be got of that kind'.⁶⁶ This speaks both to the fate and location of manuscripts after the Reformation as well as to Mostyn's status within the family. Ultimately the search for the indulgences was unsuccessful, but Humphreys did

⁶³ MH, MC vol. II, no. 55: John Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, London, 3 Sept. 1679; vol. II, no. 5: Mutton Davies to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 24 Apr. 1677.

⁶⁴ Douglas, *English Scholars*, p. 53.

⁶⁵ Broadway, "No Historie So Meete", p. 108.

⁶⁶ MH, MC vol. III, no. 48: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

find that ‘which serues my turn as well almost (viz) the decree which first made St Wenefred a saint & ordered her day to be obserued – it is soe late as to beare date Jan: 4. 1415 which fully confirms my conjecture of the time that this tale was invented’.⁶⁷

The Mostyn Collection and Welsh historicised culture

Thomas Mostyn’s various collections and networks reveal the extent to which the ‘British history’ and an interest in the past of the region and its families remained a continuous feature of Welsh culture in the seventeenth century. From Sir John Wynn’s efforts in the early seventeenth century to those of Bishop William Lloyd in the 1680s, a fascination with the region’s history never faded. The emphasis on the former power and significance of the Welsh within ecclesiastical and political history continued, whether or not it received ridicule from both the English and the Scots. It is possible to draw a line from Humphrey Lhuyd’s *Breviary of Britayne* to the Romantic ‘revival’ of the eighteenth century without discounting the seventeenth century as a low point for Welsh history-writing and culture. Humphreys, Lloyd, and Mostyn were all engaged in scholarly activity concerning Welsh history, and the purchases and notes of other North Welsh antiquaries show that they, too, were deeply interested in the field. There remained a strong tendency in published and unpublished work to defend the unique role of the Welsh in British history, and a resistance to claims that either ignored or diminished this role. Unlike English scholars this was not fuelled by a sense of national destiny or the Reformation but was part of a much longer tradition, and had to be defended as English historical scholarship began to privilege the role of others over the ‘Ancient Britons’.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ MH, MC vol. III, no. 50: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

⁶⁸ Parry, *The Trophies of Time*, p. 2.

Bishop William Lloyd published his *Historical Account of Church-Government* in 1684, described by his biographer as an attempt to refute nonconformist arguments concerning the ancient nature of non-episcopal church government.⁶⁹ In the preface to his work Lloyd engaged with Scottish claims to be the original inhabitants of the British Isles, descended from the Trojans. In arguing against Buchanan's *History of Scotland* he claimed that:

We live still in that Country of which our Ancestors were the first Inhabitants. And tho we have been twice conquered since, yet we have still kept our grounds... And we have this to say more, which few can say elsewhere; that we keep still the same Language, which was spoken first in this Country: and we know no reason to doubt, but that, as one of our Ancestors told a great King that invaded us, God will have an account for this Country in no other Language but ours at the day of Judgement.⁷⁰

Lloyd argued that Scottish attempts to discredit Welsh historians by comparing their accounts with Greek and Roman narratives were worthless, and that the 'superstructures' of Scottish antiquities upon which their claims of historical ancientness were based were ultimately derived from Welsh sources. He attacked Scottish narratives on the basis that they were contradicted or unsupported by their own ancient sources.⁷¹ Lloyd did not defend Geoffrey of Monmouth's account entirely, acknowledging that certain aspects of Geoffrey's work were a 'Lye'. He used Gildas, Nennius, Geoffrey, Bede, Alfred of Beverley, Sigebert of Gembloux, Gerald of Wales, and William of Newborough together to assess the age and authenticity of Geoffrey's work before moving on to examine the Scottish claims.⁷²

Lloyd's book is significant in relation to the Mostyn collections because he borrowed a number of these works and other documents from Mostyn when he was in the process of

⁶⁹ A. Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd, 1627-1717: Bishop, Politician, Author and Prophet* (1952), p. 229.

⁷⁰ W. Lloyd, *An historical account of church government as it was in Great-Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion* (1684), pp. 24-5.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 10-20.

writing the book. These included Mostyn's copy of Gildas, a papal interdict of 1224, and a rent roll of St. Asaph from 1454.⁷³ Lloyd presented Mostyn with a copy of the book in June 1684. Although it was far from unusual for an author to present his local friends and patrons with copies of new works, correspondence between the two indicates a much closer relationship than merely one of collector/lender and author/borrower. At the same time as Lloyd was probably working on the book, Mostyn bought the works that Lloyd was arguing against or relying on as evidence. In June 1682, for example, Mostyn sought out and purchased Buchanan's *History*.⁷⁴ This was eight years before the English translation of Buchanan's Latin work, and it seems more than coincidence that Mostyn should buy a work so closely related to the heart of Lloyd's book. Humphrey Humphreys, then Dean of Bangor, evidently collaborated closely with Lloyd, requesting manuscripts from Mostyn on behalf of Lloyd on at least one occasion. Humphreys, too, was engaged in 'more close consideration of our British history' from 1685, and although he never had anything printed in his own name, was clearly considered an expert in Welsh history, pedigrees, and language by such authorities as Edward Lhuyd.⁷⁵ Like Lloyd, he borrowed many manuscripts from Mostyn, but more of his discussion with Mostyn survives regarding his methods and his engagement with Mostyn on the historical issues and sources.

Humphreys would now be considered an interdisciplinary scholar, asking Mostyn for 'such MS poems that are ancient for out of such I have gathered somethings historicall & hope to find much more exactly at least something of the principles & humours of the age's wherein they were writ will be found.'⁷⁶ Humphreys's main scholarly interest was in the history of religion in Wales, whether in relation to the pre-Roman British church, or to the

⁷³ MC, vol. III, no. 18: William Lloyd to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., 22 Feb. 1683; vol. III, no. 39: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, St. Asaph, 5 Mar. 1684.

⁷⁴ MH, MS 9091, no. 23: William Pyers (?) to Thomas Mostyn, London, 17 June 1682.

⁷⁵ MH, MC vol. IV, no. 46: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 12 Jan. 1686; *DWB*, p. 396.

⁷⁶ MH, MC vol. IV, no. 46: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, Bangor, 12 Jan. 1686.

history of pilgrimages to Holywell.⁷⁷ He supported the idea of an ancient and uncorrupted British church predating Augustine of Canterbury, another historical theory supposedly out of vogue in the seventeenth century.⁷⁸ He used pedigrees, charters, manuscript narratives and printed books in his research, for which he was prepared to beg, borrow, and purchase whatever materials he deemed necessary. Yet Humphreys also lent Mostyn manuscripts and books in return, such as his ‘Pontifical of Bangor’, which he deemed considerable because ‘it is the onely one in the world & you see it is about 400 year old, for you’le find in the later end of it it was the pontifical of Bishop Anian’.⁷⁹ He lent Mostyn a guide to Latin abbreviations, suggesting that Mostyn was involved in the active reading and consideration of the manuscripts in his care.⁸⁰ Once again this demonstrates that Mostyn was not a mere passive collector of antiquities and manuscripts, but an active participant in the research and writing of Welsh history. Although he is not known to have written any histories himself, it is also true of Humphreys and Lloyd that the bulk of their work either is lost or never progressed beyond notes.

Far from abandoning Welsh history and culture, therefore, Mostyn both supported and added to it. Even had he confined himself to supporting the labours of antiquarian scholars in Wales and England through preserving and collecting manuscripts his behaviour would have contradicted Morgan’s bleak assessment of the state of Welsh historical study. Yet he went far beyond that. Mostyn was fascinated with Welsh poetry, literature, and history. He commissioned copies of Welsh poems and supported the contemporary bardic order. He preserved historical manuscripts and at the very least aided in the study of those works. His patronage connections were utilised to the full and, in keeping with Welsh traditional

⁷⁷ Lloyd, ‘Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn’, p. 60; S. Handley, ‘Humphrey Humphreys (1648-1712)’, *ODNB*.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ MH, MC vol. V, no. 7: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

⁸⁰ MH, MC vol. III, no. 44: Humphrey Humphreys to Thomas Mostyn, n.p., n.d.

gentry ideals, he opened his house and library to Lloyd, Humphreys, and other interested parties. He read, borrowed, and studied the same materials as his ecclesiastical friends, and sought out further sources as required. His knowledge was commended, though no evidence of written work survives. As a North-East Welsh gentleman Mostyn felt a strong connection to his forebears, and a sense of ancestral patrimony which went beyond a passive fondness for his region.

Conclusion

A Welsh historicised culture existed throughout the seventeenth century, and emerged even stronger into the eighteenth century. The Romantic ‘revival’ of Welsh culture was no accident, but instead a heightened version of an existing situation, bolstered by the support of London and Oxford Welshmen alongside English writers and antiquaries. Gentlemen like Thomas Mostyn sustained and encouraged this historicised culture in a number of ways: through their collections, patronage, personal engagement with texts, and participation in scholarly networks. Their interests outside Wales bolstered rather than reduced their interest in Welsh culture, and provided the means for strengthening intellectual and kinship networks. Rather than suffering from historical amnesia, the Welsh historical memory thrived in the seventeenth century.

II. Sir Thomas Hanmer: Anglican squire or ‘church papist’?

The historical reputation of most seventeenth-century Welsh gentlemen is somewhat inglorious and obscure. It is not often as ignominious, however, as that of Sir Thomas Hanmer, principal representative of the Hanmer family in the period 1640-78. As well as the usual references to obscurity Hanmer has been described by historians as ‘disillusioned’ and ‘lukewarm’ in his political stance, and included amongst Andrew Hopper’s ‘turncoats and renegades’ for his apparent willingness to settle with the parliamentary regime after

1645.⁸¹ In contrast to the Davieses and Myddeltons, the Hanmers did not show a strong interest in Welsh culture or traditions in the seventeenth century. Yet they did exhibit many of the key characteristics of Welsh gentry behaviour in this period. They were early and committed Royalists. They went into exile on the Continent and were in contact with many leading figures of the exiled English court. After their return they remained largely secluded on their estates and played no part in Interregnum political life. They were Members of Parliament before the Civil War and after the Restoration, were Deputy Lieutenants, and held positions at Court.

While the Hanmers' commitment to the persecution of non-conformists was relatively enthusiastic after the Restoration, their own religious beliefs are somewhat murky. The evidence suggests that, at the very least, Sir Thomas Hanmer and his family were extremely conservative in their faith, if not 'church papists'. While they were never presented as Catholic recusants, were awarded positions of local and national responsibility, and upheld the religious legislation against others in this period it appears that their religious identity was ambiguous at best. The Hanmers are interesting because of this ambiguity surrounding their religious allegiance, but also for what they reveal about attitudes to religious complexity in the North-East Wales region. After describing the family context of the Hanmers, this case study will examine the evidence on the one hand, that Sir Thomas Hanmer was an orthodox adherent of the Church of England and a typical member of the higher gentry of North-East Wales, and on the other, that he was a highly successful Catholic conformist or church papist.

Family context

⁸¹ G. Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Basingstoke, 2003), p. 75; *DWB*, p. 336; A. Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegades: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012), p. 111.

The Hanmers were a long-established Welsh gentry family based at Hanmer and Bettisfield, only a few miles away from the border with Shropshire. They settled in Wales following the Edwardian conquest of 1277-83. They became one of the leading families of Flintshire and Denbighshire and had considerable influence in the region in local government, elections, and religious affairs. Heads of the family had served as either borough or county MP since the mid-sixteenth century.⁸² In 1624, when he was only thirteen years old, Sir Thomas Hanmer (1612-78) inherited the Hanmer and Bettisfield estates upon the death of his father. In his father's will, Hanmer was placed under the guardianship of several prominent local gentlemen, all kinsmen to his father. These were John Hanmer, the Bishop of St Asaph (1574-1629), Sir John Trevor, Sir Roger Mostyn, Sir Thomas Trevor, and Humphrey Dymock.⁸³ All of these gentlemen had different religious outlooks, but more significantly they were well-connected in North Wales and in London. The group also included gentlemen, lawyers, and clergymen. Hanmer sought to provide his son with guardians who could guide him to his majority with financial and legal acumen, and the appropriate social connections – both in terms of regional Welsh kinship and London society. Mostyn, for example, was the head of one of the most prominent and powerful North-East Welsh families, while Sir John Trevor was very active at Court and in parliament. Hanmer's father was a deputy lieutenant, sheriff, member of the Council of Marches, and MP for Flintshire, and he intended his son to follow the same path.

While Sir John Hanmer was based largely in Wales throughout his life, his son travelled abroad and experienced life at court. Sir Thomas was a page of honour at the court of

⁸² History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Sir Thomas Hanmer for 1640-60 section, revised by David Scott. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

⁸³ Will of Sir John Hanmer, transcribed in Sir J. Hanmer, *A Memorial of the Parish and Family of Hanmer in Flintshire* (1877), pp. 60-2.

Charles I, where he met his first wife, a maid of honour in the queen's service.⁸⁴ His new brother-in-law, Thomas Baker, has been tentatively identified as the gentleman who in 1638 conveyed a Van Dyck portrait to Bernini in Rome as the model for the bust sculpted of Charles I.⁸⁵ Hanmer was himself painted by Van Dyck, and in 1638 obtained a pass to travel in Europe.⁸⁶ It would be a great coincidence if Hanmer and his brother applied to travel the Continent at the same time as his brother-in-law was in Italy, so despite the 'proviso not to go to Rome' that may have been precisely what he did. Sir Thomas was connected to court elites by friendship and alliance, and had first-hand experience of contemporary trends in art, music, and clothing. In his lifetime he was to endure exile in France, seek political favour through the use of his unique tulip, *Agate Hanmer*, and become known across Europe for his gardening prowess and knowledge. John Evelyn addressed him as 'Prince of Florists', a 'Virtuoti' of the tulip.⁸⁷ Despite this cosmopolitan life story, Hanmer still came from a traditional Welsh family. His approach to patronage and kinship, religion, and politics was characteristic of other North-East Welsh gentlemen of his generation.

The Hanmers and religion before 1640

The Hanmer family had a somewhat chequered history in terms of their loyalty to the Church of England. In the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI and I the family were labelled as Catholics. Sir Thomas Hanmer's grandfather (also Sir Thomas) was implicated in plots against Queen Elizabeth as one of her 'papisticall adversaries' in 1584 and was

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁸⁵ R. Torsten Petersson, *Bernini and the Excesses of Art* (New York, 2003), p. 120.

⁸⁶ TNA, SP 16/39 fo. 90: Minute for entry on the Council Register of Council pass for Sir Thomas Hanmer and his brother John Hanmer to travel for three years, with proviso not to go to Rome, 30 Sept. 1638.

⁸⁷ J. Robinson, 'New Light on Sir Thomas Hanmer', *Garden History*, 16 (1988), pp. 3-4; BL, Add MS 78928 fo. 184v: John Evelyn to Sir Thomas Hanmer, Paris, 7 Feb. 1651.

termed ‘a notorious papiste’ who heard masses at Hanmer in 1586.⁸⁸ Despite this he continued to be a JP, MP for Flintshire and a member of the Council in the Marches of Wales until his death in 1619, buried ‘privately in the night with Store of Candles’. Despite his religious affiliation, he maintained an interest in the Church of England. Hanmer was one of the signatories of a petition in 1604 to Lord Zouche requesting that the next bishop should be Dr Parry because of his ‘good life, discreet government, and painful preaching as well in the Welsh tongue as the English.’⁸⁹ This shows concern for the spiritual life of the region in a wider sense, and an understanding of the role that the Welsh language had to play in Welsh religion. The Hanmer family produced Jesuits and seminarians as well as Catholic conformist heirs.⁹⁰

On the other hand Sir Thomas Hanmer II’s father, Sir John Hanmer, has somehow acquired a reputation as a ‘leader of the Puritan party’ in an unspecified institution or region. This assertion in W. R. Williams’ parliamentary history of Wales and in the Hanmer family history has been repeated many times elsewhere but the basis for it is unclear – Sir John Hanmer was only politically active in parliament in 1624, the year of his death.⁹¹ While an MP, his only recorded activity was to attend a meeting concerning the sale of a Denbighshire estate.⁹² While his entry in the *Dictionary of Welsh National Biography* explains that he devoted part of the Bettisfield tithe to encourage preaching in the parish, this is the only extant evidence of his religious behaviour.⁹³ Sir John’s will was completely conventional in its stipulations, aside perhaps from the specific command that he be

⁸⁸ TNA, SP 12/175 fo. 153: The names of the Confederates against Her Majesty who have diverse and sundry times conspired her life and do daily confederate against her, 1584; TNA, SP 12/189 fo. 34: Secret advertisements to Walsingham, 12 May 1586.

⁸⁹ HMC, *Salisbury*, 16 (1933), p. 314.

⁹⁰ HMC, *Salisbury*, 10 (1883), p. 448; TNA, SP 15/34 fo. 96: Intelligences of the Residence of John Garrat, Oct. 1601; TNA, PC 2/34 fo. 45: letter to the bishop of Hereford, 9 Aug. 1626.

⁹¹ W.R. Williams, *The Parliamentary History of the Principality of Wales, from the earliest times to the present day, 1541-1895* (Brecknock, 1895), p. 86; Hanmer, *Memorial of the Parish and Family of Hanmer*, p. 58.

⁹² *HOP 1604-1649*, IV, 531-2.

⁹³ *DWB*, p. 336.

‘buried in the daytime.’⁹⁴ Sir John appears to have attempted actively to display his Protestantism, in order to demonstrate his political loyalty in comparison to his father’s alleged Catholic nonconformity. Furthermore, a sincere and religiously-based difference between two generations, or two branches of the same family, was far from unusual.⁹⁵

As with many other North-East Welsh families the Hanmers during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI and I had connections with both the Catholic and Protestant faiths. The main branch was at least outwardly conformist (if to greatly varying degrees), and maintained its interest in the parish church and local religious affairs within the Church of England. On the other hand there were many signs that the ‘old faith’ had not lost its grip – there were Catholic Hanmer cadet branches, and strong connections with local Catholic families. The conformist main branch maintained its links with Catholic kinsmen. Whether the head of the family was opposed to international Catholicism (as with the Mostyns) or wary of the need to obey certain orders from London (as with the Salusburys of Lleweni), they did not act strongly against recusants even in periods of crisis. The Hanmers are interesting because they exemplify the inconsistency and obfuscation that resulted from an ambiguous religious affiliation in North-East Wales. Outwardly conformist, supportive of the Church of England and, in the seventeenth century, never prosecuted for recusancy, they nonetheless present an interestingly complex picture of religious life in the region.

Sir Thomas Hanmer as royalist Anglican squire

⁹⁴ TNA, PROB 11/145/358: Will of Sir John Hanmer, 8 Mar. 1625.

⁹⁵ P. Marshall, ‘Faith and Identity in a Warwickshire Family: The Throckmortons and the Reformation’, *Dugdale Occasional Papers*, 49 (2010), p. 4; S. Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 417-18; P. Marshall and G. Scott, ‘Introduction: The Catholic Gentry in English Society’, *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 2, 6.

Sir Thomas Hanmer has been evaluated within his roles as a royalist, father, and tulip-grower during the centuries since his death.⁹⁶ Yet his religion has never yet been questioned. It was presumed by historians that the Justice of the Peace, *custos rotulorum*, Deputy Lieutenant, Commissioner of Array, and head of the ancient Hanmer family was as ardent an Anglican as many of his neighbouring *uchelwyr*. He returned home from his continental travels to serve Charles I in the Civil War. Hanmer was granted a commission as colonel, and was condemned by Sir Thomas Myddelton as one of the Council of War responsible on 22 June 1643 for designing and imposing the oath in English and Welsh against parliament and its commanders.⁹⁷ This oath was taken in parish churches and overseen by the clergy and gentry. In this regard, he appears a typical North-East Welsh gentleman. North Welsh royalists foregrounded support for the Church of England within their pleas to the king and parliament.⁹⁸ Sir Thomas Hanmer was, from his return home, intimately involved with the design of the oath (surely calculated to exemplify the main tenets of royalist support), the recruitment of troops, and the coordination of regional forces with commanders in Chester and Shrewsbury. He was proposed as Vice-President of Wales under Prince Rupert in February 1644 because he was ‘a person very well affected to his Majestie & of very good esteeme in Wales’.⁹⁹ A hostile report described him as ‘the cheefe ringleader of the Welsh rebels’ in c.1650.¹⁰⁰ In neither friendly nor hostile reports is there any mention of any religious unorthodoxy on Hanmer’s part, which surely would have played to the advantage of his legal and military adversaries in the region.

⁹⁶ D. Scott, unpublished *HOP 1640-1660* article on Sir Thomas Hanmer; E. Scarisbriek, *The Holy Life of Lady Warner, Sister Clare of Jesus...* (Dublin, 1769); J. Robinson, ‘New Light on Sir Thomas Hanmer’; F. Young, *The Gages of Hengrave and Suffolk Catholicism, 1640-1767* (2015).

⁹⁷ TNA, C231/5 fo. 534: Crown Docquet Books, 1629-43; SP 29/159 fo. 50: A list of Several Colonels who had commissions for raising and commanding of regiments of horse, foots, and dragoons, 20 Jun. 1666; NLW, Bettisfield 111: Commission to Sir Thomas Hanmer, 7 Sept. 1642; BL, Harley MS 6804 fo. 142: List of Commissioners in Flintshire; BL, Add MS 1890 Vol 1 fo. 20v: List of Commissions for raising horse and dragoons since 10 Oct. 1642; Sir Thomas Myddelton, *A declaration published by Sir Thomas Middleton... setting forth the illegality and incongruity of a pernicious oath and protestation* (1644), p. 2.

⁹⁸ See chapter two, pp. 82-4, and chapter three, pp. 159-60.

⁹⁹ NLW, Bettisfield 113: Copy letter of Edward Nicholas to Prince Rupert, n.p, n.d.

¹⁰⁰ Hanmer, *Parish and Family of Hanmer*, pp. 72-3.

Hanmer's baptism of his youngest child, Philip, could be seen as positive evidence of Anglicanism. At the christening on 24 May 1656 in Lewisham, Hanmer selected his brothers-in-law and his mother as Philip's godparents, an unexceptional fact except for the 1645 ban on baptism with godparents. Amongst those whose religious faith was much more clearly demonstrated, this has been seen as a sign of resistance to the Interregnum suppression of orthodox Church of England traditions. As discussed in chapter two, baptism with godparents continued amongst all social groups in North-East Wales. Amongst royalists it became confined increasingly to a circle of close family and royalist associates. As part of a wider royalist and Anglican associational culture, orthodox religious practices and services were seemingly easy to access in North-East Wales. Yet many conformist gentry Catholics had been undertaking home or private baptisms for generations by 1656, using resident priests. Others accepted the necessity of a Protestant baptism as better than none.¹⁰¹ In Hanmer's case, therefore, a private baptism with godparents is not as sure an indicator of Anglican affiliation as it would be for others. For Sir Roger Mostyn, for example, there is other evidence of his faith and the politico-religious beliefs of the clergymen he used.¹⁰²

On the other hand, the officiating clergyman at Philip Hanmer's christening was 'Dean Lany', the Laudian Benjamin Lany, dean of Rochester and fellow royalist exile. Although Lany attracted the suspicion of Puritans with his actions and attitudes before the First Civil War, he was one of a small group of Church of England clergy (mostly Laudians) battling to prevent conversions to Catholicism amongst the English community in exile. He

¹⁰¹ J. Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850* (1975), pp. 133-5; A. Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993), p. 85.

¹⁰² S.L. Ward 'Responses to godly government in North-East Wales, 1646-1660: gentility, religion and Royalist political activity', in C. Knaack and J. van Tol (eds.), *Godly Governance, Religion and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, forthcoming).

emphasised the value of the sacraments and ceremony as opposed to sermons, the importance of episcopacy, and the authority of the king over the church and state.¹⁰³ This could support a view of Hanmer as a High Church Anglican, although it would presuppose that Lany would not baptise Hanmer's children otherwise. It is impossible to know whether Lany knew Hanmer well enough to understand his private confessional identity, or alternatively whether the two were close enough friends for Lany to baptise Hanmer's child regardless.

At the Restoration Sir Thomas certainly appeared to be a typical conservative Anglican squire. As with many other royalist gentlemen it is extremely difficult to separate politically and religiously motivated actions in this period. If Hanmer is to be seen as part of a wider Anglican movement against former politico-religious adversaries, however, his actions as an influential landowner, patron, and JP are vitally important. In areas of England and Wales dominated by conservatives, early actions against Puritan ministers and officials were common, often preceding official sanctions in parliament or by the Church.

Unsurprisingly, Puritans of all stripes were harassed and prosecuted in North Wales in the early months of the Restoration. Sir Thomas Hanmer struck early against his former antagonists in Flintshire by reporting the intruded minister of Hanmer, Richard Steele, to the local commissioners for removing and restoring of ministers. The order for Steele to appear before the commissioners was dated 20 October 1660, and presuming the report was made some time before that, it demonstrates Hanmer's eagerness to have Steele ejected from the parish of Hanmer.¹⁰⁴ The Act for Confirming and Restoring Ministers was only passed on 13 September 1660, so Hanmer must have been extremely prompt in making his report. Personal reasons no doubt played a part in this decision. Hanmer had

¹⁰³ E. Allen, 'Benjamin Lany (1591-1675)', *ODNB*.

¹⁰⁴ NLW, Bettisfield 108: Order for Richard Steele to attend the commissioners, 20 Oct. 1660.

been paying Steele part of his tithe income since 1651 and whatever Hanmer's precise confessional identity was, it was incompatible with Steele's Puritan beliefs.

Steele was finally ejected, but not before a petition was gathered in support of him, praising his 'Ministeriall Abilityes and religious Life'. The initiative behind this apparently came from Andrew Ellis of Allthrey, a kinsman of Hanmer's, a former member of the local parliamentary county committee, and one of the commissioners under the Act for the better Propagation and Preaching of the Gospel in Wales.¹⁰⁵ Although there were many names affixed to the petition, notes by each parish indicated that the parishioners knew Sir Thomas would not receive it kindly, for example, 'most of the Inhabitants of the township of Hanmer did earnestly expresse their desires & affections to Mr. Steele, but durst not subscribe their hands, lest then Sir Thomas Hanmer should bee offended'.¹⁰⁶ Hanmer was unpersuaded, and Steele duly ejected. He was presented at the Flintshire Great Sessions alongside Philip Henry for not reading the Book of Common Prayer in services, and left for London in 1666.¹⁰⁷ Hanmer proceeded against Luke Lloyd junior, son of another former committeeman and commissioner for the propagation of the gospel, in 1665. He wrote to Sir Job Charlton, Chief Justice of Chester, of the 'strange, irreverent, and bold carriage' of Lloyd, binding him to appear before Charlton at the next assizes because 'giving the lie was a great provocation to the breach of the peace, and being given in a sacred place and to a sacred person at the Communion board, we thought it fit to be transmitted over to your Lordship'. According to Philip Henry, Lloyd had accused the vicar of being a liar just after the sacrament. Hanmer was clear that another reason for reporting it was that Deputy Lieutenants had orders to have a 'speciall eye over such as

¹⁰⁵ C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, (3 vols, 1911), II, 343.

¹⁰⁶ NLW, Bettisfield 109: Petition against the removal of Richard Steele, 12 Nov. 1660.

¹⁰⁷ M.H. Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M. A. of Broad Oak, Flintshire, A.D. 1631-1696* (1882), pp. 82, 181.

conformed not to the Church or State & to secure the most dangerous, & had many nonconformists in that parish of Hanmer who wee feard would grow insolent if such an affront to the Church should passe unpunished'.¹⁰⁸ Hanmer was involved in the daily business of ensuring the loyalty of the population, hearing oaths of allegiance with two other JPs in 1660, and prosecuting those who did not conform.¹⁰⁹ The 'old guard' of the 1640s and 1650s were seen as a threat to religion and the state by central government and in the regions. In that sense, regardless of Hanmer's confessional identity, he occupied the role of 'the resident Anglican squire and JP' that John Spurr describes as such a force for local conformity.¹¹⁰

When Hanmer was elected to parliament in 1669 his committee membership confirms (to some extent) his interest in matters of religious and political concern. Sir Thomas was a member of the committee for an additional bill to prevent seditious conventicles, of 8 December 1670, and both Sir Thomas and his son Sir John Hanmer were members of the committee for the Bill for ease of Protestant Dissenters in March 1673.¹¹¹ It is highly probable that they were not in favour of the measures proposed in the second committee. Given the continued presence of a number of dissenters at Hanmer, it is not difficult to see why Hanmer was so perturbed by the question of conventicles. During the Interregnum the Puritan ministers of the area met regularly at Hanmer and held monthly disputations there. Many of these men (and their more ardent followers) remained following the Restoration.¹¹² Hanmer 'signified his dislike' of the monthly exercises, putting an end to them in April 1661. He was evidently so worried about the number of nonconformists

¹⁰⁸ NLW, Bettisfield 24: Sir Thomas Hanmer to Sir Job Charlton, 12 Mar. 1665; Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 176.

¹⁰⁹ Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, p. 72.

¹¹⁰ J. Spurr, 'The Lay Church of England', in G. Tapsell (ed.), *The later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012), p. 106.

¹¹¹ CJ, vol. 9: 7 Mar. 1673, p. 265.

¹¹² Lee (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, pp. 41, 45, 50, 78.

travelling to Hanmer in September 1661 that he complained to the Chancellor, leading to a prohibition being sent because ‘fanatiques from Wrexham flockt hither’. Philip Henry, relating Hanmer’s illness following these actions, exhorted himself to ‘rejoice not when thine enemy falleth’.¹¹³

His work against the local nonconformists continued throughout the 1660s. In October 1663 Sir John Hanmer ordered the local dissenters to meet him in an alehouse in Hanmer before arresting them. Sir Thomas Hanmer and his uncle William Hanmer (both JPs) explained that this was on a charge of frequenting conventicles.¹¹⁴ It is difficult to imagine that he was uninvolved in the excommunication of three dissenters at Hanmer in 1665, and he and Sir John were again involved in the arrest, imprisonment, and examination of a group of nonconformists in July 1665. These men were examined by the Deputy Lieutenants (including three of the Hanmer family) about meetings, letters, and the administration of the sacrament.¹¹⁵ Sir Thomas Hanmer was consistently opposed to nonconformity. This may have been for political as much as religious reasons but it is equally possible that the two were inseparable in his mind. John Spurr depicts such men as ‘opportunists, men whose hatred of nonconformity or love of monarchy was deeper than their affection for the church’, but at least in Hanmer’s case a complex mixture of motivations is more likely.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 95, 98.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

¹¹⁵ It must be noted that Hanmer’s reputation as a severe persecutor has been formed largely by Henry, who frequently also discusses the actions of other JPs but does not name them. He was personally acquainted with Hanmer and described his actions in much more detail than other JPs. *Ibid.*, p. 176.

¹¹⁶ Spurr, ‘The lay Church of England’, p. 111.

On the surface, therefore, Sir Thomas Hanmer appeared a characteristically anti-Puritan, pro-Church North-East Welsh gentleman for most of his life.¹¹⁷ His religion has occasioned virtually no comment from historians. While he did not engage in sheltering ejected Church of England clergy as many other North-East Welsh families did, he maintained bonds of kinship and sociability in the region that along with the evidence above, make him appear unexceptional in political and religious terms.

Sir Thomas Hanmer as church papist

A closer examination of key aspects of Hanmer's life, writings, and actions, however, demonstrate that he was far from the archetypal Anglican North-East Welsh gentleman. There is much more evidence that Hanmer was a conformist Catholic. This would not have been incompatible with a royalist allegiance, with his early flight into exile, or with his maintenance of close kinship and social connections. While Sir Thomas Hanmer cannot be seen as an exemplar of Welsh Anglicanism, as a 'church papist' his experiences are informative about the way that such behaviour was treated in North-East Wales, and the primacy of social and political relationships over long-established religious ones.

Hanmer's desire not to be revealed as a Catholic may also provide a tentative explanation for his flight from Hanmer Hall into exile after its looting in 1644. The traditional explanation for his rapid journey from royalist commander to early exile was that he was a reluctant royalist, forced to become a commander due to pressure at Court but quick to leave for France at the earliest opportunity.¹¹⁸ This is not borne out by his efforts while in command, or his near promotion to Vice-President of Wales. The Welsh royalists still prevailed against their adversaries in 1644, and Hanmer had not disgraced himself in battle.

¹¹⁷ For his actions in relation to the royalists and Scots during the Interregnum, see the unpublished History of Parliament biography of Hanmer. D. Scott, unpublished *HOP 1640-1660* article on Sir Thomas Hanmer.

¹¹⁸ D. Scott, unpublished *HOP 1640-1660* article on Sir Thomas Hanmer.

His main estate, Hanmer Hall, had been looted by parliamentary troops, however, which meant that his Catholic chapel may well have been revealed. Shortly after the retaking of Hanmer Hall on 28 March 1644, Hanmer was given permission by the king to leave for the continent.¹¹⁹ It is possible that this was a coincidence, but the other explanations for his behaviour in 1644 do not correspond with his preceding actions.¹²⁰ To be revealed as a Catholic would have been expensive, particularly during the Interregnum, and would probably have led to his removal from prestigious local offices even after the Restoration.¹²¹ Although a few Catholics remained as JPs or were proposed as sheriff up to the 1640s, the influence of most was restricted to (admittedly still powerful) kinship networks and the reliance on the local status of their family.

The education of Sir Thomas Hanmer's son and heir, John (1635-1701), is the most persuasive evidence of the family's Catholic faith. The Hanmers had been in exile in France for four years when John was sent to the English College at Lisbon to be educated. While at Lisbon John Hanmer defended theses in theology in 1651 and 1653, leaving in 1654 to go back to England via Rome.¹²² The family is described in an account of the English College at Lisbon as 'true to the faith', having long maintained a Catholic chapel at Hanmer Hall.¹²³ John Hanmer was accompanied on his journey to the College by Father Thomas Pennant, a Jesuit friar originally of Bychton in Flintshire, and a member of the Catholic

¹¹⁹ Hanmer, *Parish and Family of Hanmer*, pp. 73-6.

¹²⁰ The incident is not mentioned in the following papers, aside from the taking of the garrison at Hanmer. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* (1643-9) – 25-30 Apr. (issue 52), 30 Apr.-7 May 1644 (issue 53); *Mercurius Britannicus* (1643-6) – 25 Mar.-1 Apr. 1644 (issue 29); 1-8th Apr. (issue 30); 8-15 Apr. (issue 31); 15-22 Apr. (issue 32); 22-29 Apr. (33); 29 Apr.-6 May (34); *Perfect Diurnall* (1643-9) – 1-8th Apr. 1644; 8-15th Apr. 1644; 15-22 Apr. 1644; 22-29 Apr. 1644; 29 Apr. – 6 May 1644; *True Informer* (1643-5): 23-30 Mar. 1644 (27); 30 Mar.-6 Apr. (28); 6-13 Apr. (29); 13-20 Apr. (30); *Weekly Account* (1643-8): 27 Mar.-3 Apr. (31); 3-10 Apr. (32); 10-17 Apr. (33); 17-25 Apr. (34); 25 Apr.-1 May 1644; *Mercurius Aulicus* (24-30 Mar.); (7-13 Apr.)

¹²¹ Although it has been convincingly argued that Catholics suffered less during the Interregnum in England, the absence of protection by their Protestant relatives meant that Welsh Catholics were more exposed to financial punishment.

¹²² W. Croft, *Historical Account of Lisbon College* (1902), p. 207.

¹²³ Croft, *Historical Account of Lisbon College*, p. 207; M. Sharratt (ed.), *Lisbon College Register 1628-1813* (1991), p. 77.

cadet branch of the prominent Pennant family of Downing. This demonstrates the Hanmers' connections within North-East Welsh Catholic networks, maintained while in France as well as at home in Wales. It is surely significant that Sir Thomas sent his heir to Lisbon for his education. As Gabriel Glickman has pointed out, the English Catholic community had transnational horizons, due in no small part to their exile in English colleges across Europe.¹²⁴ In the Interregnum, formerly conformist Caroline notables placed their children within English colleges. Some, including the earl of Bristol, returned from exile with 'highly ambiguous religious identities'.¹²⁵ Trevor Hanmer, Sir Thomas's daughter, was on her own account schooled by Huguenots, and that option also existed for John. Instead Sir Thomas chose a Catholic education for his son, at a time when there were English divines and potential tutors near him in France.

Sir Thomas was evidently deeply concerned not to be revealed as a Catholic. According to his daughter's hagiography, a narrative of her journey into the Sepulchrine convent at Liège and her life as a Sepulchrine and then a Poor Clare, his second wife persuaded Sir Thomas not to allow Trevor to become a nun. While in the 1650s Sir Thomas was convinced to allow Trevor to enter the convent of St Bennet in Paris, her stepmother argued that this would make her look unkind and give the impression that Sir Thomas was Catholic:

[I]t would give suspicion also to the world, that he himself was a Papist, and consequently expose him to greater difficulties than he lay under then; they being persecuted no less for their religion, than for their loyalty.¹²⁶

This was an effective argument, and Trevor was prevented from joining the convent until 1664, after she had already married and given birth to at least one child. As Catholic

¹²⁴ G. Glickman, *The English Catholic Community 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009), p. 9.

¹²⁵ G. Glickman, 'The Church and the Catholic Community 1660-1715' in G. Tapsell (ed.), *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012), p. 219.

¹²⁶ Scarisbriek, *Holy Life of Lady Warner*, p. 7.

gentlemen in the broader region in the 1640s and 1650s worked to place their daughters in English convents on the Continent, Trevor Hanmer's choice would have raised questions about Sir Thomas's religious affiliation. William Blundell of Crosby in Lancashire arranged for his daughter Jane to join the Poor Clares in 1658, as did Sir John Mostyn of Talacre's daughters Margaret and Elizabeth in 1644.¹²⁷ Although there is a tendency in such hagiographies to create a journey strewn with obstacles and difficulties, the impression that Hanmer was sensitive to threats to his reputation for conformity is borne out elsewhere.

Sir Thomas Hanmer was engaged with Catholic associational culture in Wales and England. William Hanmer of Fenns befriended and sheltered Catholic priests, while Hanmer himself housed a small community of Catholic recusants.¹²⁸ Bettisfield, where the other main Hanmer estate lay, was home to one of the larger recusant communities in the area. In the 1657 Flintshire Great Sessions returns twenty out of the seventy-one reported recusants were from Bettisfield – home to the recusant gentry Morgan family as well as the Hanmers.¹²⁹ It was common from the time of Elizabeth onwards for Catholics to (in Bossy's terms) 'coagulate' around a gentleman's household, and Catholic gentry and nobility across England and Wales were able to provide some level of protection for themselves and Catholic tenants or servants using their patronage connections and remaining local influence.¹³⁰ As Glickman has argued in relation to post-1688 Catholics,

¹²⁷ Blundell had links with the North-East Welsh region which remain unexplored. It is unlikely, however, that he was unacquainted with the recusant activist family, the Mostyns of Talacre. G. Baker, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2010), p. 83; E. Bedingfield, *The Life of Mary Mostyn, mother Margaret of Jesus* (1878), pp. 24-5.

¹²⁸ E.G. Jones, *Cymru A'r Hen Ffydd* (Cardiff, 1951), p. 70; G. Bowen, *Welsh Recusant Writings* (Cardiff, 1999), p. 25; TNA, SP 12/37/37 fo. 3: Survey of Recusants' and Delinquents' Estates, 1654-8.

¹²⁹ NLW, Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60, fos 138v-139v.

¹³⁰ Bossy, *English Catholic Community*, p. 175; W. Sheils, "'Getting on" and "getting along" in parish and town', in B. Kaplan *et al* (eds), *Catholic Communities in Protestant states: Britain and the Netherlands c.1570-1720* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 67-8; A. Walsham, 'Supping with Satan's Disciples: Spiritual and Secular Sociability in Post-Reformation England', in N. Lewycky and A. Morton (eds), *Getting Along?: Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of Professor W.J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 52-4; M. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c.1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 25 and *passim*.

they pursued a strategy of reconciling ‘inward piety with a practical re-engagement in the Protestant nation’.¹³¹ In North-East Wales, this local influence could still be extremely strong. Trevor Hanmer’s initial plans to become a nun were supported by a Jesuit member of her family, one Father Hanmer, and Hanmer’s objections to his daughter becoming a nun were out of circumstance rather than principle.¹³² As Francis Young has commented, it would have been remarkable for a Protestant father to agree for his daughter to become a Catholic and a nun.¹³³ Hanmer’s second wife, Susan Hervey, was part of the wider Gage-Hervey family of Hengrave Hall. Hengrave was, in the Interregnum, ‘something of a bolthole for Royalists and Catholics’, and the Gage family were well known for their Catholic faith. Hanmer stayed at Hengrave and other nearby properties in the area. Even though Susan Hervey was nominally a Protestant, her family context was mixed to say the least.¹³⁴ If Hanmer was not a Catholic of any kind himself, he was certainly prepared to countenance Catholicism in his family and friends to a degree unusual even in North-East Wales.

Hanmer’s own words betray some indication of where his sympathies lay. First, in his account of France, written in 1648 but unpublished until 1838, he described the people, government, court, religion, and diplomatic status of the country. In his description of the ‘absolute’ rule of the French kings, he blamed the people for their subjugation under a powerful sovereign. He connected these circumstances to the contemporary situation at home:

The historyes of all nations are full of examples, that too much felicity, too great immunities of subjects, puffe them up to their owne ruine, and, by contesting for supream power, justly forfeit their owne freedoms and riches. Soe the Protestants in ffrance enforc’d the king to oppresse them, and, by their

¹³¹ Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, p. 54.

¹³² Scarisbriek, *The Holy Life of Lady Warner*, pp. 6-7.

¹³³ Young, *The Gages of Hengrave*, p. 23.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

disobedience and ambition, enslaved themselves; and soe the commotions of the house of Guise, and of ye citty of Rouen the other day, did but full the king's coffers, and work their own humiliation; and so the miserable Hollenders, by refusing their owne prince (the king of Spaine) a small contribution, plunged themselves into a warr of three score yeares continuance, and the highest impositions and excises that may bee, and, by casting of one lawful master, made themselves slaves to hundreds; and, by this tyme, the English feele how dangerous innovations are, and what are the consequences of opposing and contemning majesty.¹³⁵

While the first part of this explanation is similar to that in the first paragraph of Clarendon's *History of the Great Rebellion*, the second is unusual in placing the blame for misfortunes and massacres solely on Protestant shoulders.¹³⁶ According to Hanmer the French Protestants caused their own downfall because of their own ambition, and the petty refusal of the Dutch Protestants to pay Philip II a rightful contribution led to social unrest and war. That Protestants used the excuse of religion to advance 'their own political power' and ambitious ends was a powerful and ubiquitous line of argument within Catholic polemic, as was the idea that Protestant actions were 'innovation' or dangerous novelty.¹³⁷ It is surely significant, therefore, that Hanmer takes this line when explaining the upheavals in Europe over the previous two hundred years. It would be extremely unusual for a Protestant to argue thus.

Second, Hanmer and his wife demonstrated an uncertain grasp on the liturgy of the Church of England in relation to the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist. In a passage relating to Trevor Hanmer's conversations with her Jesuit relative and her husband, immediately prior to her conversion to Catholicism, her biography reveals the Hanmers' confusion regarding the Eucharist:

One night, after supper, it happened, that my Lady Hanmer, in a discourse about religion, affirmed, "That the *Belief of the Real Presence of our Saviour in the Blessed*

¹³⁵ Bunbury (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer*, p. 260.

¹³⁶ Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (8 vols, 1826), I, 1-3.

¹³⁷ S.J. Barnett, 'Where Was Your Church Before Luther? Claims for the Antiquity of Protestantism Examined', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 68:1 (1999), p. 14.

Sacrament, was acknowledged by the public liturgy of the church of England, which was authorized and commanded to be read in all churches in the kingdom.” Lady Warner, surprized at this assertion, modestly replied; “Then, madam, I have hitherto been very ignorant in the religion I profess, and have been brought up in from my childhood.” ... Sir Thomas Hanmer affirming my lady to be in the right, and his daughter in the error.

Francis Young has argued that the Hanmers’ attitudes were ‘probably consciously adopted and denoted adherence to a High Church Laudian understanding of conformity’.¹³⁸ There was a ‘strong moderate realist tendency’ amongst Anglican writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as an ‘increasingly sophisticated philosophical analysis of both eucharistic presence and sacrifice’. Moderate realist theology included references to the ‘real presence’ of Christ in the sacraments, but qualified this by explaining that the presence was spiritual – communicants partook of Christ’s divine, rather than corporal, nature.¹³⁹ Even set amongst those Church of England divines engaging in theological debate, therefore, Hanmer’s statement would have been erroneous. In considering the printed rubric it is also difficult to see Hanmer’s statement as orthodox or accurate. Though the 1549 Prayer Book contained ‘real-presence implications’, and the 1559 Prayer Book did not exclude the real presence, the Black Rubric following the Collects at the end of the service in the 1662 Prayer Book (like that of 1552) denied the ‘Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood’, this time as a compromise with Presbyterians.¹⁴⁰ The spoken liturgy retained real presence implications alongside the declaration of the act of taking communion as one of remembrance. As Daniel Swift has explained, what defines the prayer book is ‘the attempt at reconciliation, rather than its achievement’.¹⁴¹ From the

¹³⁸ Young, *The Gages of Hengrave*, p. 23.

¹³⁹ B. Douglas, *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology* (2 vols, Leiden, 2011), I, 291-4.

¹⁴⁰ D. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996), pp. 181-2, 504, 621; P.N. Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer’s Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Basingstoke, 2nd edn., 1992), p. 12; B. Cummings (ed.), *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford, 2011), pp. xlv, 33-4, 36, 137-8, 407; C. Hefling and C. Shattuck (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford, 2006), p. 52.

¹⁴¹ D. Swift, ‘The Book of Common Prayer’ in A. Hadfield (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640* (Oxford, 2013), p. 586.

1580s 'Arminians' or sacramentalists wanted to restore the real presence in the eucharist to Anglican doctrine, but this was not incorporated in the 1662 edition. The Church of England itself had 'dodged the question repeatedly' in the seventeenth century, leading to variant opinions within the clergy, let alone amongst laymen.¹⁴² It is easy to see how less theologically engaged laymen might still perceive the real presence within the spoken liturgy alone, as the formulary remained unchanged from 1559. Arnold Hunt has argued persuasively that, although there was a general regard for the sacrament amongst the common people, most people saw no reason to receive more than once a year – further reducing the likelihood of familiarity with the liturgy.¹⁴³

From the evidence of his pocket books and letters, Hanmer's interests did not extend to theology or theological controversy. The account from Trevor Hanmer's 'Life' suggests that he and his wife attended Church of England services and used the Prayer Book, but it is hard to see it straightforwardly as evidence of Laudianism, as Young does. The unfamiliarity with the detail of the printed liturgy could indicate a Catholic conformist context, in which the Hanmers had received little exposure to mainstream reformed theology. In the light of the other evidence about Hanmer's confessional identity, this would make sense. Taking it as a single instance, however, it reveals little conclusive. Whatever their personal confession or relationship with established church, Sir Thomas and Lady Hanmer found attendance at holy communion to be compatible with their personal understanding of eucharistic theology.

The Hanmers and politico-religious attitudes in North-East Wales, 1640-78

¹⁴² Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*, p. 347.

¹⁴³ A. Hunt, 'The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England', *P&P*, 161 (1998), p. 45.

It is difficult to be certain about the confessional identity of many early modern individuals, particularly when they aimed to conceal it. Sir Thomas Hanmer left behind clues and glimpses into his personal faith, and this case study has speculated on their significance. Overall, the evidence seems weighted towards Hanmer being a conformist Catholic who took careful steps to appear like an orthodox Anglican gentleman. His son's education, his own writings, and the milieu in which he operated are persuasive indicators of that religious allegiance. On the whole, such a stance would not conflict with the public life of a North-East Welsh Anglican gentleman. Many Catholics (whether conformist or recusant) wanted to maintain strong connections with their parish church, and would have held local office as their ancestors had, if they had been allowed in law. In North-East Wales, some of them managed both, albeit only minor rather than major local offices. There would have been little sympathy for Puritan nonconformists from either High Church Anglicans or conformist Catholics, as in North-East Wales both groups suffered for an almost uniform royalist allegiance in the Civil Wars, and both loathed the religious policies in the Interregnum. As explored in chapter two, unlike other areas of Wales and England, Catholics suffered more in North-East Wales during the Interregnum due to the previous under-reporting of recusancy by kinsmen and allies.

Hanmer's case reveals that religiously ambiguous individuals were able to operate without difficulty in the North-East Welsh region. Their heritage and lineage was more important than their religious affiliation and, as many North-East Welsh families interacted regularly with their own Catholic conformist or recusant branches, local Catholics were generally not seen as alien or threatening. As long as their public attitudes to key local issues and particular national topics were in sympathy with their peers, there was little interrogation of their private actions and attitudes. Sir Thomas Hanmer was quick to support the king in 1642, prosecuted non-conformists from 1660, perceived Puritan radicalism as a threat to

the state, and sought to protect local interests. He socialised with local families, swapping plants, writings, and news. On all these matters he was in sympathy with the currents of local opinion, and the specifics of his religious behaviour were not enquired into. At once, therefore, Hanmer is both typical and atypical. If he was a Catholic conformist, he was atypically successful in concealing it and in operating at a national level without comment. At a local level he would have been the only Catholic conformist in such elevated positions within regional government. For the North-East Welsh gentry, however, he was a Welsh gentleman of ancient lineage, impeccably connected within local society and possessed of the correct opinions on the key matters of the day.

III. Robert Davies III: Royalism and loyalism in North-East Wales, c.1640-1668

The Davies family, squires of Gwysaney in Flintshire, could easily be seen as the obscure Welsh gentlemen of satire. Their estate was not large by English standards. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries their actions were not nationally renowned and their offspring did not go on to fame and fortune. Like many other gentry families, they sent their sons to school at Westminster, university at Oxford, and then sometimes to the Inns of Court.¹⁴⁴ Yet the Davies family wielded a significant amount of power, patronage and influence in North-East Wales in the period 1640-88. They were close socially to the regional nobility such as the earls of Bridgewater and Derby, for which they received patronage requests from far and wide.¹⁴⁵ They advised local clergymen and approved political appointments. Individuals within the family were renowned for their intellectual and antiquarian pursuits, opening their library to other antiquarians and corresponding with nationally significant individuals. The Davies family were regional opinion-leaders in

¹⁴⁴ NLW, MS 1603E: Transcripts of the Accounts of Anne Davies, p. 443.

¹⁴⁵ For example, NLW, MS 1551E fo. 10: T. Legh to Captain Thomas Davies, Lyme, 13 Jan. 1635.

favour of traditionally conservative religion, consistent political loyalty and a strong sense of Welsh culture and heritage. Loyalty held significant cultural capital in North-East Welsh society.¹⁴⁶ Closely associated with a strong territorial power base, kinship relationships, adherence to the Church of England, and an ordered and stable society, loyalty to the Crown was of paramount importance to the North-East Welsh gentry. The Davies family's royalist allegiance throughout the period 1641 to 1660 and into the Restoration was, therefore, both significant and typical of the region's gentry attitudes. They were capable of bringing out their political 'interest' and connections in favour of the king, of resisting new governments, and providing a focal point for the disaffected. The Davieses had a consistent reputation for loyalty that was the source of some pride to them, and their lives and experiences from 1642 to 1668 exemplify many of the most characteristic traits of North-East Welsh royalism.

Robert and Thomas Davies: Family context

The Davieses were an ancient family, descended from Welsh princes and established in the region since at least the thirteenth century.¹⁴⁷ Robert Davies III (1616-68) inherited Gwysaney and its estates in 1633. As he was only seventeen years old, Davies was placed under the guardianship of his uncle, Colonel Thomas Davies (c.1583-1655), and his father-in-law, Sir Peter Mutton. By 1642 Robert Davies was twenty-six, respected as head of one of the most important families in North-East Wales, and in regular contact with his well-connected uncle and with many of the most prominent families in the region. The only member of the Davies family to be mentioned consistently in academic studies is Robert

¹⁴⁶ See chapter three, pp. 149-54.

¹⁴⁷ Their pedigrees trace the family back further, to the ninth century, but they do not appear in other sources until the thirteenth century. G.A. Usher, *Gwysaney and Owston: A History of the Family of Davies-Cooke of Gwysaney, Flintshire and Owston, West Riding of Yorkshire* (Denbigh, 1964), p. 16.

Davies IV (1658-1710) the antiquary and natural historian.¹⁴⁸ Otherwise the family's extensive contribution to North Welsh history and culture has only been recognised within the 1964 family history, and a nineteenth-century genealogical history of the house of Gwysaney.¹⁴⁹ This neglect is undeserved. The Davieses were extremely influential throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and used their connections with the earls of Derby and Bridgewater to build their authority and patronage network. Although the heir tended to be largely resident in Wales, younger sons became, for example, merchants and soldiers living in London and abroad. The Davieses were connected by marriage to Archbishop John Williams, the Pennants, Thelwalls, Eytons, and Edwardses. This allied them furthermore to the Mostyns and Wynns of Gwydir, and further back in the family tree they were connected to the Salusburys of Lleweni. The Davies, then, were *uchelmyr* like the Mostyns – strongly rooted in their lands, with a long-established power base and well-developed kinship and alliance network. Also important was their pride in their lineage and identity, their connections to the Welsh historicised culture and adherence to Welsh gentry ideals. This case study will argue that these facets were vital in allowing them to operate as royalist officers during the Civil Wars and to act in opposition to the regime in the Interregnum. Their tradition of service, either military or political, and the ideal of loyalty to the Crown made the Davieses treasure loyalty above all.

Royalist actions, 1640-1668

From the early 1640s to the end of Robert Davies's life in 1668 Gwysaney was perceived as a bastion of loyalty to the Crown. The actions of the Davieses in this period demonstrate the truth of this reputation. They include a prompt and consistent royalist allegiance from

¹⁴⁸ E.g. D. Huws, 'Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn manuscripts', p. 451; H. Emanuel, 'The Gwysaney Manuscripts', *NLWJ*, 7 (1951-2), pp. 326-43; J.G. Jones, 'Scribes and Patrons in the Seventeenth Century', in P.H. Jones and E. Rees (eds), *A Nation and its Books: A History of the Book in Wales* (Aberystwyth, 1998), p. 87.

¹⁴⁹ Sir J.B. Burke, *A Genealogical History of the House of Gwysaney* (1847); G.A. Usher, *Gwysaney and Omston*.

at least 1642, a refusal to compromise or become involved with the Interregnum regimes, and an active involvement in the Restoration regime in Flintshire and in London.

Civil War Royalism: Military and administrative service

A royalist allegiance has often been seen as the result of reactions to parliamentary developments in London from 1641-2, as well as of long-term political, social, and religious attitudes. Historians have depicted the early 1640s as fundamentally when royalism became a 'party' or movement in a meaningful way, rather than a universal phenomenon.¹⁵⁰ An up-to-date knowledge and understanding of parliamentary and court politics was, therefore, crucial in forming longer-term attitudes into immediate and practically effective opinions.¹⁵¹ Unlike other notable families, such as the Salusburys of Lleweni, Mostyns of Mostyn and Myddeltons of Chirk, the Davieses were not directly involved in parliamentary politics before the outbreak of the Civil War. This did not mean that they were uninterested in the progress of affairs in the Long Parliament. Through their kinship network and London connections they had long received news of political events from London and abroad, for example the earl of Strafford's trial. The earl of Bridgewater reported on 6 April 1641 that 'the E. of Strafforde's Businesse held so long yesterday that all weere almost tired, as ill as himselfe' leading those present to be 'ready and willing to Leape at a Cruste' on their return home after 8pm.¹⁵² The same letter discussed business at the Council of the Marches and rumours of changes to the judiciary.

¹⁵⁰ J. de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004), pp. 1-2; A. Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in J. Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49* (Basingstoke, 2009), p. 63; J.W. Daly, 'The Origins and Shaping of English Royalist Thought', *Historical Papers/Communications historiques*, 9 (1974), pp. 18, 21.

¹⁵¹ Particularly if royalism is to be considered as more than an emotional or ignorant political choice.

¹⁵² NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 8b: J. Bridgewater to Thomas Davies, London, 6 Apr. 1641.

Thomas Davies was treated by the Bridgewater family as a kinsman and acted on their behalf in matters at Ludlow and in Cheshire when they were absent. Bridgewater employed various agents to send him news from London and elsewhere, and encouraged other correspondents to do the same. These included well-informed insiders like John Castle (a clerk of the Privy Council) and Roger Holland, and correspondents in Ludlow, such as the clerk Henry Ecclestone.¹⁵³ Castle's letters of 1640 spoke gloomily of the political situation, while Ecclestone wrote in October 1641 of the iconoclasm committed locally by Sir Robert Harley.¹⁵⁴ Davies's position within Bridgewater's household allowed him and his family privileged access to the most recent information concerning political events nationwide. Thomas Davies was frequently in London arranging affairs for Bridgewater or executing his commands.¹⁵⁵ Furthermore it is clear from Bridgewater's correspondence that Thomas Davies relayed news and information when Bridgewater was absent or indisposed, and that other Davies family members were also involved in this network. Robert Davies, for example, communicated on his uncle's behalf in 1631, as did Elizabeth Davies in the 1640s.¹⁵⁶ News undoubtedly had the potential to push an individual towards action, or to a more formalised position in relation to the events in London.

There is little trace of the Davieses forming ideas or positions of allegiance prior to the Civil War. The Flintshire petition of 1642, the petition from North Wales, and that purporting to come from the whole of Wales, also from 1642, do not include signatures. Despite this, as a prominent Flintshire gentleman and a later committed royalist it is highly

¹⁵³ e.g. HL, EL 7863: John Castle ('de Sacro Bosco') to Lord Bridgewater, n.p., 29 Sept. 1640; EL 7874: Roger Holland to Lord Bridgewater, n.p., 19 Sept. 1640.

¹⁵⁴ HL, EL 7350: Henry Ecclestone to Lord Bridgewater, Ludlow, 25 Oct. 1641.

¹⁵⁵ For example, HL, EL 7877: Roger Holland to Thomas Davies, n.p., 15 Jan. 1641; EL 6603: Richard Harrison to Lord Bridgewater, Barbican, 11 Mar. 1639; EL 647: Thomas Davies to Lord Bridgewater, n.p., 18 Sept. 1635.

¹⁵⁶ HL, EL 6490: Robert Davies to Lord Bridgewater, Gwysaney, 27 July 1631; EL 11761: Elizabeth Davies to John Salusbury, n.p., n.d.

likely that Robert Davies was involved in their organisation.¹⁵⁷ The protestation returns for Mold do not survive, and there is no correspondence in either the Gwysaney collections or elsewhere clearly to demonstrate their reactions to events or commitment to the king. As a Justice of the Peace, Robert Davies would have been summoned to the meeting at Flint on 14 February 1642 organised by the High Sheriff David Pennant to raise men and arms for the county's service.¹⁵⁸ He was high on the list of the Commissioners named in relation to the 'Act for the Speedie Contribution and Loan, towards the relief of His Majesties distressed Subjects of the Kingdom of Ireland' in March 1642, and was named Commissioner of Array in summer 1642.¹⁵⁹ Although no Commission for Davies has yet emerged, he appears in David Pennant's list of Commissioners of Array even prior to the outbreak of war.¹⁶⁰ It would be almost unthinkable should he not have been a Commissioner of Array, given his family's alliances and his prominence in local society. While their motivations may be unproven, therefore, the service record of the Davieses early in the First Civil War and their attitude subsequently demonstrates that they were keen to serve Charles I in any capacity possible.

It was Thomas Davies, usually addressed as 'Captain' or 'Lieutenant-Colonel', who made the most visible military contribution of the family in the Civil War. He was servant to Prince Henry in his youth, and this service may well have consolidated an already well-formed family loyalty to the Crown.¹⁶¹ He was an experienced soldier, having fought under the earl of Essex against the Spanish in the Netherlands from 1620-5. His surviving letters

¹⁵⁷ *The Humble Petition of Many Hundred Thousands, inhabiting within the Thirteene Shires of Wales* (1642); BL, Harley MS 1980 fo. 76v: The humble Petition of the Gentry Ministers and freeholders of the Countie of Flint; BL, Add MS 46399A fo. 78: A Protestation and Oath to be taken by the Inhabitants of the Sixe Counties of Northwales.

¹⁵⁸ FRO, D/DM/271 fos 8-9v: David Pennant letterbook.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, fos 16-18, 46.

¹⁶⁰ Although this letter is not dated it is appended to a letter received on 15 Mar. 1642. FRO D/DM/271 fo 17: David Pennant to the Commissioners of Array for Flintshire, Holywell, n.d.

¹⁶¹ 'Gwysaney Papers', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 12 (1881), p. 204.

depict an horrific conflict but his actions there were to provide him and other North-East Welsh soldiers with valuable experience when fighting in the Civil War less than twenty years later.¹⁶² Davies used his Bridgewater connections to gain a senior commission in 1643, having persuaded Lord Dunsmore (nephew of Lord Chancellor Egerton) to intervene with the King on his behalf.¹⁶³ He was given a commission as Lieutenant-Colonel, had 'Priority of Command' in Flintshire and was Constable of Hawarden Castle in 1643. Davies commanded a regiment of 500 Flintshire men that combined dragoons with infantry. He was promoted over Roger Mostyn in this commission, a fact that the King explained in the following manner in his letter to Capel on 19 July 1643:

although other persons may have received Commissions to raise forces in those parts who have thereby the precedency yet wee knowing the ability of Colonell Davies who hath served us, and our late Royall father of blessed memory in all our expeditions, cannot but esteeme him fitt to have that respect as to be preferred to the Priority of Command.¹⁶⁴

This demonstrates Thomas Davies' position and status as well as the Royalists' need for experienced commanders in the North-West. He led his forces throughout the First Civil War, taking part in fighting at (amongst other places) Hawarden and at the siege of Denbigh. He compounded under the Articles of Denbigh for £51 – a significantly smaller sum than his nephew Robert who compounded on the same day under the same articles but was fined £645.11.4. Thomas Davies took the Negative Oath and National Covenant, however, whilst there is no record of Robert Davies ever doing the same. This is one possible explanation for the difference between them – Robert Davies' fine was one of the highest in North-East Wales.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶² For example NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 34a: Thomas Davies to Robert Davies, The Hague, 20 May; Gwysaney Transcripts 34c: Thomas Davies to Robert Davies, Breda, 20 Feb. 1625; N. Tucker, 'Volunteers in the Thirty Years War', *NLWJ*, 16 (1969), p. 62.

¹⁶³ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 30: Lord Dunsmore to Thomas Davies, Oxford, 4 July 1643.

¹⁶⁴ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 1: Charles I to Lord Capel, Oxford, 19 July 1643.

¹⁶⁵ N. Tucker, *North Wales in the Civil War* (Denbigh, 1958), pp. 169-70; M. Green (ed.), *Calendar of the proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, &c. 1643-1660* (5 vols, 1889-1892), III, 1717-18.

Robert Davies also contributed to the Royalist war effort. He was the High Sheriff of Flintshire from 1644-6 and again at the Restoration in 1660. As an active Commissioner of Array Davies was prominent in raising the alarm in January 1643 about an anticipated attack by Sir William Brereton's forces and in arranging meetings with the Commissioners of other counties.¹⁶⁶ As High Sheriff, Davies acted as Pennant had before him, raising money on warrants from the King or Prince Rupert as contributions to, for example, the defence of Hawarden in 1644.¹⁶⁷ There are no accounts of the part that Robert Davies played in the fighting in North Wales and Chester. He does not appear in contemporary recollections of events aside from those of the siege and capture of the ancestral home, Gwysaney, in April 1645. Brereton's forces attacked 'Goozanna' during the siege of Hawarden, part of the drive to reduce Chester's defences and access to additional forces.¹⁶⁸ He was subsequently imprisoned for a year following the siege by Sir William Brereton and was apparently present at the siege of Denbigh Castle in 1646.¹⁶⁹ Further confirmation of loyalty is seen in the Davies household accounts kept by Robert Davies' wife Ann, which lists under expenditure the repayment of £100 'Ann Mostin's money, which P Rupert had'. From other correspondence this seems to have been an inheritance that Davies was managing, and was required to pay back to the benefactors after making a wartime loan to Prince Rupert.¹⁷⁰ It is probable, therefore, that his nomination for the abortive Order of the Royal Oak was for his consistent loyalty, wartime administration and financial support, as well as his actions in the Interregnum rather than any outstanding military service in the

¹⁶⁶ WRO, CR2017/TP142/1: Sir Thomas Hanmer to Richard Grosvenor, Bangor-on-Dee, 15 Jan. 1642; WRO, CR2017/TP142/2: Robert Davies to John Jones, n.p., n.d.; Gwysaney 32B, Copy letter from Charles I to Lord Byron, n.p., 11 Dec. 1643; NLW, MS 1603D (unfoliated): John Lloyd to (?) Robert Davies, Vaynol, 2 Aug. 1642.

¹⁶⁷ NLW, MS 17156D fo. 23: Warrant from Prince Rupert to the High Sheriff of Flintshire, 9 June 1644.

¹⁶⁸ *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament and the Chief Collections of Letters from the Armie* (4th-11th Apr. 1645); B. Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English affairs...* (1682), p. 136.

¹⁶⁹ Usher, *Gwysaney and Owston*, p. 59; NLW, MS 1603E: Transcripts of the accounts of Anne Davies, p. 43.

¹⁷⁰ NLW, MS 1603E: Transcripts of the accounts of Anne Davies, p. 432.

First Civil War.¹⁷¹ From 1642 to 1646 Robert and Thomas Davies served the king loyally in military and administrative functions. Like many other North-East Welsh officers, they were prompt in answering the king's call to arms, and devoted their lives, estates, and money to sustaining the cause even when it seemed lost.

Interregnum Exile

From 1646 to 1660 the Davieses of Gwysaney chose to remain in a state of complete political exile. They remained aloof from all of the successive Interregnum governments and avoided being entrusted with local office during this period. Robert Davies and his son Mutton were imprisoned more than once. This may have resulted from their involvement (or suspected involvement) in clandestine Royalist activities. They hosted ejected clergy at Gwysaney and corresponded with their noble patrons and connections. It is difficult to depict the Gwysaney of the late 1640s and 1650s as anything but a refuge for Royalists and Anglicans. The Davies family were clearly viewed with suspicion by local and regional governments judging from their arrest and imprisonment at various flashpoints in the period, but they were greatly respected in the area at large. While the world changed around them, the Davieses attempted to remain steadfast in their pre-1642 loyalties.

Although North-East Wales was remarkable for the extent to which the gentry remained outside of the Interregnum political world, even the most loyal of gentlemen found it difficult to remain completely disengaged. Even the ultra-royalist Mostyns, for example, hosted Henry Cromwell on his journey to Ireland via Holyhead in 1655.¹⁷² As discussed in chapter three, Robert Davies was one of the 'better sort' deciding who of quality was fit to be an MP during the Interregnum. Although most of these were Parliamentary younger

¹⁷¹ P. Jenkins, 'Wales and the Order of the Royal Oak', *NLWJ*, 24 (1986), p. 345.

¹⁷² Evans, "To contynue in my bloud and name", p. 166.

sons of Royalist families, some of the regionally important ultra-royalists were involved (including the Mostyns and Sir Evan Lloyd). These North-East Welsh royalists prioritised the choice of an MP of appropriate status over political allegiance, and mobilised traditional electoral alliances to do so. They may also have hoped that they could influence a chosen candidate from their political wilderness.¹⁷³ Outside electoral matters, Robert Davies did not become involved personally in any form of government. It is likely that he was one of the JPs who refused to swear in the Deputy Sheriff in 1646.¹⁷⁴ Robert Davies's only attendance at a parliamentary committee was for the purposes of compounding, for which he first travelled to London in September 1648.¹⁷⁵ There can be little doubt that this political exile was a deliberate choice. Had they decided to compromise and engage with the regimes of the 1650s the Davieses would have been welcomed into local government for their experience and connections. Both were lacking on the North Wales committees, a fact commented on in hostile sources. Robert Davies appears only to have been a royalist administrator rather than a military commander, despite his heavy composition fine. Other gentlemen managed to overcome such service records if they were willing to take the requisite oaths.

One reason for their continued disengagement was the loyalty of Robert and Thomas Davies to the cause of the Stuart kings. Although this can be assumed by some of their actions in the 1650s it is also evident in the documents that they chose to preserve. One of the letters that survives in the Davies archives is a copy of the earl of Derby's poignant

¹⁷³ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 42B: Roger Mostyn to Robert Davies, Gloddaeth, 12 July 1656; FRO, D/G/3275 no. 89: Samuel Wood to Sir John Trevor, Chester, 28 Nov. 1646.

¹⁷⁴ This may seem late for Parliament to have established control over justice in the region but in fact the siege of Harlech in Gwynedd was still ongoing (until Mar. 1647) and the siege of Denbigh had only been over for a couple of weeks. FRO, D/G/3275 no. 88: Samuel Wood to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 13 Nov. 1646.

¹⁷⁵ The extent to which this date formed part of the fabric of the family's memory of that period is illustrated in his wife Anne's accounts, where one of the payments she made was noted as 'delivered me the day my husband went to london first to compound'. NLW, MS 299D fo 159: Rental book of Lleweni and Gwysaney, 1636-44.

final letter to his wife on 12 October 1652.¹⁷⁶ This no doubt meant more to Davies than a moving token of Royalist bravery in the face of an unjust punishment. The Davies family were connected, by marriage and via the Bridgewater, to the Stanleys. They may also have been either informal stewards or senior tenants of the Stanleys in Flintshire. Davies received reassurance that Derby had not parted with his interests in Flintshire in September 1652. In March 1653 the eighth earl of Derby asked Robert Davies to arrange a meeting of a group of gentlemen ‘nam’d in the Commission’ that he appended.¹⁷⁷ This was probably the meeting of Derby tenants that took place in March 1653, which Davies attended as one of Derby’s appointed commissioners alongside former Commissioners of Array George Hope, Evan Edwards and Edward Lloyd. This meeting was apparently to persuade the tenants to agree to new fines and leases under threat of their tenancies being passed to Sir John Trevor.¹⁷⁸ The loyalty of Robert Davies to the Stanleys even after the execution of the seventh earl, and the nature of the memento they kept of Derby, is further evidence of the family’s wider political stance.

Another demonstration of the Davies family’s oppositional stance is in their composition record. While Thomas Davies was able to compound under the articles of Denbigh for a relatively lenient £51 Robert Davies’ composition fine began at £600. The Committee of Compounding imposed a £645 fine at Goldsmith’s Hall but Ann Davies’ accounts also list £700 paid ‘unto sequestrators att several tymes’ – a huge financial burden. The same accounts list payments of the decimation tax from 1655 ‘to Capt Sontlye by orders from

¹⁷⁶ NLW, MS 1595E fo. 17: A copy of a letter from James, seventh earl of Derby, to his wife, 12 Oct. 1652.

¹⁷⁷ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 14: the earl of Derby to Robert Davies, Doddleston, 12 Mar. 1652.

¹⁷⁸ According to Sir John Trevor’s steward, this attempt at persuasion was unsuccessful, even when reinforced by the presence of some of the most influential gentlemen in the area. NLW, Gwysaney transcripts 38B: Christopher Pashley to Robert Davies, Shotton, 19 Sept. 1652; FRO, D/GW/2104: the earl of Derby to various, Mold, 16 Mar. 1653; FRO, D/G/3276 no. 79: John Peck to Sir John Trevor, n.p., 19 Mar. 1653.

Major General Berry', indicating that the Davieses were still seen as delinquents.¹⁷⁹ Between 1647 and 1651 Robert Davies paid over £1300, an astounding amount of money considering his apparent military contribution. There is no record of Davies taking the National Covenant and Negative Oath when his uncle did in 1647 and this could be one reason for his continued punishment as a delinquent.¹⁸⁰ In 1655 Davies was forced to mortgage part of the estate for £5,000.¹⁸¹ The periods he spent in prison can hardly have sweetened his attitude. As well as the year 1645-6, Davies was arrested before June 1658 and released within the year.¹⁸² His son Mutton, who by this point had returned from a long trip abroad to Paris, Liege and Rome, was also arrested in 1658. He was imprisoned in 1659 for his involvement in Booth's rebellion as a captain of horse under Roger Whitley.¹⁸³ They were by no means alone – Sir Roger Mostyn was confined in Conwy castle in the same period – but it was a mark of ultra or active royalists under suspicion of conspiring against the Protectorate. Roger Whitley's plot of 1658 did not mark Robert or Mutton Davies as 'active' Royalists but did include them on the list of possible plotters.¹⁸⁴

The extent to which Robert Davies was involved in subversive activities cannot be known, but he was certainly deeply involved in arranging festivities which were viewed with extreme suspicion by Interregnum authorities. Davies was one of the main organisers and most enthusiastic participants in the great North Welsh cockfights of the late 1640s and 1650s. Roger Mostyn, for example, begged John Wynn for the loan of cocks due to his need to 'win a match with my Cousin Robert Davies of Gwersaney for much monies' in

¹⁷⁹ NLW, MS 1603E: Transcripts of the accounts of Anne Davies, pp. 412, 437-8. Green (ed.), *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding*, III, 1717; J.T. Cliffe, 'The Cromwellian Decimation Tax of 1655: The Assessment Lists', in *Seventeenth-Century Political and Financial Papers* (Camden Soc., 5th ser., 7, 1996), p. 408.

¹⁸⁰ Green (ed.), *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding*, III, 1718.

¹⁸¹ Usher, *Gwysaney and Owston*, p. 62.

¹⁸² NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 4: Order from Oliver Cromwell to Colonel Croxon to free Robert Davies, 30 June 1658.

¹⁸³ Usher, *Gwysaney and Owston*, p. 68; *HOP 1660-1690*, II, 198.

¹⁸⁴ Bodl., MS Eng. hist. e. 309: Notebook of Roger Whitley, 1658.

1652.¹⁸⁵ Although it is impossible to confirm that these gatherings were intended for Royalist plotting, they did involve many of the leading royalist gentry from across North Wales. Although cockfighting was not banned until 1656 it was strongly disapproved of long before for its festive nature, tendency to involve drinking, and popularity amongst royalist ‘delinquents’. That many of the prominent royalist families of the region took part in the matches was of great cause for concern, compounding fears regarding the number and strength of ‘delinquents’ in North Wales. As discussed in chapter three, there was a lively royalist associational culture, of which Gwysaney was certainly part. The Manleys, Edwardses and Breretons all socialised at Gwysaney and took part in gambling and drinking.¹⁸⁶ The Davieses possessed royalist images, including a miniature of Charles II and one of Charles I. These were part of an attempt to create a royalist cultural environment, and could be used as either a public or private sign of allegiance to the royalist cause.¹⁸⁷ The Davieses shared the same ‘corporate identity’ as other influential North-East Welsh royalist families, including a fascination with the image of Charles I and his son.¹⁸⁸ Their house was a key location within royalist social networks, and loyal service to the Crown was commemorated in portraits, miniatures, and in the display of arms and armour. They commissioned portraits of family members and friends in military dress, including Sir Gerard Eyton and John Robinson of Gwersyllt.¹⁸⁹

North-East Welsh Royalist participation in acts of cultural royalism and plotting can partly be explained in terms of societal relations in the region. The pre-war social lives of the Davieses and other royalist families revolved around kinship and friendship networks in the immediate locality and the wider region. Due to the level of unified royalism in the

¹⁸⁵ NLW, Bodewryd MS 70: Roger Mostyn to John Wynn, Mostyn, 11 Feb. 1652.

¹⁸⁶ FRO, D/GW/1928: Accounts of an Edwards of Stansty, 1657-60.

¹⁸⁷ Miniatures at Gwysaney Hall.

¹⁸⁸ N. Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 5.

¹⁸⁹ Portraits at Gwysaney Hall.

Civil War, these networks in the Interregnum closely overlapped royalism with pre-war networks. Hence, the Davieses socialised with the Mostyns, Salusburys, Morgans, Pennants, Bridgewater and corresponded with the family of the earl of Derby. There was little need to create new networks of resistance when the old social networks corresponded so closely. It also means that it is difficult to distinguish resistance from relatively normal social behaviour, aside from the appearance of deliberately disobeying instructions from central and local government (of which they previously would have been a part).

As discussed in chapter three, Welsh royalism was closely associated with support for the Church of England. The Davieses were able to maintain their own access to Prayer Book or traditional worship throughout the Interregnum. Their private chapel, complete with highly decorated font and carved pews, was the focus of their worship. Until 1825 there was a section of the house known as ‘the Priest’s house’, which at least indicates that the Davieses routinely had a resident chaplain to serve their religious (and possibly educational) needs.¹⁹⁰ The family played host to Thomas Price, later Archbishop of Cashel, during which he debated the validity of the Irish Church with a Catholic neighbour, most likely Mr Conway of Sychton.¹⁹¹ Upon the Restoration, Price wrote to Davies from Dublin, thanking him for ‘multiplied and long continued favours upon my undeservednes’, sending his prayers to the family and especially Mrs. Davies and remarking that ‘I doe remember all my parishioners with true affection giving them a place in my dayly prayers’. Although Price’s entry in the *ODNB* indicates that he was chaplain to the duke of Ormonde in the 1650s he seems to have spent a considerable part of that time at Gwysaney.¹⁹² That Price

¹⁹⁰ Architectural plan at Gwysaney that shows the layout and the crack in the wall.

¹⁹¹ FRO, D/HE/475: Thomas Price to Mr Conway of Sychton, Gwysaney, 23 Apr. 1652; NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 39, Christopher Pashley to Robert Davies, Shotton, 19 Sept. 1652; Gwysaney Transcripts 41C: Mutton Davies to Robert Davies, Rouen, 10 Aug. 1654.

¹⁹² Little work has been done on Price. His entry in the *Dictionary of Irish Biography* records his place of birth as being in Wales, and place of education as Dublin, but also that ‘nothing is known of his family’. His role as chaplain to Ormond is listed, but not his presence in North-East Wales in the Interregnum, or his

referred to those at Gwysaney as his 'parishioners' strongly hints at his providing services for the house, and even local community, while sheltering at the house. Christopher Pashley sent greetings to Price in his letter of September 1652, as did Mutton Davies writing from Rouen in August 1654.¹⁹³ This suggests that, in common with other Royalist families such as the Mostyns, the Davieses attempted to maintain Anglican worship in their own home and contributed to the effort to aid the Church of England's ejected clergy.

The Davieses quiet but determined approach to resisting the Interregnum regimes was typical of many of the gentry families of North-East Wales. While not frequently being named in plots or rebellions, they were often suspected due to their continued intransigence and self-imposed political isolation. They were enthusiastic participants in royalist associational culture, clothed themselves and their associates as royalists in portraits, and sheltered ejected clergymen. The Davieses refused to accept that the political changes were permanent, and built for themselves a royalist world to survive the storm.

Restoration and Reaction – Gwysaney from 1660-68

The Restoration represented a return to normality for hopeful and loyal royalists. The Davieses, in common with many other royalist families, rebuilt their fortunes in the Restoration. They improved their lands, built a deer park and lavish gardens in the Continental style, and recommenced their involvement in the political life of the region. They mined for lead in their grounds and lent money to other gentlemen.¹⁹⁴ The Davieses also returned to political life and influence after the Restoration. They had a strong

subsequent connections with the region. From his interest in promoting the Irish language and his communications with Conway suggest that he is worthy of further research. NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 43: Thomas Price to Robert Davies, Dublin, 6 Mar. 1660; *DIB*; N.J.A. Williams, 'Thomas Price (1599-1685)', *ODNB*.

¹⁹³ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 39, Christopher Pashley to Robert Davies, Shotton, 19 Sept. 1652; NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 41C, Mutton Davies to Robert Davies, Rouen, 10 Aug. 1654.

¹⁹⁴ NLW, 1603D: Transcripts of the Accounts of Anne Davies, pp. 443-4.

influence on local elections, and appear to have been responsible for the election of Roger Whitley as MP for Flint Boroughs – a seat he was to hold from 1660 until the election of 1681.¹⁹⁵ The instruction from the earl of Derby that his tenants should support whichever candidate the Davies family preferred was no doubt useful. Derby's letter to his tenants and connections in Flintshire is an encomium to Davies and his loyalty:

I think I shall not much divert your owne Inclinations by moving you to appeare at the Election and bestow your votes as Robt Davis esq the late High Sheriffe of your County shall direct, and for such persons as he shall nominate. His Loyaltie to his prince, his affection to his Country and his freindlynesse to his neighbours are sufficiently known so that the worth and fitnessse of such persans as he shall propose to you can not be doubted of.¹⁹⁶

As if to support Derby's judgement, Robert Davies was nominated for the Order of the Royal Oak in 1660 alongside his kinsmen Sir Roger and Sir Thomas Mostyn.¹⁹⁷ As Philip Jenkins has argued, this was a tool for identifying the 'extreme Royalist faction' in Wales after the Restoration. According to Jenkins, these gentlemen were more likely to have sympathy for Catholicism and hostility to dissent.¹⁹⁸ The enrolment of Davies' son Robert into the prestigious Lifeguard regiment in January 1661, under the sponsorship of the formerly exiled Royalist Francis Manley, further demonstrates their status and loyalty.¹⁹⁹ Furthermore, Robert Davies was instrumental in the earl of Derby's fight to reclaim his lands. He arranged tenants' meetings and corresponded with the successive earls throughout the Interregnum and continued to do so subsequent to the Restoration. Derby kept Davies acquainted with the details of the trial to regain his Welsh lands from the Interregnum governors Jones, Ellis, and Twistleton, including his search through 'deeds, &

¹⁹⁵ *HOP 1660-1690*, III, 709-11; NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 44B: Roger Whitley to Robert Davies, London, 10 May 1661; Gwysaney Transcripts 44C: Roger Whitley to Robert Davies, London, 17 Dec. 1660.

¹⁹⁶ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 15: the earl of Derby to various, Chester, 9 Apr. 1661.

¹⁹⁷ P. Jenkins, 'Wales and the Order of the Royal Oak', p. 345.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

¹⁹⁹ Davies was listed as a cornet in Charles, Lord Brandon's regiment in 1666. NLW, 1603D: Transcripts of the Accounts of Anne Davies, p. 442; SP29/163 fo 166: List of officers in the 13 troops of the regiment of horse commanded by Chas. Lord Gerrard of Brandon, 20 July 1666.

antient Records'.²⁰⁰ Davies was involved, as sheriff, with the Commission for the Raising of Money for disbanding the Army in Flintshire in September 1660.²⁰¹ He regained his place on the bench (and as part of the quorum) in 1660 in a county known for its ardent persecution of dissenters.²⁰² Robert Davies' name was near the top of the list of Welsh gentry who petitioned the King for the disabling of those who 'concurred therein or procured or promoted petitions to bring on that most horrid Triall or other Addresses to owne the same' so that 'the lives of your Majesties most loyall subjects may noe more be come into the hands of bloudthirstie men'.²⁰³ In many ways, therefore, Robert Davies was the archetypal Welsh Royalist.

Conclusion

Lloyd Bowen summarised David Underdown's early work on royalism as describing a kind of 'national spirit', a 'passive conservatism' and 'obstinate, unthinking attachment to the old order'. Underdown envisaged a moderate middle ground of 'Country' ideology that opposed governments who ignored this parochial conservatism, explaining the opposition to the king in the First Civil War and the return of the monarchy at the Restoration in these terms.²⁰⁴ The case of Robert and Thomas Davies demonstrates that, although Welsh royalism was certainly conservative in origin, it was far from unthinking or even necessarily parochial. It had its roots in an ancient culture of territorial influence, respect for princes, and strong desire for an ordered and deeply connected society, but also derived from a highly contemporary understanding of the political situation in London. The permanence

²⁰⁰ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 16: the earl of Derby to Robert Davies, Mold, 23 Oct. 1663.

²⁰¹ NLW, Gwysaney Transcripts 12: Commission from Albemarle etc., 27 Sept. 1660.

²⁰² J.R.S. Phillips, *The Justices of the Peace in Wales and Monmouthshire, 1541 to 1689*, (Cardiff, 1975), p.114.

²⁰³ NLW, MS 9066E no 2272: The humble petition of diverse Lords Knights & gentlemen Inhabitants of the six Counties of Northwales, n.d.

²⁰⁴ L. Bowen, 'David Underdown, Royalist Conspirators and the Character of English Politics', *History Compass*, 11 (2013), p. 347.

of the choice, and the political and financial consequences that resulted from it, reflects the strength of opinion behind it.

If royalism is envisaged as a spectrum with 'ultra royalists' on one extreme and those who vacillated between reluctant support for the king and neutralism on the other, the Davieses must surely be placed fairly close to the ultra royalist extreme. They refused to take the parliamentary loyalty oaths, isolated themselves from political life, and chose to adopt an approach of cultural dissent. They were consistently under suspicion and sometimes under arrest for this irreconcilable attitude, and were closely connected with royalist exiles and agents. This is significant in terms of the character of North-East Welsh royalism as a whole. It was remarkable partly because of the strength and unity of this irreconcilable attitude, which must have been reinforced by its mutuality. The Davieses were not isolated or minority examples of ultra royalism as in other regions, but were indicative of the region's attitude as a whole. Few North-East Welsh royalists who fought for Charles I throughout the First Civil War made significant compromises with the regime in the Interregnum. This became a badge of identity, and a historical memory that moulded future generations' politics and actions.

Conclusion

In 1688 we leave the North-East Welsh gentlemen described in the introduction to this thesis on the brink of an era of further uncertainty. This reflects the instability of the period 1640 to 1688, which included two civil wars, an interregnum, a Restoration, several significant politico-religious crises, and a revolution. Yet only the years 1685 to 1688 provided a true challenge to the ideals and ideology of the North-East Welsh gentry. Prior to 1685 their path was clear: royalism, loyalism, and Anglicanism. Even during James II's attempts to implement religious toleration their opposition was wavering and reluctant, and ultimately did not end in a firm commitment to William's invasion. From 1689 the North-East Welsh gentry were placed in a difficult position. If they wished to maintain their positions at the head of local political life and society, they needed outwardly to conform and support the regime. The 1689 Act of Toleration allowed freedom of worship to most Protestant nonconformists so long as they swore the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy. This was anathema to those North-East Welsh gentry families who identified their struggles in the mid-seventeenth-century crises with those of the Established Church. One of the other pillars of North-East Welsh identity had also been shaken – the legitimacy of the Crown. It is telling that many of the names featured within this thesis are also to be found within the lists of the Jacobite clubs, or in association with Jacobite sympathies. Their belief in the importance of loyalty continued after 1688, but the North-East Welsh gentry were placed in the awkward position of being required to serve William, a monarch they believed was illegitimate. Their overall identity, however, stood firm in the face of such challenges, as it had throughout the previous forty-eight years of turbulence.

This thesis redefines and recovers seventeenth-century Welsh political and social culture. The thesis challenges a Welsh nonconformist historical orthodoxy which emphasised Puritanism and radical religious developments while denying conservative or Anglican historical realities. It therefore overcomes the problems created by that long-lasting historiographical trend: including a failure to explain Welsh royalism or loyalty to the Church of England. The thesis challenges the still lingering idea in Welsh historiography that the Welsh gentry were Anglicised and alienated from ‘the people’, and that the Church was similarly remote and unpopular. It relocates the Welsh gentry within Welsh native and conservative culture, and provokes new discussions of the role and behaviour of conservative communities in seventeenth-century Britain. This thesis has argued that there were distinctive patterns of continuity within North-East Welsh society. These, alongside many of the ideals of gentility attached to them, spanned the medieval and early modern periods. While their precise form adapted to changing circumstances, the fundamental basis for the operation of power, authority, and identity remained stable throughout. The territorial authority of the *uchelwyr* and the *pencenedl*, and the associated practical power of kinship, remained strong beyond the period of this study. Gentry ideals of a stable, ordered society, supported by a legitimate monarch and the Church, continued to be the foundation of these structures. The desire for a patriarchal and hierarchical society was common across Western Europe, but in North-East Wales this was rooted in fundamental power structures and ideas. The extent to which lineage and tradition supported the authority of the gentry meant that historical concepts and culture were of enhanced significance within North-East Wales. It meant that North-East Welsh gentry identity constantly related contemporary self-representation to the past. Considerations of the future – whether in marriages, naming, architecture, or monuments that would shape images of families for generations to come – were also intimately connected to the past. Pedigrees, manuscripts, and historical narratives were pressed into this service, and helped

to shape the image of the North-East Welsh gentlemen inside and outside his region for generations to come.

The North-East Welsh historicised identity and culture had important ramifications for the religious and political beliefs of the region's gentry. In terms of religion, it was significant in two principal ways. First, the Church was one pillar of the ideal ordered society. It was 'by law established', and in the Welsh historical imagination was rooted in the Welsh past. Welsh gentlemen fought for it in the Civil Wars, sheltered and protected it in the Interregnum, and sought to protect its exclusivity during the Restoration. Within North-East Wales its clergy were connected to the gentry by ties of kinship, friendship, or obligation. Outside the region clergymen from Wales remained in contract with their Welsh gentry patrons, and these connections led to individual gentry having an extraordinary inside knowledge of the workings of politics and religion sourced from bishops and other senior clergymen. The Welsh Church was enmeshed with contemporary actions and cultures of memory. Second, the Church was not only supported for pragmatic or political reasons. It was beloved by the North-East Welsh gentry in its own right. Ceremonial and visual cultures of worship had been prevalent in the region for hundreds of years, and continued to be sustained even during the Interregnum. Thus Caroline religious policies were not implemented for political reasons, or due to slavish and ignorant support for the Crown. They coincided with already existing tendencies within North-East Welsh parishes, supported by ordinary people and elites. People across the social strata made varying efforts to sustain the Church's liturgy, teachings, and clergymen in the 1650s. They worked to protect the Church from perceived nonconformist threats from 1660 onwards, by reporting conventicles and individual Protestant nonconformists to the authorities.

Dissent from the Established Church was not approached entirely consistently. Catholics were treated differently to Protestant or Puritan nonconformists. While the Catholic gentry were accepted into North-East Welsh society, subject to their family having been of the Roman faith for generations, Puritans were not integrated to the same extent. Catholicism was the *Hen Ffydd*, the Old Faith, and its gentry adherents were not seen as a political threat, even during times of crisis. While international Catholicism, Jesuits, and court Catholicism was seen as politically threatening, local Catholics seem not to have been regarded in the same light. Thus prosecutions of Catholics increased in the Interregnum, unlike regions of England, as gentry protectors were out of office and had reduced influence. Puritan nonconformity had none of the heritage or tradition which made Catholicism acceptable to the North-East gentry. After 1662, the majority of gentlemen who dissented from the Church were reported to the authorities, prosecuted, and repeatedly arrested at moments of crisis. Clearly this was prompted by a combination of political and religious motivations. The social status of many nonconformist preachers did not aid the dissenting cause in the North-East Wales. The memory of 1641, quickly absorbed into the North-East Welsh historicised narrative, was a potent justification for persecution. The threat against the Church and an ordered society could not be allowed to flourish again.

The political culture of the North-East Welsh gentry was, as has already been suggested, intimately interconnected with their ideals, historicised culture, and religious proclivities. Continuity was of utmost importance, and those entrusted with political authority were drawn from families with impeccable lineage. This meant that political crises led to a conservative and unpartisan response. There were few contested elections in the period 1640 to 1688, and parties barely developed in North-East Welsh political discourse. Clearly this did not mean that there was an entirely harmonious local political atmosphere – the

North-East Welsh gentry were infamous for regional political power-play and feuding – but in relation to national political issues harmony was by far the preferred public image.

A consistent language of loyalty to the Stuart dynasty is visible for nearly all of the period, a language which emphasised the Welsh support for the Crown and its actions. Even when James II's efforts to introduce religious toleration finally proved too much for the North-East Welsh gentry to bear, their language reflected a strong desire for James to mend his ways and make himself acceptable to his most loyal of subjects. This ideal, self-image, and language of loyalism had profound consequences for the North-East Welsh gentry in the period 1640 to 1688. Alongside support for the Church, it was one primary reason for the overwhelmingly royalist allegiance amongst the North-East gentry. That it formed part of the self-image of the North-East Welsh gentry is surely a significant reason for their continuing royalism in the 1650s, and their largely self-imposed isolation from most forms of political engagement with the new regimes. The next generation was brought up to think of themselves as royalist, with politically acceptable tutors and chaplains, and for the contemporary heads of families to break with tradition with a public acceptance of the Commonwealth or Protectorate would be too much of a fracture to consider, no matter how potentially useful its implications.

This led the North-East Welsh gentry to express their opposition in a variety of ways, all intended to demonstrate political disengagement and the illegitimacy of the regimes. From plots and rebellions to cockfights, gambling, and other manifestations of royalist associational culture, the Welsh royalists maintained their opposition in the face of the overwhelming appearance of long-term defeat. Welsh culture was highly visual, in the lay as well as the ecclesiastical sphere and employed a powerful visual rhetoric. It was used to express gentry ideals and allegiances, to sustain royalist associational culture and identify

fellow royalists in the Interregnum, and to remember the efforts of the 1650s from 1660 onwards. It preserved hope, memorialised actions, and aimed to crystallise future behaviour in a similar conservative way. Thus this thesis has argued that the North-East Welsh gentry had a unified and coherent social, religious, and political outlook. It was conservative in nature and operation and, sometimes in counterintuitively radical ways, provided a near binary opposite to the prevailing governmental culture.

Thematically there are fertile lands at both a macro and micro level. Taking a broad view, further work on the seventeenth-century Welsh Church would be of significant interest and worth. A study that cut across social strata and which considered the hierarchy and parochial clergy, operation of the Church at a local level, and liturgical and visual preferences would be of immense value to Church history. It would also be informative in terms of wider regional political and religious culture. It would certainly not be easy – the institutional sources relating to the Church in Wales do not survive in the same quantity or quality as those for English dioceses or regions. Such a work would require the use of a wide range of ecclesiastical, parochial, and gentry sources in order to provide as full a picture as possible. Broad studies of the development of Welsh history-writing and news culture would benefit both English and Welsh historiographies. Both topics have tended in the past to be discussed at a micro level, or in the context of other developments. They have much to contribute in terms of obtaining a more holistic sense of Welsh identity and the relationship of Wales to the ‘margins’ where it has so frequently been placed. Unlike the Welsh Church, there is an immense amount of underused and rich archival material clearly available to the historian, alongside private libraries which hold treasures yet to be discovered. Collaborative interdisciplinary work examining the literary, political, and religious culture of early modern Wales would provide a fresh perspective even on relatively well-trodden paths within Welsh historiography.

There is an extremely strong case for studying Welsh culture when placed in other geographical and political contexts. There has never been any detailed work on the Welsh in Ireland from the Irish Rebellion of 1641 to the Glorious Revolution. This despite the fact that there had been continuous economic relationships between Wales and Ireland for centuries, and gentry families inter-married and remained connected long after their initial reasons for contact had faded. From Welsh archival collections it appears that many Welsh gentry settlers, merchants, and clergymen were either temporarily or permanently resident in Ireland. They interacted with their kin and friends back in Wales, and it would be valuable in a 'four nations' context to understand how the traditional conservative Welsh culture operated and survived when in Ireland. Similarly, Welshmen travelled to the colonies in North America, as merchants, in expeditionary forces, and as settlers. While there have been studies of their eighteenth- and nineteenth-century equivalents, only A.H. Dodd has explored the actions of the Welsh in the broader Atlantic archipelago.¹ A thematic study exploring Welsh interaction with the Americas throughout the early modern period would be of immense value. Since Dodd's pioneering work new sources are accessible, and new types of source considered as part of historical research.

There is an almost infinite potential for micro-studies focussed on North-East Wales. A detailed study of Jacobite Wales is long overdue. No monograph has been produced on the topic, and only a handful of articles, sporadically published over the last sixty years.² At a

¹ A.H. Dodd, *The Character of Early Welsh Migration to the United States* (Cardiff, 1957). Examples of works on later periods include: R.C. Allen, 'The Origins and Development of Welsh Associational Life in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia', *THSC*, 15 (2009), pp. 105-26; L. Johnson, 'The Welsh in the Carolinas in the Eighteenth Century', *North American Journal of Welsh Studies*, 4 (2004), pp. 12-19; B. Jones, 'Writing Back: Welsh Emigrants and their Correspondence in the Nineteenth Century', *North American Journal of Welsh Studies*, 5 (2005), pp. 23-46; A. Jones and B. Jones, *Welsh Reflections: Y Drych and America, 1851-2001* (Llandysul, 2001).

² J.P. Jenkins, 'Jacobites and Freemasons in Eighteenth-Century Wales', *WHR*, 9 (1979), pp. 391-406; S. Jones, 'Jacobite imagery in Wales: Evidence of Political Activity?', *Royal Stuart Papers*, 53 (1998); D. Nicholas, 'The Welsh Jacobites', *THSC*, (1948), pp. 467-74; *Idem.*, 'A Welsh Discovery', *The Stewarts*, 8 (1950), pp. 305-313; R.H. Owen, 'Jacobitism and the Church in Wales', *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, III

time when historians are becoming increasingly interested in Jacobite support across Britain, this would be a timely study. Flintshire and Denbighshire were both known to be areas of strong cultural support for Jacobitism, but the extent and nature of such devotion is unknown. A micro-study that concentrated on North-East Welsh Jacobite circles, their culture, and activities would contribute significantly to the wider literature on Jacobitism within the 'four nations'. The Wynnstay, Baron Hill, and Brogyntyn papers would be an excellent starting point, but there is material evidence and correspondence sources in other collections less known for their relevance to Jacobitism. Another potential case study revolves around the political and religious allegiance of the Myddelton family of Chirk. An ancient Welsh gentry family whose fortunes changed rapidly in the sixteenth century, their changing beliefs and attitudes were expressed in correspondence, notebooks, accounts, catalogues, their houses, and their sponsoring of the activities of others. Case studies of the Catholic Tresham and Throckmorton families in England have disclosed fascinating insights into the wider political and religious culture beyond the kindred or region where they were based.³ A Myddelton case study would certainly do the same, revealing the regional impact of, for example, London merchant culture, parliamentarianism, and the rise of parties in late-seventeenth-century England and Wales.⁴

As with any major research project, there have been many potential tangents and paths not taken during the writing of this thesis. Two significant examples are the experience of the Catholic population during the seventeenth century, and the political survival strategies of Sir Thomas Hanmer. As the thesis has argued, the Protestant or conformist gentry were

(1953), pp. 111-19; J.A. Price, 'Side Lights on Welsh Jacobitism', *Y Cymmrodor*, xiv (1901), pp. 136-53; P.D.G. Thomas, 'Jacobitism in Wales', *WHR*, 1 (1963), pp. 279-300.

³ K. McKeogh, 'Early Modern Catholic Culture and Identity in the Circle of Sir Thomas Tresham, 1580-1611' (Univ. of Oxford DPhil thesis, forthcoming); P. Marshall and G. Scott (eds.), *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation* (Farnham, 2009).

⁴ An article will be forthcoming on Sir Thomas Myddelton II in this context, but a piece with a broader focus would yield interesting fruit.

flexible concerning the local existence and practice of Catholicism. North-East Welsh Catholic gentry families appear to have maintained their gentle status and authority among their kindred, were occasionally proposed for local office, and participated fully in regional society. While St. Winifred's Well sporadically attracted the attention of central government and the Church hierarchy, North-East Welsh Catholic gentry families continued to act as a nexus for visits to the Well and the local area. They married into both Catholic and Protestant families, and continued to be respected for their ancient faith and lineage. This thesis focused on the Protestant or conformist majority, but an examination of the lived experience, theological perspective, and religious culture of the North-East Welsh Catholic gentry would be highly worthwhile. As with the Welsh Jacobites, Flintshire and Denbighshire were home to comparatively concentrated numbers of Catholics and evidence related to their activities remains in family archives across the religious spectrum. Second, the remarkable political strategies of Sir Thomas Hanmer have proven a constant distraction. His religious affiliation is discussed in the second case study of this thesis, but Hanmer's political machinations are as interesting and mysterious. David Scott's revised draft of Hanmer's History of Parliament biography explores the issue of his apparent attempts to return from exile by betraying royalist negotiations with the Scots.⁵ Hanmer's actions in this period would bear further examination, particularly in terms of the involvement of key North Welsh figures and allies such as Sir John Trevor. Yet perhaps more intriguing were Hanmer's (apparently successful) endeavours in gaining favour or protection by using his gardening abilities to Interregnum and Restoration political figures.⁶

⁵ History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Sir Thomas Hanmer for 1640-60 section, revised by David Scott. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.

⁶ An article on this subject will be forthcoming.

This thesis is intended to prompt further work on Welsh society, religion, and political culture. The richly continuous, complex, and conservative world of the North-East Welsh gentry is fascinating in its own right and as a counterpoint to the more divided world of their peers in the rest of Wales and in England. In his study or his hall, the North-East Welsh gentleman remained Welsh, royalist, and Anglican to the end of his days.

Bibliography

Manuscript and archival sources

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales

Add MS 263B: Poetry of Foulk Wynn of Nantglyn.

Add MS 467E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1626-1649.

Add MS 468E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1649-1660.

Add MS 469E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1660-1683.

Bodewryd MSS, Bodewryd Letters.

Brogyntyn MSS, Clennau Papers and Letters.

Bettisfield MSS.

Chirk MSS.

Great Sessions 14/70: Flintshire Crown Book, 1637-60.

Gwysaney 54: Catalogue of the books and manuscripts in Llanerch library, 1778.

Gwysaney Transcripts.

Lleweni MSS.

MS 299D: Rental book of Lleweni and Gwysaney, 1636-44.

MS 3072E/129: Mostyn historical documents and letters, vol. II.

MS 1551E: Letters and papers, 1591-1767, collected by John Lloyd of Caerwys.

MS 1593E/iii: Caerwys Churchwardens' Accounts, 1662-9.

MS 1595E: Miscellany, 15-19th centuries.

MS 1603D: Transcripts by Angharad Llwyd and original documents, 17-19th centuries.

MS 1603E: Transcripts of the Accounts of Anne Davies.

MS 5390D: Poetry, masques, short plays, memoranda etc. of the Salusbury family of Lleweni.

MS 6272C: Autograph letters and one copy letter.

MS 9062E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, c.1623-32.

MS 9063E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1641-9.

MS 9064E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1649-55.

MS 9065E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1655-60.

MS 9066E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1660-63.

MS 9067E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1663-8.

MS 9068E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1668-64.

MS 9069E: Wynn of Gwydir papers, 1674-c.1684.
MS 11440D: Letter book of Colonel John Jones, 1651-60.
MS 11449E: Correspondence and papers of John Jones Jnr., and others.
MS 12205A: Welsh and English Sermons by John Piers, 1641-1707.
MS 12403E: Letters to Maurice Wynne, 1650-1680.
MS 12463B: Notebook of Archibald Sparke, 1652-9.
MS 17057E: Transcripts of warrants following forfeitures of popish recusants' estates.
MS 17119A: Commonplace book, seventeenth century.
MS 17126D: Catalogue of the Books in Llanerch Library, 1778.
MS 17156D: Letters and papers relating to the Davies family of Gwysaney, 1624-c.1703.
Peniarth MSS.
SA/CR: Chapter records of the diocese of St Asaph.
SA/MISC: Miscellaneous records of the diocese of St Asaph.
Sweeney Hall MSS A3-7: Edward Lloyd's letters and memoranda, 1662-1681.
Wynnstay MSS.

Bangor, University Archives

Baron Hill MSS.
Mostyn Add MS 9067.
Mostyn 183: Will of Sir Thomas Mostyn.
Penrhos MSS.

Chester, Chester Record Office

DSS: Papers of the Shakerley family of Hulme and Somerford.
ZBasten: Papers of the Henry family of Chester.
ZCR 63: J.P. Earwaker Collection and Manuscripts.

Hawarden, Flintshire Record Office

D/DM/271: David Pennant letterbook.
D/G/3275: Trevor letters, 1633-1648.
D/G/3276: Trevor letters, 1649-1655.
D/GW: Gwysaney papers.
D/HE: Rhual MSS.

D/KK/115: Mold Churchwardens' Accounts, 1654-1663.

P/14/1/21: Cilcain Churchwardens' Accounts, 1657-1706.

D/M: Mostyn MSS.

London, The British Library

Add MS 1890 Vol 1 fo 20v: List of Commissions for raising horse and dragoons since 10 Oct. 1642.

Add MS 4274: Thoresby papers vol. 1: Letters, etc., of Archbishops and Bishops, c.1551-1721.

Add MS 9049: Bishops' Lands sales, 1647-51.

Add MS 14886: Welsh poetry and prophecies.

Add MS 14891: Welsh *Englynion* and Poems.

Add MS 14897: Welsh poetry and prophecies.

Add MS 18981: A shorte viewe of the danger of Anglesey & Carnarvons surprisall by the Enemy, c.1644.

Add MS 19870 fo. 134: A Register of Assessments for troops, accounts of aids, and subsidies, proclamations, commissions, letters and orders of the Privy Council, and of the Lord President of Wales, with correspondence of the sheriff and justices of the county of Flint, 1586-1637.

Add MS 33373: Y Cwta Cyfarwydd: A Chronicle or Memorandum-book of Peter Roberts, c. 1607-47.

Add MS 33374: The papers of John Jones of Gellilyfdy.

Add MS 38175: Correspondence and papers of Sir Kenelm Digby, 1633-1744.

Add MS 42849: Papers, mainly of Philip Henry, 1661-1805.

Add MS 46399A fo. 78: A Protestation and Oath to be taken by the Inhabitants of the Sixe Counties of Northwales.

Add MS 61685: A BOOKE Shewing the true and auncient Genealogie of Sir Roger Moston of Moston, 1623.

Add MS 78928 fo. 184v: John Evelyn to Sir Thomas Hanmer, Paris, 7 Feb. 1651.

Cotton MS Vitellius C I: Account of Protestants visiting Holywell, 1579.

Egerton MS 2182: Original letters to John Douglas, D.D., 1650-1813.

Harley MS 164: The Diary of Sir Simonds D'Ewes.

Harley MS 1026: Memorandum Book of Justinian Paget.

Harley MS 1980: Collection of Handwritten Welsh Tracts.

Harley MS 2125: Collections of Randle Holme.
Harley MS 2129: Funeral Certificates and Orders of Randle Holme.
Harley MS 6804 fo. 142: List of Commissioners in Flintshire.
Lansdowne MS 111/4: The state of North Wales touchinge Religion.
Lansdowne MS 216: A historical account of government in Wales.

London, Lambeth Palace Library

Comm VII/1-2: Records of the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales.
Comm XIIa/1: Copy return for sale of Dean and Chapter lands, 1648-50.
MS 1027: Sequestered livings in Wales, 1662.
MS 943: Papers of William Laud.

London, The National Archives

C 231/5 fo. 534: Crown Docquet Books, 1629-43.
E 113/3: Answers to Exchequer Bills, 1664.
PC 2/34 fo. 45: letter to the bishop of Hereford, 9 Aug. 1626.
PROB 11/145/358: Will of Sir John Hanmer, 8 Mar. 1625.
SP 12/37/37 fo. 3: Survey of Recusants' and Delinquents' Estates, 1654-8.
SP 12/175 fo. 153: The names of the Confederates against Her Majesty who have diverse and sundry times conspired her life and do daily confederate against her, 1584.
SP 12/189 fo. 34: Secret advertisements to Walsingham, 12 May 1586.
SP 15/34 fo.96: Intelligences of the Residence of John Garrat, Oct. 1601.
SP 16/39 fo. 90: Minute for entry on the Council Register of Council pass for Sir Thomas Hanmer and his brother John Hanmer to travel for three years, with proviso not to go to Rome, 30 Sept. 1638.
SP 23/27: Correspondence of the Committee for Compounding, 1654-5.
SP 28/346: Accounts of Sir Thomas Middleton.
SP 29/41 fo. 3: Thomas Baker to Henry Bishop, Wrexham, 2 Sept. 1661.
SP 29/42 fo.136 List by Rich. Earl of Carbery, Lord Lieutenant of North Wales, of the Deputy Lieutenants in the several counties.
SP 29/44 fo. 94: James Hicke to Secretary Nicholas enclosing a letter from Thomas Baker, Wrexham, 11 Nov. 1661.
SP 29/59 fo. 38: Thomas Baker to Secretary Nicholas, Wrexham, 7 Sept. 1662.

SP 29/159 fo. 50: A list of Several Colonels who had commissions for raising and commanding of regiments of horse, foots, and dragooners, 20 Jun. 1666.

SP29/163 fo 166: List of officers in the 13 troops of the regiment of horse commanded by Chas. Lord Gerrard of Brandon, 20 July 1666.

SP 29/171 fo. 96: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Secretary Williamson, Chester, 12 Sept. 1666.

SP 29/262 fo. 175: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Secretary Williamson, Chester, 10 July 1669.

SP 29/276 fo. 155: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Williamson, Chester, 13 June 1670.

SP 29/277 fo. 11: Sir Geoffrey Shakerley to Williamson, Chester, 2 July 1670.

SP 29/44 fo. 94: James Hickes to Secretary Nicholas, Wrexham, 13 Nov. 1661.

SP 29/41 fo. 3: Thomas Baker to Henry Bishop, Wrexham, 2 Sept. 1661.

SP 29/420 fo. 88: Account of Monmouth's reception in Chester, 11 Sept. 1682.

SP 29/420 fo. 106: Sir George Jeffreys to Secretary Jenkins, Wrexham, 16 Sept. 1682.

SP 29/420 fo 110: Peter Shakerley's list of those waiting on Monmouth, 16 Sept. 1682.

SP 29/420 fo. 153: Peter Shakerley to Secretary Jenkins, Chester, 23 Sept. 1682.

London, Parliamentary Archives

HL/PO/JO/10/1/83, unfol.: Protestation return of Holt, Feb. 1642.

Mostyn, Mostyn Hall

Cywyddau ac Awdlau i Hen Deulu Mostyn.

'Cywydd Marwnad Sir Roger Mostyn Marchog'.

Handwritten book of regional pedigrees, c.1685.

Mostyn Library Inventory, 2 July 1739.

MS 9088: Mostyn Newsletters, 1673-6.

MS 9089: Mostyn Newsletters, 1676-80.

MS 9090: Mostyn Newsletters, 1680-2.

MS 9091: Mostyn Newsletters, 1682-3.

Mostyn Correspondence vol. I, 1672-6.

Mostyn Correspondence vol. II, 1677-80.

Mostyn Correspondence vol. III, 1681-4.

Mostyn Correspondence vol. IV, 1685-6.

Mostyn Correspondence vol. V, 1687-8.

Oxford, Bodleian Library

- MS Ashmole 1814: Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd.
MS Ashmole 1825: Letterbook of Edward Lloyd.
MS Eng. letters e.29: Correspondence of the Henry family, 1652-1713.
MS Eng. hist. e. 309: Notebook of Roger Whitley, 1658.
MS Rawlinson A 139A: Beaufort's return to the 'Three Questions survey, 1686.
MS Tanner 26: English historical papers, 1691.
MS Tanner 35: English historical papers, 1682.
MS Tanner 36: English historical papers, 1681.
MS Tanner 57: English historical papers, 1648.
MS Tanner 146: Welsh dioceses.

Ruthin, Denbighshire Record Office

- D/GA: Galltfaenan MSS.
DD/WY: Wynnstay MSS.
PD/11/1/12, Bryneglwys Churchwardens' Accounts 1660-80.
PD/18/1/1: Cerrigydrudion Parish Registers 1590-1735.
PD/25/2/1 Derwen Churchwardens' Accounts, 1660-1814.

San Marino, Huntington Library

Ellesmere Papers.

Warwick, Warwickshire Record Office

CR2017/TP: Pennant papers

Printed primary sources

'Sir Thomas Hanmer, Grandfather of the Speaker, his Account of France in 1648' in Sir Henry Bunbury (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart., Speaker of the House of Commons* (London, 1838), pp. 245-319.

William, 2nd Baron Bagot (ed.), *Memorials of the Bagot family* (Bliethfield, 1824).

Bedingfield, E., *The Life of Mary Mostyn, mother Margaret of Jesus* (1878).

Carte, T., (ed.), *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, Concerning the Affairs of England, from the year 1641 to 1660: Found among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers* (2 vols, 1739).

- Cummings, B. (ed.), *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford, 2011).
- Dore, R.N., (ed.), *The Letter Books of Sir William Brereton* (2 vols, Stroud, 1990).
- Fincham, K. (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (2 vols, Woodbridge, 1998).
- Firth, C.H., and Rait, R.S. (eds.), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (3 vols, 1911).
- Foley, H. (ed.), *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (7 vols, 1875-83).
- Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1889).
- Green, M., (ed.), *Calendar of the proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, &c. 1643-1660* (5 vols, 1889-1892).
- Grey, A. (ed.), *Debates of the House of Commons* (10 vols, 1763).
- Griffith, G., *A Bold Challenge of an Itinerant Preacher* (1652).
- Griffith, G., *A Relation of a Disputation between Dr. Griffith and Mr. V. Powell* (1653).
- Griffith, G., *A Welsh Narrative Corrected and Taught to Speak True English and some Latine* (1653).
- Hanmer, Sir J., *A Memorial of the Parish and Family of Hanmer in Flintshire* (1877).
- 'How Culhwch won Olwen', in S. Davies (trans.), *The Mabinogion* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 179-203.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (1879).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Eleventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (1887).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, G.C.B, Preserved at Belvoir Castle* 4 vols (1888-1905).
- To the honourable court the House of Commons now assembled in Parliament, the humble petition of many hundred thousands, inhabiting within the thirteen shires of Wales, Directed to the House the 12 of February, 1641* (1642).
- Howells, B.E., (ed.), *A Calendar of Letters Relating to North Wales, 1533-c.1700* (Cardiff, 1967).
- The humble petition of the Gentry, Clergy, and other Inhabitants, subscribed of the Counties of Flint, Denbigh, Mountgomery, Carnarvan, Anglesey, Merioneth, being the six Shires of Northwales, as was presented this present March the 15th 1641* (1642).
- The humble petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Free-holders, of the County of Flint, presented to his Majesty at York, the fourth of August, 1642* (1642).

- The Humble Petition of Many Hundred Thousands, inhabiting within the Thirteene Shires of Wales* (1642).
- Hyde, E., *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (8 vols, 1826).
- Lee, M. H. (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A. of Broad Oak, Flintshire, A.D. 1631-1696* (London, 1882).
- Lhuyd, H., *The Breviary of Britayne*, trans. T. Twyne (1573).
- Lloyd, D., *Memoires of the lives, actions, sufferings & deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent personages, that suffered by death, sequestration, decimation, or otherwise, for the Protestant religion, and the great principle thereof, allegiance to their sovereigne, in our late intestine wars, from the year 1637, to the year 1660. and from thence continued to 1666* (1677).
- Lloyd, W., *An historical account of church government as it was in Great-Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion* (1684).
- London Gazette*, 1-4 May 1682.
- London Gazette*, 4-8 May 1682.
- London Gazette*, 25-29 Oct. 1683.
- Mercurius Publicus*, 27 (28 June-5 July 1660).
- Myddelton, Sir Thomas, *A declaration published by Sir Thomas Middleton... setting forth the illegality and incongruity of a pernicious oath and protestation* (1644).
- Myddelton, W.M. (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts, A.D. 1605-1666* (St. Albans, 1908).
- Myddelton, W.M. (ed.), *Chirk Castle Accounts (continued) A.D. 1666-1753* (Horncastle, 1931).
- Newcombe, R., *A Memoir of Gabriel Goodman... also of Godfrey Goodman, D. D. Bishop of Gloucester* (Ruthin, 1825).
- Pennant, T., *The History of the Parishes of Whiteford and Holywell* (1796).
- Perfect Occurrences of Parliament and the Chief Collections of Letters from the Armie* (London, 4th-11th Apr. 1645).
- Powel, D., *Historie of Cambria, now called Wales* (1584).
- Prise, Sir J., *Historiae Bryannicae Defensio* (1573).
- Roberts, B., 'Llythyr John Lloyd at Edward Lhuyd', *NLWJ*, 17 (1971), pp. 183-206.
- Roberts, R.A., Salisbury, E., Giuseppi, M.S., Owen, G.D. (eds), HMC, *Salisbury*, 10 (24 vols, 1883-1976).
- Scarisbrike, E., *The Holy Life of Lady Warner, Sister Clare of Jesus...* (Dublin, 1769).
- Smith, W.J. (ed.), *Calendar of Salisbury Correspondence, 1553-c.1700* (Cardiff, 1954).
- Sharratt, M. (ed.), *Lisbon College Register 1628-1813* (1991).
- Thomas, D.R. (ed.), *Y Cwitta Cyfarnydd* (1883).

Vox Angliae: or, The Voice of the Kingdom (1682).
The Welshman's Last Petition and Protestation (1642).
 Whitelocke, B., *Memorials of the English affairs...* (1682).
 Whiteman, A. (ed.) with the assistance of M. Clapinson, *The Compton Census of 1676: A Critical Edition* (Oxford, 1986).
 Wynne, Sir J., *The History of the Gwedir Family* (1770).
 Wynne, W., *History of Wales* (1692).

Printed secondary works

Aaron, J., 'Haunted by History: Welsh Gothic 1780-1800', in S. Mottram and S. Prescott (eds), *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 183-200.
 Adolph, A.R.J.S., 'Randle Holme (1570/71-1655)', *ODNB*.
 Allen, E., 'Benjamin Lany (1591-1675)', *ODNB*.
 Allen, R., *Quaker Communities in Early Modern Wales* (Cardiff, 2007).
 Arblaster, P., 'Posts, Newsletters, Newspapers: England in a European System of Communications', *Media History*, 11 (2005), pp. 21-36.
 Baker, G., *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman* (Manchester, 2010).
 Barbarics-Hermanik, Z., 'The Coexistence of Manuscript and Print: Handwritten Newsletters in the Second Century of Print: 1540-1640', in G. Kemp and M. Walsby (eds), *The Book Triumphant: Print in Transition in the Sixteen and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 2011).
 Barnett, S.J., 'Where Was Your Church Before Luther? Claims for the Antiquity of Protestantism Examined', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 68:1 (1999), pp. 14-41.
 Bartrum, P.C., 'Notes on the Welsh Genealogical Manuscripts', *THSC*, 1968, pp. 63-98.
 Beaver, D.C., *Parish Communities and Religious Conflict in the Vale of Gloucester 1590-1690* (Cambridge, 1998).
 Beverley Smith, J., 'Historical Writing in Medieval Wales: The Composition of *Brenhinedd y Saesson*', *Studia Celtica*, 42 (2008), pp. 55-86.
 Blackwood, B.G., *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Manchester, 1978).
 Bosher, R.S., *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662* (1951).
 Bossy, J., *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850* (1975).

- Boswell, C., 'Popular Grievances and Royalist Propaganda in Interregnum England', *Seventeenth Century*, 27 (2012), pp. 313-34.
- Bowen, G., *Welsh Recusant Writings* (Cardiff, 1999).
- Bowen, L., 'The Battle of Britain: History and Reformation in Early Modern Wales', in T. Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds.), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 135-50.
- Bowen, L., 'David Underdown, Royalist Conspirators and the Character of English Politics', *History Compass*, 11 (2013), pp. 341-51.
- Bowen, L., 'Fashioning communities: the county community in early modern Wales', in J. Eales and A. Hopper (eds), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hatfield, 2012), pp. 77-99.
- Bowen, L., 'Information, language, and political culture in early modern Wales', *P&P*, 228 (2015), pp. 125-58.
- Bowen, L., 'The Seeds and Fruits of Revolution: The Erbery Family and Religious Radicalism in Seventeenth-Century Glamorgan', *WHR*, 25 (2011), pp. 346-73.
- Bowen, L., "'This Murmuring and Unthankful Peevish Land": Wales and the Protectorate', in P. Little (ed.), *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 144-64.
- Bowen, L., *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c.1603-1642* (Cardiff, 2007).
- Bowen, L., 'Rediscovering Difference? Nations, Peoples, and Politics in the British Civil Wars', *History Compass*, 4/5 (2006), pp. 836-51.
- Bowen, L., 'Representations of Wales and the Welsh during the Civil Wars and Interregnum', *HR*, 77 (2004), pp. 358-76.
- Bowen, L., 'Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639-1640 and 1642', *HJ*, 56 (2013), pp. 297-319.
- Bowen, L., 'Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 44-66.
- Braddick, M., *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008).
- Braddick, M.J. and Walter, J., 'Introduction. Grids of power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society' in *idem* (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 1-42.
- Brigden, S., *London and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1989).
- Broadway, J., *"No historie so meete": Gentry culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Manchester, 2006).
- Brogan, S., *The Royal Touch in Early Modern England: Politics, Medicine and Sin* (2015).

- Brooks, P.N., *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Basingstoke, 2nd edn., 1992).
- Burke, Sir J.B., *A Genealogical History of the House of Gnyssaney* (1847).
- Button, A.E., 'Royalist Women Petitioners in South-West England, 1655-62', *Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000), pp. 53-66.
- Capp, B., *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2012).
- Carr, A.D., 'The Making of the Mostyns', *THSC* (1979), pp. 137-57.
- Chadwick, M., and Evans, S., 'The Library of Thomas Mostyn of Gloddaith, c.1676-1692' in A. Bautz, (ed.), *Collecting Texts and Manuscripts, 1660-1860* (forthcoming).
- Chapman, M.L., 'The Records of the Great Sessions for Wales', in J. & S. Rowlands, *Welsh Family History: A Guide to Research* (Birmingham, 1998), pp. 191-210.
- Charles, R.A., 'Teulu Mostyn fel Noddwyr y Beirdd', *NLWJ*, 7 (1951-2), pp. 74-110.
- Charles-Edwards, T.M., *Wales and the Britons, 350-1064* (Oxford, 2014).
- Charlton, C.V. (ed.), *A Calendar of Inner Temple Records* (9 vols, 1896).
- Cliffe, J.T., 'The Cromwellian Decimation Tax of 1655: The Assessment Lists', in *Seventeenth-Century Political and Financial Papers* (Camden Soc., 5th ser., 7), pp. 403-92.
- Coleby, A., *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Constantine, M., and Johnston, D., 'Introduction: Writing the Revolution in Wales', in *idem* (eds), *'Footsteps of Liberty and Revolt: Essays on Wales and the French Revolution* (Cardiff, 2013), pp. 1-10.
- Cooper, T., 'David Lloyd (1635–1692)', rev. A. Lacey, *ODNB*.
- Crampin, M., *Stained Glass from Welsh Churches* (Talybont, 2014).
- Cressy, D., 'Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', *HLQ*, 68 (2005), pp.257-68.
- Croft, W., *Historical Account of Lisbon College* (1902).
- Cust, R., 'Catholicism, Antiquarianism, and Gentry Honour: The Writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midland History*, 23 (1998), pp. 40-70.
- Daly, J. W., 'The Origins and Shaping of English Royalist Thought', *Historical Papers/Communications historiques*, 9 (1974), pp. 15-35.
- Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism* (Oxford, 1992).
- Davies, L.M., 'The Tregaer Manuscript', *NLWJ*, 31 (2000), pp. 243-70.

- Davies, R.R., 'Kinsmen, neighbours and communities in Wales and the western British Isles, c.1100-c.1400' in P. Stafford, J.L. Nelson and J. Martindale (eds), *Law, laity and solidarities: Essays in honour of Susan Reynolds* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 172-87.
- Davies, E.D., 'The Revolution of 1688 and its aftermath in Merioneth', *Journal of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society*, 14 (2003), pp. 118-25.
- Davies, E.T., 'The "Popish Plot" in Monmouthshire', *Publications of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, 25 (1976), pp. 32-45.
- Davies, W.L., "'Y Gwir er Gwaethed yw... 1684". A Welsh Story of the Popish Plot', *Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1935), pp. 243-52.
- Daybell, J., *Women Letter-writers in Tudor England* (Oxford, 2006).
- Dodd, A.H., 'The Civil War in East Denbighshire', *DHST*, 3 (1954), pp. 41-89.
- Dodd, A.H. 'Flintshire Politics in the Seventeenth Century', *FHSP*, 14 (1954 for 1953-4), pp. 22-46.
- Dodd, A.H., *Studies in Stuart Wales* (Cardiff, 1957).
- Dodd, A.H., "'Tuning" the Welsh Bench', *NLWJ*, 6 (1950), pp. 249-59.
- Douglas, B., *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology* (2 vols, Leiden, 2011).
- Douglas, D.C., *English Scholars* (1939).
- Edwards, E., *English-Language Poetry from Wales, 1789-1806* (Cardiff, 2013).
- Emanuel, H., 'The Gwysaney Manuscripts', *NLWJ*, 7 (1951-2), pp. 326-43.
- Evans, J.R., 'The Popish Plot', *NLWJ*, 6 (1949), pp. 43-50.
- Evans, N., and Pryce, H., 'Writing a Small Nation's Past: States, Race and Historical Culture' in *idem.* (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past: Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850-1950* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 3-30.
- Everitt, A., *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Leicester, 1966).
- Fincham, K., and Tyacke, N., *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007).
- Fletcher, A., *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (1975).
- Ford, A., 'Martyrdom, History and Memory in Early Modern Ireland', in I. McBride (ed.), *History and Memory in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 43-66.
- Gauci, P., *Politics and Society in Great Yarmouth* (Oxford, 1996).
- Gerritsen, A., and Riello, G. (eds), *Writing Material Culture History* (2015).
- Glickman, G., 'The Church and the Catholic Community 1660-1715' in G. Tapsell (ed.), *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012), pp. 212-242.

- Glickman, G., *The English Catholic Community 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009).
- Goldie, M., 'Politics and Religion in the Era of the *Entring Book*' in *idem.*, (ed.), *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice. I. Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 1-32.
- Goldie, M., 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England', in O. P. Grell, J. I. Israel, and N. Tyacke (eds), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 331-68.
- Gordon, A., *Writing Early Modern London: Memory, Text and Community* (Basingstoke, 2013).
- Greir Evans, F.M., *The Principal Secretary of State: A Survey of the Office from 1558 to 1680* (Manchester, 1923).
- De Groot, J., *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004).
- Gerritsen, A. and Riello, G. (eds), *Writing Material Culture History* (2015).
- Gibney, J., 'The Memory of 1641 and Protestant Identity in Restoration and Jacobite Ireland', in M.A. Busted, F. Neal and J. Tonge (eds), *Irish Protestant Identities* (Manchester, 2008), pp. 13-27.
- Gosden, C., and Marshall, Y., 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology*, 31 (1999), pp. 169-78.
- Gray, M., "'The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time': The Reformation Church in Wales' in T.Ó hAnnracháin and R. Armstrong (eds), *Christianities in the Early Modern Celtic World* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 42-54.
- Gray, M., 'The Diocese of Bangor in the late sixteenth century', *JWEH*, 5 (1988), pp. 31-72.
- Gray, M., 'The Diocese of St. Asaph in 1563', *JWRH* (1993), pp. 14-33.
- Gray, M., *Images of Piety: The Iconography of Traditional Religion in Late Medieval Wales* (Oxford, 2000).
- Gray, M., 'Reforming Memory: Commemoration of the Dead in Sixteenth-Century Wales', *WHR*, 26 (2012), pp. 186-214.
- Greaves, R.L., *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1662-1677* (Stanford, 1990).
- Green, I.M., *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978).
- Griffiths, G.M., 'Glimpses of Denbighshire in the Records of the Great Sessions', in *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society*, 22 (1973), pp. 93-120.
- Griffiths, G.M., 'Some Extra Diocesan Activities of Bishop George Griffith of St. Asaph', *NLWJ*, 12 (1962), pp. 298-301.

- Griffiths, G.M., 'The Restoration of St. Asaph: The Episcopate of Bishop George Griffith, 1660-1666 Part 2', *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, 13, (1963), pp. 27-40.
- Griffiths, P., Fox, A., Hindle, S., 'Introduction', in *idem* (eds), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 1-10.
- Gruenfelder, J.K., 'The Wynns of Gwydir and Parliamentary elections in Wales, 1604-40', *WHR*, 9 (1978), pp. 121-41.
- Guthrie, N., *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Guy, J.R., 'The significance of Indigenous Clergy in the Welsh Church at the Restoration', in S. Mews (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 16 (Oxford, 1982), pp. 335-43.
- 'Gwysaney Papers', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 12 (1881), pp. 202-11.
- Haigh, C., 'The Church of England, the Catholics, and the People', in *idem* (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke, 1984), pp. 195-220.
- Handley, S., 'Humphrey Humphreys (1648-1712)', *ODNB*.
- Harper, S., "'Songs of the doings of their auncestors": Aspects of Welsh and English Musical Traditions', in R. Kennedy and S. Meecham-Jones (eds), *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 231-50.
- Harris, T., *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (2006).
- Harris, T., *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2006).
- Heal, F., 'What Can King Lucius Do for You?', 'The Reformation and the Early British Church', *EHR*, 120 (2005), pp. 593-614.
- Heal, F., and Holmes, C., *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke, 1994).
- Hechter, M., *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (1975).
- Hefling, C., and Shattuck, C. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford, 2006).
- Helmets, H.J., *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge, 2015).
- Henning, B.D. (ed.), *The House of Commons 1660-1690* (3 vols, 1983)
- Hill, C., 'Puritans and the Dark Corners of the Land', in *idem.*, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England* (New Haven, 1991), pp. 3-47.
- History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished articles on Denbigh Boroughs, Denbighshire, Flint Boroughs, and Flintshire for 1640-60 section.
- History of Parliament Trust, unpublished article on Sir Thomas Hanmer for 1640-60 section, revised by David Scott.

- Hobson, A., 'The King's Most Loyal Subjects: The Relationship between Anglican Loyalists and Roman Catholics in the Reign of Charles II', *Royal Stuart Review*, 1996, pp. 6-15.
- Holmes, C., *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980).
- Hopper, A., 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire', *HJ*, 45 (2002), pp. 281-303.
- Hopper, A., *Turncoats and Renegades: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012).
- Howard, S., *Law and Disorder in Early Modern Wales* (Cardiff, 2008).
- Hughes, A., *Politics, Society, and Civil War in Warwickshire* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Hughes, A., and Sanders, J., 'Gender, Geography and Exile: Royalists and the Low Countries in the 1650s', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith, *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 128-48.
- Hughes, W.J., *Wales and the Welsh in English Literature: From Shakespeare to Scott* (1924).
- Hunt, A., 'The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England', *P&P*, 161 (1998), pp. 39-83.
- Hurdsman, C.N., *A History of the Parish of Chirk* (Wrexham, 1996).
- Hutton, R., 'Henry Muddiman (bap. 1629, d.1692)', *ODNB*.
- Hutton, R., *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1986).
- Hutton, R., *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-1646* (Oxford, 1982).
- Huws, D., *Welsh Medieval Manuscripts* (Cardiff, 2000).
- Huws, D., 'Sir Thomas Mostyn and the Mostyn Manuscripts' in J.P. Carley and C.G.C Tite (eds.), *Books and Collectors 1200-1700* (London, 1997), pp. 451-72.
- Jacob, W., 'Part II: 1660-1780', in N. Yates (ed.), *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603-1920* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 65-206.
- Jenkins, G.H., *The Foundations of Modern Wales 1642-1780* (Oxford, 1993).
- Jenkins, G.H., *Literature, Religion, and Society in Wales, 1660-1730* (Cardiff, 1978).
- Jenkins, G.H., *Protestant Dissenters in Wales 1639-1689* (Cardiff, 1992).
- Jenkins, P., 'The Anglican Church and the Unity of Britain: The Welsh Experience, 1560-1714', in S.G. Ellis and S. Barber (eds), *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State 1485-1725* (1995), pp. 115-38.
- Jenkins, P., 'Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches in the Seventeenth Century', *HJ*, 23 (1980), pp. 275-93.

- Jenkins, P., 'Church, Nation and Language: The Welsh Church, 1660-1800', in J. Gregory and J.S. Chamberlain (eds.), *The National Church in Local Perspective: The Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 265-84.
- Jenkins, P., *A History of Modern Wales 1536-1990* (Harlow, 1992).
- Jenkins, P., *The Making of a Ruling Class: The Glamorgan Gentry, 1640-1790* (1983).
- Jenkins, P., 'Seventeenth-century Wales: definition and identity' in B. Bradshaw and P. Roberts, (eds.), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 213-35.
- Jenkins, P., "'The Sufferings of the Clergy': The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, Part 1', *JWEH*, 3 (1986), pp. 1-17.
- Jenkins, P., "'The Sufferings of the Clergy': The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, 2: The Account of Francis Davies', *JWEH*, 4 (1987), pp. 9-41.
- Jenkins, P., "'The Sufferings of the Clergy': The Church in Glamorgan During the Interregnum, 3: The Account of Edward Mansell', *JWEH*, 5 (1988), pp. 73-80.
- Jenkins, P., 'Wales and the Order of the Royal Oak', *NLWJ*, 24 (1986), pp. 339-51.
- Jones, A.R., and Stallybrass, P., *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Jones, D.L., 'The Glorious Revolution in Wales', *NLWJ*, 26 (1989), pp. 27-31.
- Jones, E.G., 'Catholic Recusancy in the counties of Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery, 1581-1625', *THSC*, (1945), pp. 114-33.
- Jones, E.G., *Cymru A'r Hen Ffydd* (Cardiff, 1951).
- Jones, F., 'An Approach to Welsh Genealogy', *THSC*, 1948-9, pp. 303-466.
- Jones, F.M., 'Huw Morys and the Civil Wars', *Studia Celtica*, XLIV (2010), pp. 165-99.
- Jones, G., 'Early Modern Welsh Nationalism and the British History' in S. Mottram and S. Prescott (eds), *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 21-38.
- Jones, J.G., 'Concepts of Order and Gentility' in *idem.* (ed.), *Class, community and culture in Tudor Wales* (Cardiff, 1989), pp. 121-57.
- Jones, J.G., *Concepts of Order and Gentility in Wales 1546-1640* (Llandysul, 1992).
- Jones, J.G., *Early Modern Wales, c.1525-1640* (Basingstoke, 1994).
- Jones, J.G., 'George Griffith (1601-1666/7)', *ODNB*.
- Jones, J.G., 'The Reformation Bishops of St. Asaph', *JWEH*, 7 (1990), pp. 17-40.
- Jones, J.G., 'Scribes and Patrons, 'Scribes and Patrons in the Seventeenth Century', in P.H. Jones and E. Rees (eds), *A Nation and its Books: A History of the Book in Wales* (Aberystwyth, 1998), pp. 83-91.

- Jones, J.G., *The Welsh Gentry 1536-1640: Images of Status, Honour and Authority* (Cardiff, 1998).
- Jones, J.G., 'The Welsh language in Local Government: Justices of the Peace and the Courts of Quarter Sessions c.1536-1800', in G.H. Jenkins, (ed.), *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution* (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 181-206.
- Jones, J.G., 'The Wynn Family', *ODNB*.
- Kay, M., 'Prophecy in Welsh manuscripts', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 26 (2006), pp. 73-108.
- Key, N., and Ward, J.P., 'Metropolitan Puritans and the Varieties of Godly Reform in Interregnum Monmouth', *WHR*, 22 (2006), pp. 646-72.
- Kearney, H., *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Keblusek, M., 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Experience, 1642-1660' in A. Smyth (ed.), *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 55-68.
- Kennedy, T., 'The Edwards family of Plas Newydd in Chirkland', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society*, 41 (1992), pp. 71-85.
- Kennedy, T., 'Roman Catholic Recusancy in Denbighshire', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society*, 42 (1993), pp. 27-36.
- Kerrigan, J., *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603-1707* (Oxford, 2008).
- Ketton-Cremer, R.W., *Norfolk in the Civil War: A Portrait of a Society in Conflict* (1969).
- Key, N., and Ward, J.P., 'Metropolitan Puritans and the Varieties of Godly Reform in Interregnum Monmouth', *WHR*, 22 (2006), pp. 646-72.
- Kishlansky, M.A., *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986).
- Klausner, D., 'Family entertainments among the Salusburys of Lleweni and their circle, 1595-1641', *Welsh Music History*, 6 (2004), pp. 129-42.
- Knight, J., "'From the Welsh good Lord deliver me": soldiers, papists, and civilians in Civil War Monmouthshire', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 151 (2005), pp. 1-18.
- Knight, J., 'Taking Sides: Royalist Commissioners of Array for Monmouthshire in the Civil War', *Monmouthshire Antiquary*, 22 (2006), pp. 3-18.
- Knights, M., *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005).
- de Krey, G.S., 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-1682', in D.B. Hamilton and R. Strier, *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Restoration England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 231-52.

- Lacey, A., *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003).
- Lambert, M., 'Death and Memory: Clothing Bequests in English Wills 1650-1830', *Costume*, 48 (2014), pp. 46-59.
- Llewelyn Williams, W., *The Making of Modern Wales: Studies in the Tudor Settlement of Wales* (1919).
- Lloyd, N., 'The Correspondence of Edward Lhuyd and Richard Mostyn', *FHSP*, 25 (1971-2), pp. 31-61.
- Liapi, L., "'Loyal Hind'", "'The Prince of Thieves'": Crime Pamphlets and Royalist Propaganda', in S.F. Davies and P. Fletcher (eds), *News in Early Modern Europe: Currents and Connections* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 96-114.
- Little, P., and Smith, D.L., *Parliaments and Politics during the Interregnum* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Lord, P., *Words with pictures: Welsh Images and Images of Wales in the Popular Press, 1640-1860* (Aberystwyth, 1995).
- Loveman, K., *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008).
- Loxley, J., *The Writing of Royalism 1628-1660* (Cambridge, 2001).
- MacCulloch, D., *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996).
- MacGillivray, R., *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague, 1974).
- Major, P., *Writings of Exile in the English Revolution and Restoration* (Farnham, 2013).
- Maley, W., and Schwyzer, P., 'Introduction: A Welsh Correction', in *idem.* (eds), *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 1-5.
- Maltby, J., "'The Good Old Way": Prayer Book Protestantism in the 1640s and 1650s', *Studies in Church History*, 38 (2004), pp. 233-56.
- Maltby, J., *Prayer book and people in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*, (Cambridge, 1998).
- Maltby, J., 'Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of "Anglicanism", 1642-60' in C. Durston and J. Morrill (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158-80.
- Marshall, P., 'Faith and Identity in a Warwickshire Family: The Throckmortons and the Reformation', *Dugdale Occasional Papers*, 49 (2010).
- Marshall, P., and Scott, G., 'Introduction: The Catholic Gentry in English Society', *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 1-30.
- Matikkala, A., *The Orders of Knighthood and the Formation of the British Honours System, 1660-1760* (Woodbridge, 2008).

- Matthews, R., “‘Such a doleful president of misery and calamity’”: Protestant fears of Catholics in Monmouthshire in the First Civil War, 1642-46’, *The Monmouthshire Antiquary*, 22 (2006), pp. 19-38.
- Matthews, R., “‘To a Man for the King’”: The Allegiance of Welsh Catholics during the First Civil War, 1642-6’, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, vol. 20 (2001), pp. 86-97.
- McCall, F., *Baal’s Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013).
- McElligott, J., *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Miller, J., ‘Containing Division in Restoration Norwich’, *EHR*, 121 (2006), pp. 1019-47.
- Miller, J., *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Milton, A., ‘A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism’, in A.F. Marotti (ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), pp. 85-115.
- Milton, A., ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in J. Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61-81.
- Milton, A., ‘Coping with Alternatives: Religious Liberty in Royalist Thought, 1642-7’, in R. Armstrong and T. Ó hAnnracháin (eds), *Insular Christianity: Alternative Modes of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c. 1570-1700* (Manchester, 2013), pp. 149-69.
- Morgan, P., *The Eighteenth Century Renaissance* (Llandybie, 1981).
- Morgan, P., ‘A Nation of Nonconformists: Thomas Rees (1815-88) and Nonconformist History’, in N. Evans and H. Pryce (eds), *Writing a Small Nation’s Past: Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850-1950* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 97-109.
- Morgan, R., *The Welsh and the Shaping of Early Modern Ireland 1558-1641* (Woodbridge, 2014).
- Morgan, V., ‘The Construction of Civic Memory in Early Modern Norwich’, in M. Kwint, C. Breward, and J. Aynsley (eds), *Material Memories* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 183-97.
- Morrill, J., *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974).
- Morrill, J., ‘The Church in England, 1642-9’, in *idem* (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 89-114.
- Morrill, J., *The Nature of the English Revolution* (1981).
- Morrill, J., *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War 1630-50* (Harlow, 1980).
- Mostyn, L.N.V.L. and Glenn, T.A., *History of the Family of Mostyn of Mostyn* (1925).
- Neufeld, M., *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013).

- Nice, J., “‘The Peculiar Place of God’: Early Modern Representations of England and France’, *EHR*, 121 (2006), pp. 1002-18.
- Palmer, A.N., *The History of the Parish Church of Wrexham* (Wrexham, 1886).
- Parry, G., ‘Aylett Sammes. (c.1636-c.1679)’, ODNB.
- Parry, G., *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquaries of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1995).
- Parry, E., *Royal Visits and Progresses to Wales and the border counties of Cheshire, Salop, Hereford and Monmouth...* (1851).
- Peacey, J., ‘Radicalism Relocated: Royalist Politics and Pamphleteering of the Late 1640s’, in A. Hessayon and D. Finnegan (eds.), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 51-68.
- Pettegree, A., *The Invention of News: How the World Came to Know About Itself* (New Haven, 2014).
- Phillips, J.R.S., *The Justices of the Peace in Wales and Monmouthshire, 1541 to 1689* (Cardiff, 1975).
- Pierce, H., ‘Artful Ambivalence? Picturing Charles I in the Interregnum’, in J. McElligott and D. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 67-87.
- Pittock, M., *Material Culture and Sediton, 1688-1720: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013).
- Plomer, H.R., Bushnell, G.H., Dix, E.R.McC., and Pollard, A.W. (eds), *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725* (Oxford, 1932).
- Pollman, J., ‘Of living legends and authentic tales: how to get remembered in Early Modern Europe’, *TRHS*, 23 (2013), pp. 103-25.
- Powell, N.M., ‘Genealogical narratives and kinship in Medieval Wales’ in E.D. Kennedy and R. Radulescu, (eds), *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France* (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 175-202.
- Prescott, S., “‘If there be Helicon in Wales it is’”: Writing Wales in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth Century Poetry’ in S. Mottram and S. Prescott, (eds.), *Writing Wales from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 131-48.
- Pritchard, T.W., *St. Winifrede, her Holy Well and the Jesuit Mission* (Wrexham, 2009).
- Puleston, Sir T.H.G., *The Story of a Quiet Country Parish, Gleanings of the History of Worthenbury, Flintshire* (1895).
- Questier, M., *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c.1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006).

- Questier, M., 'Conformity, Catholicism and the Law' in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English church, c.1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 237-61.
- Reay, B., *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (1985).
- Rees, J.F., 'The Wynn of Gwydir Papers', *Welsh Outlook*, 14 (1927), pp. 212-15.
- Rees, T., *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (1861).
- Richards, T., 'Flintshire and the Puritan Movement', *FHSP*, 13 (1952-3), pp. 53-71.
- Richards, T., *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales* (London, 1920).
- Richards, T., *Religious Developments in Wales (1654-1662)*, (London, 1923).
- Richards, T., *Wales Under the Penal Code (1662-1687)* (1925).
- Ridgway, M.H., *Church Plate of St. Asaph Diocese* (Denbigh, 1997).
- Roberts, P., 'Tudor Wales, national identity and the British inheritance' in B. Bradshaw and P. Roberts (eds), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 8-42.
- Roberts, S.K., 'Godliness and Government in Glamorgan, 1647-1660', in C. Jones, M. Newitt, and S.K. Roberts (eds), *Politics and People in Revolutionary England* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 225-52.
- Roberts, S.K., 'How the West was Won: Parliamentary Politics, Religion, and the Military in South Wales, 1642-9', *WHR*, 21 (2003), pp. 646-74.
- Roberts, S.K., 'Local Government Reform in England and Wales During the Interregnum', in I. Roots (ed.), *Into Another Mould: Aspects of the Interregnum* (Exeter, 1981), pp. 24-41.
- Roberts, S.K., 'Propagating the Gospel in Wales: The Making of the 1650 Act', *THSC*, new ser., 10 (2004 for 2003), pp. 57-75.
- Roberts, S.K., 'The Sermon in Early Modern Wales: Context and Content', in H. Adlington, P. McCullough, and E. Rhatigan (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 303-25.
- Robertson, B., *Royalists at War in Scotland and Ireland, 1638 – 1650* (Farnham, 2014).
- Robinson, B.S., "'Darke Speech": Matthew Parker and the Reforming of History', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, pp. 1061-83.
- Robinson, G., *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Constructing Allegiance* (Ashgate, 2012).
- Robinson, J., 'New Light on Sir Thomas Hanmer', *Garden History*, 16 (1988), pp. 1-7.
- Rudrum, A., 'Resistance, Collaboration, and Silence: Henry Vaughan and Breconshire Royalism?', in C.J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds), *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (Columbia, Miss., 1999), pp. 102-18.

- ‘Salisbury Correspondence’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 3rd ser., 26 (1861), pp. 120-22.
- Sanford, R.L., *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2002).
- Schneider, G., *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark, Del., 2005).
- Schwytzer, P., ‘British History and “British History”’: The Same Old Story?’, in D.J. Baker and W. Maley (eds), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 11-23.
- Schwytzer, P., *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Scott, J., *England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Scott-Warren, J., ‘News, Sociability, and Bookbuying in Early Modern England: The Letters of Sir Thomas Cornwallis’, *The Library*, 1 (2000), pp. 381-402.
- Sharpe, K., *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000).
- Sheils, W., “Getting on” and “getting along” in parish and town’, in B. Kaplan, B. Moore, H. van Nierop, and J. Pollmann (eds), *Catholic Communities in Protestant states: Britain and the Netherlands c.1570-1720* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 67-83.
- Sherlock, P., *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Farnham, 2008).
- Singer, R., ‘Liberating Britain from Foreign Bondage: A Welsh revision of the Wars of the Roses in L.M. Spooner’s *Gladys of Harlech; Or, The Sacrifice* (1858)’ in P. Lindfield and C. Margrave, (eds), *Rule Britannia? Britain and Britishness 1707-1901* (Newcastle, 2015), pp. 143-58.
- Smith, D.L., *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640-1649* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Smith, D.L., “Our Fears Surpass Our Hopes”: Virginian Reactions to the Execution of Charles I (1649-52)’, in L. Hennenon and L. Roper (eds), *Fear and the Shaping of Early American Societies* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 137-59.
- Smith, G., *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Basingstoke, 2003).
- Smith, G., *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies* (Farnham, 2010).
- Smith, L.B., ‘On the hospitality of the Welsh: A Comparative View’, in H. Pryce and J. Watts (eds), *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 181-94.
- Speck, W., *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolt of 1688* (Oxford, 1988).

- Southcombe, G., and Tapsell, G., *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture: Britain and Ireland, 1660-1714* (Basingstoke, 2010).
- Sowerby, S., *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.; 2013).
- Spurr, J., 'The Lay Church of England', in G. Tapsell (ed.), *The later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012), pp. 101-26.
- Spurr, J., *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991).
- Stoyle, M., 'Caricaturing Cymru: Images of the Welsh in the London Press, 1642-6', in D.E.S. Dunn (ed.), *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 162-79.
- Stoyle, M., 'English "Nationalism", Celtic Particularism, and the English Civil War', *HJ*, 43 (2000), pp. 1113-28.
- Stoyle, M., *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994).
- Stoyle, M., 'Remembering the English Civil Wars', in P. Gray and K. Oliver (eds), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester, 2004), pp. 19-30.
- Stoyle, M., *Soldiers and Strangers: An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (New Haven, 2005).
- Suggett, R., 'The Welsh Language and the Court of Great Sessions' in G.H. Jenkins (ed.), *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution* (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 45-122.
- Swift, D., 'The Book of Common Prayer' in A. Hadfield (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 576-91.
- Tapsell, G., *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012).
- Tapsell, G., *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Thomas, D.R., 'A Discoverie of the Present State of the Byshoppricke of St. Asaphe', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (1884), pp. 53-8.
- Thomas, D.R., *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, general, cathedral, and parochial* (1874).
- Thomas, H., 'Missioners on the Margins? The Territorial Headquarters of the Welsh Jesuit College of St Francis Xavier at The Cwm, c. 1600-1679', *Recusant History*, 32 (2014), pp. 173-93.
- Thomas, P.D.G., 'Jacobitism in Wales', *WHR*, 1 (1962), pp. 279-300.
- Thomas, P.D.G., 'Parliamentary Elections in Brecknockshire', *Brycheiniog*, 6 (1960), pp. 99-113.

- Thomas, P.D.G., 'Wynnstay versus Chirk Castle: parliamentary elections in Denbighshire, 1716-41', *NLWJ*, 11 (1959), pp. 105-23.
- Thornton, D.E., 'Orality, literacy and genealogy in early medieval Ireland and Wales', in H. Pryce (ed.), *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 83-98.
- Thornton, T., 'Nationhood at the Margin: Identity, Regionality and the English Crown in the Seventeenth Century' in L. Scales and O. Zimmer (eds), *Power and the Nation in European History* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 232-47.
- Tindal Hart, A., *William Lloyd, 1627-1717: Bishop, Politician, Author and Prophet* (London, 1952).
- Tittler, R., *Portraits, Painters, and Publics in Provincial England, 1540-1640* (Oxford, 2012).
- Torsten Petersson, R., *Bernini and the Excesses of Art* (New York, 2003).
- Tucker, N., *Denbighshire Officers in the Civil War* (Denbigh, 1964).
- Tucker, N., *North Wales in the Civil War* (Denbigh, 1958).
- Tucker, N., 'Volunteers in the Thirty Years War', *NLWJ*, 16 (1969), pp. 61-76.
- Tudur Jones, R., 'Relations between Anglicans and Dissenters: The Promotion of Piety, 1670-1730', in D. Walker, *A History of the Church in Wales* (Bridgend, 1976), pp. 79-102.
- Underdown, D., *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1987).
- Underdown, D., 'Settlement in the counties 1653-8' in G.E. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (1972), pp. 165-82.
- Usher, G.A., *Gwynsany and Owston: A History of the Family of Davies-Cooke of Gwynsany, Flintshire and Owston, West Riding of Yorkshire* (Denbigh, 1964).
- Vallance, E., 'Henry Maurice (?1647-1691)', *ODNB*.
- Vallance, E., 'Royalist Absolutism in the 1650s: The Case of Robert Sheringham', in C. Cuttica and G. Burgess (eds), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (2012), pp. 33-46.
- Walsham, A., *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham, 2014).
- Walsham, A., *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993).
- Walsham, A., 'History, Memory, and the English Reformation', *HJ*, 55 (2012), pp. 899-938.
- Walsham, A., 'The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and "Parish Anglicans" in Early Stuart England', *JEH*, 49 (1998), pp. 620-51.
- Walsham, A., *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2011).

- Walsham, A., 'Supping with Satan's Disciples: Spiritual and Secular Sociability in Post-Reformation England', in N. Lewycky and A. Morton (eds), *Getting Along?: Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of Professor W.J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 29-56.
- Ward, S.L., 'Responses to godly government in North-East Wales, 1646-1660: gentility, religion and Royalist political activity', in C. Knaack and J. van Tol (eds), *Godly Governance, Religion and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, forthcoming).
- Ward, S.L., 'Round-head Knaves': The Ballad of Wrexham and the subversive political culture of Interregnum North-East Wales', forthcoming in *Historical Research*.
- Weil, R., 'Thinking about Allegiance in the English Civil War', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), pp. 183-91.
- West, W.N., '“No Endlesse Monument”': Artificial Memory and Memorial Artifact in Early Modern England', in S. Radstone and K. Hodgkin (eds), *Regimes of Memory* (2003), pp. 61-75.
- Whyte, N., *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory, 1500-1800* (Oxford, 2009).
- Willett, R., *A Memoir of Hawarden Parish, Flintshire, Containing Notices of the Princes of North Wales* (Chester, 1822).
- Williams, D., *A History of Modern Wales* (1950).
- Williams, N.J.A., 'Thomas Price (1599-1685)', ODNB.
- Williams, G., 'John Owen (bap. 1580, d. 1651)', ODNB.
- Williams, G., 'Part I: 1603-1660', in N. Yates (ed.), *The Welsh Church from Reformation to Disestablishment, 1603-1920* (Cardiff, 2007), pp. 3-62.
- Williams, G.A., *When was Wales? A History of the Welsh* (1985).
- Williams, M.R.F., 'The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649-1660', *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 909-33.
- Williams, W.R., *The Parliamentary History of the Principality of Wales, from the earliest times to the present day, 1541-1895* (Brecknock, 1895).
- Willie, R., 'Sacrificial Kings and Martyred Rebels: Charles and Rainborowe Beatified', *Etudes Episteme*, 20 (2011).
- Wolfe, M., "'There very children were soe full of hatred": royalist clerical families and the politics of everyday conflict in Civil War and Interregnum England', *Studies in Church History* 40, (Woodbridge, 2004).
- Wood, A., *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2013).

Wood, C.D., 'The Welsh Response to the Glorious Revolution of 1688', *JWRH*, new ser., 1 (2001), pp. 15-33.

Wood, J., 'Perceptions of the Past in Welsh Folklore Studies', *Folklore*, 108 (1997), pp. 92-102.

Worden, B., 'The Levellers in History and Memory, c.1660-1960', in M.J. Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 256-82.

Wynn Thomas, M., 'Anglo-Welsh Literature', in J. Koch (ed.), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia* (5 vols, Santa Barbara, CA, 2006), I, 61-7.

Young, F., *The Gages of Hengrave and Suffolk Catholicism, 1640-1767* (2015).

Zaret, D., *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton, N. J., 2000).

Unpublished theses

Clark, R., 'Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire 1603-1730' (Univ. of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1979).

Evans, S., "'To contynue in my bloud and name": Reproducing the Mostyn Dynasty, c.1540-1692' (Univ. of Aberystwyth PhD thesis, 2013).

Garland, S., 'News in Late-Seventeenth Century Britain' (Univ. of Bangor PhD thesis, 2016).

McKeogh, K., 'Early Modern Catholic Culture and Identity in the Circle of Sir Thomas Tresham, 1580-1611' (Univ. of Oxford DPhil thesis, forthcoming).