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Summary

The thesis looks at the gentry involved in county government in Herefordshire during the reign of Charles I, then examines the effects of the Civil War and studies the changes in the personnel of the administration during 1646-61.

Herefordshire's economy, largely based on agriculture, was restricted by geographical isolation and transportation problems. The county contained a large Catholic minority. Puritanism was less widespread.

The administration was controlled by twenty-five or so of the wealthier families. These county gentry were often linked by marriages, and most of their families had medieval roots in the shire. In 1640 they were united against the King over the issues of Ship Money and the Council of Wales. By 1642 they had divided along religious lines, with the majority supporting the King and the established Church against a Puritan minority in the county on the side of Parliament.

Herefordshire was mostly under Royalist rule until the close of 1645, when Hereford fell to Parliament's forces. The Presbyterians controlled the local administration during 1646-8. A number of lesser gentry were now taking part in county government, a trend that continued during the 1650s. Presbyterians were removed from the administration in 1649, and a further purge of county government in 1653 consolidated the authority of a radical Puritan minority, backed by troops garrisoned at Hereford.

After 1653 a gradual return of Presbyterian county gentry took place in the local administration, although the radicals regained their dominance temporarily after the fall of the Protectorate in 1659. The collapse of Army rule at the end of 1659 led to the Presbyterians seizing control, and they supported the Restoration in 1660. This was followed by a return of Royalists to county government.
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CHAPTER I

Geography, Economy and Religion

'As to the prospect of the country, 'tis delightful, consisting of hills and valleys of reddish earth, bedecked with fruit trees, large woods, and groves of oak, hazel and elm, birch, yew, holly, juniper and many large hop yards'.

Such was the idyllic impression of Herefordshire formed by Thomas Baskerville, a late seventeenth century topographer. Daniel Defoe later described the inhabitants of the county:

'I observed they are a diligent and laborious people, chiefly addicted to husbandry, and they boast, not without reason, that they have the finest wool and the best hops, and the richest cyder in all Britain'.

Almost forty miles in length and some thirty-four miles at its greatest breadth, Herefordshire contained over two hundred parishes. For local government the county was divided into eleven 'hundreds', while the city of Hereford had a separate administration. Judging by the Hearth Tax returns of the 1660s and 1670s, the population of Herefordshire fluctuated around the sixty thousand mark.

The county was famed for its rich soil; it was said that Herefordshire 'would skorne to come behinde any one country throughout all England for fertility of soile'. Defoe qualified this: 'Tis certain', he wrote, 'that not any of our southern counties, the neighbourhood of London excepted, comes up to the fertility of this county'. These statements, however, can be strictly applied only to the central lowlands lying between the mountains of Wales, on the western side of the shire, and the Malvern Hills to the east. Irrigated by the Wye, Frome, Lugg, Arrow and Leadon rivers, this central region of heavy loam soils included the Grimsworth hundred and the adjoining parts of Stretford, Wolphy, Broxash and Radlow. Along with the areas of clay soils and woodlands in the Greytree hundred, these lowlands formed a contrast to the infertile, hilly outlying parts of the
county, particularly the hundreds of Wigmore, Huntington and Ewias Lacy, and much
of Webtree and Wormilow. The sandy soils of Wormilow were noted as especially
barren. The differences in fertility were reflected in land values; in 1663,
the highest values, apart from in the towns, were along the Wye, Frome and Lugg
valleys, while the lowest could be found in the hills of the north and west, and
in the Wigmore hundred.

It appears that poverty was widespread in the county; 'For so small a
circuit as this shire contains', reported the sheriff in 1637, 'there are not in
the kingdom a greater number of poor people'. In the early seventeenth century,
Rowland Vaughan of Newcourt described the unemployment in the Dore valley and
wrote that his neighbourhood was 'the plentifullest place of poor in the kingdom'.
The infertile soils found in much of south-west Herefordshire, and the continuation
of the debilitating Welsh custom of partible inheritance in some parts there, may
have contributed to the hardship in this region. For the whole county, it has
been suggested that engrossing and consolidation of large-scale corn production,
along with the concentration of resources on agriculture, were the reasons behind
unemployment and poverty in Herefordshire; displaced farm workers could rely on
few industrial alternatives for their livelihood. When assessed for taxation,
Herefordshire's overall wealth was reckoned to lie around the half-way mark in a
list of the English counties, behind the more prosperous south-eastern parts of
the country where trade and industry had developed further, and where farming was
perhaps more efficient.

Agriculture in Herefordshire was mainly based on corn and fruit growing
and the rearing of sheep and cattle. Only in the Ewias Lacy hundred did one kind
of farming (dairying) dominate over the others. The quality of the county's
produce was recognised by contemporaries. The famous 'Hereford cattle' were first
bred in the seventeenth century, under the direction of Viscount Scudamore of
Holm Lacy. The rich lowland meadows provided ample grazing for the herds, and
once fattened the cattle would be sold over much of southern England.\textsuperscript{13} Equally renowned and profitable was the wool of Herefordshire, particularly that produced from the Leominster area.\textsuperscript{14} Leominster 'Ore', as the wool was named, ranked amongst the finest in Europe:

\begin{quote}
'Where lives the man so dull, on Britain's further shore
To whom did never sound the name of Lemster Ore?'
\end{quote}

This was a question asked by the poet Michael Drayton in the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{15} The importance of wool to the county was shown in the 1630s when Spanish imports were cutting prices, and thus causing cash shortages and hardship for many people in Herefordshire.\textsuperscript{16} By the end of the century, it appears that the excellence of local wool had been declining; the increasing practice of liming the soil, in order to improve crop yields, was said to result in coarser wool.\textsuperscript{17}

Herefordshire led the other counties of the West Midlands in the production of corn. Surplus rye found its way to Shropshire and Wales; wheat was exported to Gloucestershire, and barley was transported as far as London.\textsuperscript{18} It was the orchards of the county, however, that most attracted the attention of visitors. Celia Fiennes saw 'a country of gardens and orchards, the whole country being very full of fruite trees'.\textsuperscript{19} Writing in the middle of the century, John Beale described his shire as 'the orchard of England' and claimed that 'from the greatest persons to the poorest cottager all habitations are encompassed with orchards and gardens; and in most places our hedges are inriched with rows of fruit trees'.\textsuperscript{20} The first brew of red-streak cider came from the apples of Herefordshire in the seventeenth century, again under the guidance of Viscount Scudamore. Defoe wrote of great quantities of cider sent from Hereford to London, and the county was also rivalling Kent in the growing of hops.\textsuperscript{21}

Another major product was timber, with the main areas of woodland being in the Wigmore hundred and in the southern fringe of the shire covered by the Forest
of Dean. The woodlands suffered ruthless exploitation by landowners in this period, leading to much disforestation, particularly in the northern forests of Mocktree, Deerfold, Bringwood and Prestwood, and in the area around Ledbury. It was in these parts that most of the seventeenth century enclosure awards in the county took place, but much of Herefordshire had already been enclosed before 1600; few enclosure fines were levied on the county during the reign of Charles I. One estimate is that over nine-tenths of the land had been enclosed by 1675.22

With this early rationalising of pasture land and corn production, it might almost be said that Herefordshire had advanced more rapidly than the other midland and eastern areas of England, which did not enclose on a similar scale until the eighteenth century. The enclosures, the use of lime fertilisers, Viscount Scudamore's innovations in cattle-breeding and cider-brewing, all create an impression of a progressive farming region, confirmed perhaps by Rowland Vaughan's early use of new irrigation techniques in the Dore valley.23 Moreover, some industries had developed, based mainly on agricultural products, cloth and leather in particular. They were situated in the larger towns, Leominster, Bromyard, Ross, and Hereford, where gloves were manufactured in large quantities.24

Meanwhile, an iron industry operated in the north-western woodlands and in the Forest of Dean. Forges and furnaces, using local water-power and wood as fuel, were built in these areas. Iron ore was readily available in the Forest of Dean, but in the north it had to be imported from the Clee Hills of Shropshire. During the first half of the seventeenth century, the number of blast furnaces in Herefordshire and the whole of the Forest of Dean was rising in proportion to those of Kent and the Sussex Weald.25 Gentry families involved in the industry included the Scudamores of Holm Lacy and Ballingham, the Kyrles of Walford and Much Marcle, the Gwillyms of Whitchurch and the Kembles, a Catholic family of Welsh Newton.26 A description of the process of iron-making, at a furnace near Ross, is given by Thomas Baskerville:
'The fire to melt the ore in the furnace made of stone, which may be 7 or 8 yards from bottom to top or in height, is made of charcoal burning day and night... The flame mounts fiercely a good height above the furnace; here is also at the bottom of the furnace a hole as big as that of an oven which lets the dross run away in fiery streaming flames from melted metal or ore, which metal once in 4 hours is let run into bars or other forms of iron'.

These examples of heavy industry and innovative agriculture may tend to belie the remark from Sir Robert Harley of Brampton Bryan that his native Herefordshire was 'the most clownish county of England'. Nevertheless, it remains true to say that the region was seen primarily as rustic and backward, in economic development. Local opposition hampered the advance of industry, and throughout the century many petitions complained against forest lands being wasted to provide fuel for ironworks. Water mills blocking the rivers drew similar complaints. In 1650, Lord Scudamore was requested by local magistrates to stop the building of an ironworks at Holm Lacy. In the same year, it was reported that rioters had pulled down an iron furnace near Ross.

Growth of industry in Herefordshire was also hindered by transport problems, which greatly limited the region's prosperity by restricting trade with other counties. Hills and forests encircled the county; commerce depended on the main roads that converged on Hereford from Gloucester, Worcester, Ludlow, Brecon and Monmouth, but these were unreliable, especially in the winter months; Thomas Baskerville was highly critical of the 'foul' roads he encountered on his journey into Herefordshire. Therefore, although agricultural output was in surplus and some trade did take place with neighbouring areas, it was not possible to exploit the vast potential London market, and most of the county's products were consumed locally. John Beale noted that 'by defect of transportation, our store of cider is become a snare to many, who turn God's blessings into wantonness and drunkenness'. He recognised that the unnavigability of the River Wye was a major hindrance to Herefordshire's prosperity.
and seasonal variations of depth (often too shallow in summer and overflowing in winter) the Wye was not a viable commercial waterway, despite its course running conveniently through the middle of the shire and eventually flowing into the River Severn and Bristol Channel. There were plans and petitions for the reduction of weirs, and schemes were put forward to make the river navigable, but nothing was attempted until after the Restoration. 34

Thus, despite the fertile soils in the county and the fame of its produce, Herefordshire was relatively inward-looking, isolated and economically-undeveloped because of its geographical situation and difficulties of transport. Its towns catered mainly for local trade. Markets were held at Hereford, Leominster, Ledbury, Ross, Bromyard, Kington, Weobley, Wigmore and Pembridge. 35 Hereford, with a population of near five thousand by the end of the century, was the focal point of the shire. It possessed a fine cathedral; the quarter sessions and assizes were usually held in the city, although on some occasions Leominster would be the venue. Celia Fiennes described Hereford as 'a pretty little town of timber buildings, the streets are well pitched and handsome as to breadth and length'. Defoe was less complimentary: 'It is truly an old, mean built, and very dirty city'. 36 Nehemiah Wharton, one of a Parliamentarian army occupying Hereford in 1642, nevertheless found himself impressed by the city's architecture: the cathedral was 'every way exceeding that at Worcester' and the market place was the 'statliest' in England. Encompassing the city was a strong wall, while a stone bridge of six arches, 'surpassing Worcester', crossed the River Wye. 37

Wharton was less enthusiastic about the morals of the citizenry: they were 'ignorant in the ways of God, and much addicted to drunkenness and other vices, but principally to swearing'. 38 This may have been due partly to the cider surplus, but it must be noted that Wharton was a Puritan, advocating the introduction of preaching ministers to Hereford, so that his view reflected his own religious zeal as well as the ignorance of the inhabitants. He would have
been equally disappointed with the people of the surrounding countryside, because, apart from Hereford and Leominster and parts of south-west Herefordshire, evidence of Puritanism in the county is scanty. A few of the gentry families did espouse a form of Presbyterianism, based less perhaps on fervent Calvinism and devotion to the Genevan church system than on hostility to Arminianism, with its apparent Catholic trends, and to Laud's campaign against lay ownership of tithes and advowsons. 39

The county's leading Puritan, however, was a zealous Calvinist: Sir Robert Harley (1579-1656) of Brampton Bryan came to be associated with the Presbyterian group in Parliament in the 1640s, and he was the main patron of the Puritan cause in Herefordshire. He established a Puritan minister and schoolmaster at Brampton Bryan and made his home, in the north-west uplands of the county, a centre for persecuted preachers. He also had ties with the Feoffees for Improvements organisation in London. 40 Harley, a K.B. in 1603, was also one of the wealthiest men in the shire and a leading figure socially and politically, as well as in religion. 41 He had been educated at Oriel College, Oxford, where his tutor was the Reverend Cadwalader Owen, and it was from him perhaps that Harley acquired a Puritanism that went against the family tradition; his grandfather had been a recusant, while his father, Thomas, disapproved of the installation of the Puritan rector at Brampton Bryan. 42 Other Puritans in the Herefordshire squirearchy before the Civil War, although perhaps less ardent than Sir Robert Harley, were Bennett Hoskyns of Morehampton in Dore (and later of Harewood), Sir John Kyrle, Bart., of Much Marcie and James Kyrle of Walford, who sheltered the persecuted preacher John Workman at his home in 1638. 43 Puritan ministers established at local benefices in 1642 included John Green at Pencombe, Richard Hawes at Kentchurch, John Tombes at Leominster, Timothy Woodruffe at Kingsland and Stanley Gower at Brampton Bryan. 44

In December 1640, encouraged by events at Westminster, John Tombes introduced
some Puritan reforms at his church, despite the opposition of many of the 'common people' who, he wrote, 'exclaim much against me, which moves me little'. His efforts were not fully successful, however, and in 1641, Sir Robert Harley found it necessary to rebuke the churchwardens over the 'scandalous pictures of the persons of the Trinity' at the church in Leominster. Around Brampton Bryan, where Harley's influence could be expected to be most effective, Puritanism was more widespread. In 1641 and 1642, when Parliament was requiring people to swear an oath to defend the Protestant church against 'popish innovations', this 'Protestation Oath' was taken 'with much willingnes' in the Wigmore hundred. Much less enthusiasm was shown in the rest of the county. There was a petition sent from Herefordshire in 1642, claiming to express the county's support for Parliament and the Puritan policies being enacted, but this was likely an unrepresentative document, concocted by Harley and his followers.

A more accurate reflection of majority opinion in Herefordshire came with a petition in favour of the episcopacy, also in 1642, while from the quarter sessions that summer there resulted a statement upholding the King and his church against the Puritans. This must not be taken to suggest that the Laudian reforms had been supported whole-heartedly; Bishop George Coke of Hereford reported in 1637 that the impropriation of church revenues was rife in his diocese and the lay patrons of livings were countenancing poorly paid curates 'reading prayers once a month or perhaps not so oft'. The local parson at Brockhampton was unable to get 'further than the church porch' because of opposition from the lay owner. Recourse to the law court at Hereford was unlikely to be successful for clergymen because, complained Bishop Coke, an unfavourable bias was shown by 'our juries in this country, and [by] many gentlemen, in any business against the church, and specially against the Bishop'.

The established church's ablest champion in Herefordshire was Viscount Scudamore of Holm Lacy. John Scudamore (1601-71) was the heir of an ancient
Herefordshire gentry family, that had enriched itself further in the spoils from the dissolution of the monasteries during the reign of Henry VIII. Both his father and grandfather, as well as being important local figures, were Elizabethan courtiers. His father, Sir James Scudamore (c.1568-1619), had been knighted at Cadiz in 1596, and he was reputed to have been the model for Spenser's 'Sir Scudamour' in 'The Faerie Queene'. The family was perhaps the wealthiest in the county. John Scudamore went to Magdalen College, Oxford, then the Middle Temple, and he was licensed to travel abroad in 1618. Created a baronet in 1620, he was an M.P. for the shire in 1621 and 1624. He received full possession of the family estates when his grandfather died in 1623. Scudamore took part in the expedition to La Rochelle in 1627 and, in the following year, he received the titles of Baron of Dromore and Viscount of Sligo, in Ireland. From about 1621 onwards, he had formed a friendship with William Laud, and following the advice of this cleric he gradually returned to the church some £50,000 worth of impropriated property from the Scudamore estates. If not a fully-convinced Arminian in doctrine, Viscount Scudamore was a supporter of Laudian reforms and definitely 'High Church' in his worship. Absent from the county after his appointment as ambassador to France in 1635, Scudamore's return in 1639 probably did much to consolidate the anti-Puritan, pro-Anglican feeling in Herefordshire.

Another prominent supporter of the established church was Wallop Brabazon of Eaton, a younger brother of the Earl of Meath. He was particularly resentful of the activities of John Tombes at Leominster. Tombes claimed that Brabazon used his position as a subsidy commissioner to extort additional taxes from the clergyman. He was, wrote Tombes, 'bent to blast any beginnings of Godliness'.

Further notable anti-Puritans at the start of the Civil War were Henry Lingen of Sutton and Sir Walter Pye of The Mynde in Much Dewchurch, but they appear to have been motivated more by Catholic sympathies rather than by devotion to the Anglican church. The Linges were a Catholic family; they had medieval
antecedents in the shire and their lands were worth around £2000 p.a. Their fortunes declined, however, in the second half of the sixteenth century when Jane Lingen inherited the estate. She was a recusant who married a Catholic conspirator, William Shelley of Sussex. Shelley was attainted for treason in 1583. On Jane's death in 1610, the remains of her property passed to another Catholic, her cousin Edward Lingen. Continuing the tribulations of the family, he was declared a lunatic in about 1625 and the estate came to be the subject of legal battles in following years, including a dispute between his wife, who had earlier deserted him, and the eldest son Henry. From this background, Henry Lingen (1612-62) had inherited lands in 1635 at Sutton and in the Stoke Edith area, along with the family tradition of Catholicism; but he had married a sister of Sir Walter Pye and it was from this family perhaps that Lingen realised the wisdom of outwardly conforming to the established church, despite holding Catholic beliefs. By these means, Lingen and Pye avoided recusancy fines and the weakening of their estates. Another brother-in-law of Pye's, Fulke Walwyn of Hellens in Much Marcle was a pro-Catholic who also adopted this strategy. Their conformism allowed them all to take part in local government in the shire.

One estimation of the Catholic population of English counties suggests that the proportion of Catholics to the total population in Herefordshire was lower only to Durham and Lancashire at the start of the Civil War. Monmouthshire, meanwhile, had a higher proportion than all the English counties, and it was in the Webtree and Wormilow hundreds, bordering on Monmouthshire, that most of the Herefordshire recusants were resident. Catholic riots in these districts in 1605 indicated the strength of feeling there for the old religion. Throughout the century a Jesuit centre flourished, undetected by the government, at Cwm in the south of the county, a few miles north of Monmouth.

The disturbances of 1605 persuaded the government to adopt a policy of purging thoroughly the county administration of known Catholic sympathisers. In
the June of that year, the Bishop of Hereford reported to the Earl of Salisbury that many of the local gentry had Catholic connections, and shortly after this four of the Herefordshire J.P.s were dismissed, three because of their Catholic wives and one because of his mother's Catholicism. Despite the exclusion from local government, along with recusancy fines and confiscations of inheritances inflicted on those who refused to conform to the Protestant church, many Catholics in the county chose to retain their faith. They suffered further in the 1640s and 1650s from many fines levied on them by Parliament, and from sequestrations and sales of their estates. The extent of these seizures and fines in Herefordshire perhaps explains the fears of Sir Robert Harley in November 1641 over the number of Catholics in the county. He expected a papist rising in the region and was concerned about the influence of the Herbergs of Raglan Castle, a powerful Catholic family in Monmouthshire.

The retention of Catholicism by many people in Herefordshire, while Puritanism was much less widespread, may serve to illustrate the conservative nature of the county and its sluggish response to new influences. This conservatism, brought about perhaps by geographical isolation and economic backwardness, led to much of the population supporting Charles I during the Civil War, or at least conforming to the Royalist administration, rather than taking the side of Parliament. Ironically, the strength of Royalism in Herefordshire meant that a more radical administration operated in the county from the late 1640s onwards, especially with the expulsion of Presbyterians from local government after December 1648 which, added to the earlier removal of the Royalists, left few men of wealth and status eligible to serve as J.P.s and on local committees. Thus the pre-war 'county community' of ruling gentry was replaced by men of lower rank and wealth, a trend that continued until the restoration of the squirearchy in 1660. These developments form the main theme of this study, but it is necessary first of all to look more fully at the Herefordshire county government and its personnel in the years before the Civil War.
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CHAPTER II

County Government, 1625-1640

The most important and prestigious officials in county government were the deputy lieutenants, the Justices of the Peace and the sheriff. These positions were held by the gentry of the greatest wealth and status, who thus formed a ruling oligarchy held together by class and county identity, and motivated by a mixture of duty and self-interest. The central government depended upon these officials for the maintenance of law and order in the counties, for the collection of taxes and for the local military administration. For Herefordshire, a lord lieutenant, operating from Ludlow in Shropshire, had overall charge of the militia and the raising of troops. His authority covered Wales and much of the border region, and it was the deputy lieutenants who carried out his instructions in the counties. These deputy lieutenants were often selected from the oldest and wealthiest of the squirearchical families.

The sheriff, meanwhile, had lost much of his military importance since the introduction of the lieutenancy in the sixteenth century. Similarly, his judicial role in charge of the county court had declined in relation to that of the J.P., following the development of the magistracy and the growth of the quarter sessions since the later Middle Ages. By the seventeenth century, the sheriff had already lost his medieval pre-eminence in county government, and the only politically influential function of importance remaining in his control was his being responsible for the organisation of the election of 'knights of the shire' to represent the county in Parliament; he could use his authority at elections to sway proceedings in favour of the candidate he preferred. The other tasks of this official, many of which he left to his under-sheriff, were tedious and trivial, and included the supervision of the county gaol and prisoners, the collection of royal revenues (from crown lands and from people fined by the
central courts) and the organisation of assizes, the twice-yearly visits of the circuit judges from Westminster. Thus the position of sheriff was not always coveted. It took up time and often led to financial losses because of the responsibility placed on the sheriff for debts and fines owing to the crown that were incurred during his year in office. By the seventeenth century, the appointment had become so onerous that it was frequently used as an initiation for new arrivals in Herefordshire wishing to secure for themselves a place in the county hierarchy, or on young gentlemen of established families before they were added to the Commission of the Peace.

In 1604, Sir Richard Hopton, formerly of Shropshire, who had acquired an estate in Herefordshire, was nominated for the shrievalty. He asked to be excused as he was 'a stranger in the county', but although reprieved he was considered again and appointed in 1609. Ambrose Elton junior of Ledbury was sheriff from 1645-7 before requesting not to be selected again because his service was making him fall into increasing indebtedness. Reluctant to take office in 1660 was Sir John Scudamore, Bart., of Ballingham. It appears that his fears were justified as he later blamed the unwanted appointment for debts of near £2000.

This unwillingness to accept the shrievalty was contrasted by the eagerness of local gentry to be appointed to the Commission of the Peace. The office of J.P. entailed prestige without heavy duties and financial liabilities. Apart from being required to pass judgments at the quarter sessions (usually held at Hereford for three days, four times each year), the J.P.s carried out various tasks for their districts: they checked on the operation of the poor laws, enforced trade regulations, punished recusants, licensed alehouses and annually fixed wages and prices, but the extent of an individual magistrate's activity depended on his conscientiousness. Furthermore, when commissions were appointed for the administration of charities in the shire or for the raising of subsidies and loans for the crown, then the J.P.s could rely on being included, thus
increasing their local importance even more and presenting additional opportunities for financial reward.  

Appointment to the Commission of the Peace was often a matter of inheritance, with sons succeeding fathers as J.P.s regularly; over half of the Herefordshire gentry on the Commission in 1636 were sons of earlier J.P.s. Places on the Commission would also become available for newly aggrandised families when those traditionally represented failed to produce heirs, or when a decline in economic fortunes made a family's continuing presence no longer a formality. Occasionally, political or religious indiscretions could lead to removal from the Commission. J.P.s were officially appointed by the crown, on the advice of local officials (such as the lord lieutenant and the Bishop of Hereford) and the itinerant assize judges. The Council of Wales, based at Ludlow, might also advise the government on possible additions and exclusions from the Commission, while connections with the nobility and factions at court could play a further part in the selection of local magistrates.

In the early Stuart period, the number of resident J.P.s on the Herefordshire Commission of the Peace fluctuated around the twenty mark. The shire also contained a similar number of squirearchical families that were temporarily absent from the Commission (usually because of heirs being in their minority) or barred from county government because of Catholicism. In addition to these county gentry, there were about four times as many families of 'parochial' gentry, lesser gentry of little prominence outside their parishes, but overall the gentry formed less than 2% of the population of Herefordshire; in the meantime, they owned nearly 50% of the land in the county.

The parochial gentry usually had landed incomes up to and around £100 p.a. while the incomes of the squirearchy varied mainly between £250-£750 p.a. Those with incomes near £750 p.a. or above dominated the appointments to the deputy lieutenancy and the places on the Council of Wales, as gentry representatives of
the county. Two knights of the shire were elected for each Parliament and this prestigious position was shared among the wealthiest families as the years went by. In the 1620s and 1630s, the families gaining the coveted places at the top of the county hierarchy, as well as being J.P.s, were the Scudamores of Holm Lacy, the Coningsbys of Hampton Court in Hope, the Harleys of Brampton Bryan, the Pyes of The Mynde in Much Dewchurch, the Tomkins family of Monnington, the Rudhalls of Rudhall in Weston-under-Penyard and the Brydges family of Wilton Castle in Bridstow. Of these only the Brydges and Rudhall families had estates worth well below £750 p.a. before the Civil War.  

Sir Giles Brydges, Bart. (1573-1637) may have gained his place alongside the foremost gentry partly because of his being from a younger branch of the family of Lord Chandos of Sudeley in Gloucestershire. He was also associated with Sir Giles Mompesson, while his wife was a sister of Viscount Scudamore. Besides representing Herefordshire in Parliament in 1625 and 1628, Brydges had been an M.P. for Tewkesbury (Gloucestershire) in 1621 and was created a baronet in 1627.  

John Rudhall (c.1587-1636), from an ancient Herefordshire family, was a grandson of Sir James Croft, an Elizabethan privy councillor. He was an M.P. for West Looe (Cornwall) in 1626 and married the wealthy widow of Sir Alexander Chocke of Wiltshire in 1628.  

Also established in Herefordshire from medieval times were the Scudamore, Harley and Tomkins families. Viscount Scudamore was at the summit of the hierarchy, not only because of his title, but through his appointment as custos rotulorum at the head of the Commission of the Peace.  

Sir Walter Pye senior (1571-1635) was the first of his family to gain county gentry status. He qualified as a barrister in 1597 and was an M.P. for Scarborough (Yorkshire) in the same year. During a successful legal career, he eventually gained the position of Attorney of the Court of Wards in London. Knighted in 1621, during the following decade both he and his eldest son were returned at times as M.P.s for Brecon. Pye senior invested carefully in land,
building up a large estate in the south of Herefordshire. His first wife was a sister of John Rudhall and he later married the widow of Ellis Crispe, a wealthy London alderman.17 The Coningsbys, meanwhile, were newcomers to the county from Worcestershire. In the late sixteenth century, Sir Thomas Coningsby (c.1551-1625) of Worcestershire, returned from military service for the crown on the continent and enriched himself as a steward of royal manors in the Welsh border region. He used his wealth to purchase many small landholdings in the area around Hope in Herefordshire. On his death, he left his eldest son, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, an estate there worth near £750 p.a., along with lands of a similar value in other counties.18

In this group of foremost gentry, only the Tomkins family were not elected as knights of the shire at any time. James Tomkins (1569-1636), a deputy lieutenant in 1624, was returned to Parliament as a burgess for Leominster in 1624, 1625, 1626 and 1628. He also campaigned for the re-enfranchisement of the borough of Weobley. As he owned the local manor, Tomkins could thus create a 'pocket' borough for his family by these means. Weobley did regain its parliamentary representation, in 1628, but how Tomkins achieved this success is not clear. The marriage of his eldest son, William Tomkins (c.1600-1640) with the daughter of the influential Sir George Morton, Bart., of Dorset, may have played a part in his schemes. More important perhaps was a link with the Walter family; Sir John Walter, who had been active in the re-enfranchisement of the borough of Hertford, was an uncle of Edward Littleton, Tomkins's fellow representative for Leominster in the House of Commons in 1625 and 1626. It was possibly Walter's influence that decided the case for Weobley and his son William was one of the burgesses returned in 1628 from the re-enfranchised borough, along with William Tomkins.19

Weobley was to follow Leominster in the practice of usually electing local gentry or representatives from outside the shire. Hereford alone made a habit of choosing its M.P.s from its own citizenry. This meant that with only eight
parliamentary seats available in Herefordshire, and just six before 1628, many of the county gentry found any desire for a place at Westminster difficult to satisfy. Moreover, as this was one less reason for travelling outside the county, it may have consolidated a localism already engendered by geographical and economic isolation. To judge the extent of this localism, a more detailed analysis of the county gentry is useful and can be carried out by examining the members of the last full Commission of the Peace surviving from before the Civil War, that of 1636.20

Excluding assize judges, honorary members and representatives for the clergy, the Commission contained nineteen resident Herefordshire gentry (although Viscount Scudamore was in France, as ambassador, at this time, while Sir Edward Powell, Bart., of Pengethley in Sellack often resided in London, where he had legal and commercial interests).21 Only six of the nineteen had extensive property in other shires and just one, Wallop Brabazon, was not from a family established in Herefordshire before 1603. Brabazon (c.1585-c.1675) was a younger son of a Warwickshire family that had connections and influence in Ireland. Around 1617, he married Anne Blount of Grendon, the daughter of a recusant lesser gentry family. An uncle of hers was Sir James Blount, who had served under Lord Mountjoy in Ireland. In the decades before the Civil War, Brabazon built up an estate at Eaton, near Leominster, to the value of about £300 p.a., and he made his way into the ruling hierarchy, being made sheriff in 1630 and appearing on the Commission of the Peace in 1632.22

Of the other magistrates in 1636, four were from families with Tudor origins in the county: Sir Richard Hopton (c.1580–1653) possessed an estate in Shropshire but in the last few years of Elizabeth's reign he married a daughter of another branch of the Hopton family. She was the heiress of an estate worth about £500 p.a. at Canon Frome in Herefordshire. Sir Richard thus acquired this estate and resided there. Besides his landed wealth, he was also later described
as a usurer. Sir Edward Powell, Bart. (c.1578-1653) came from a family of obscure origins that moved from south Herefordshire to make their fortunes in London in the second half of the sixteenth century. Success in their endeavours allowed one of the Powells to purchase property worth over £600 p.a. at Pengethley in Herefordshire in 1583. Edward, a barrister in 1613 and a baronet in 1622, inherited Pengethley, an estate which he extended following a lucrative legal and commercial career, and a marriage with the daughter of Sir Peter Vanlore, a London merchant. Fitzwilliam Coningsby (c.1595-1666) had succeeded his father at Hampton Court in Hope in 1625. Whereas Sir Thomas had apparently resided mainly in Worcestershire while building up his estate at Hope, Fitzwilliam integrated himself fully in the county community of Herefordshire. An old feud, of the late sixteenth century between the Coningsbys and the Crofts of Croft Castle, which had led to some affrays involving their retainers in Hereford and London, was long since pacified. Fitzwilliam Coningsby was an M.P. for the county in 1621. He married Cecilia Neville, daughter of Lord Abergavenny. The fourth of these 'Tudor families' was the Elton family of The Hazle in Ledbury. They had arrived from Cheshire in the mid-sixteenth century and featured in the Herefordshire visitation of 1569. Ambrose Elton senior (1572-1659), a magistrate in 1636, had land worth around £200 p.a. He married the daughter of Sir Edward Aston of Tixall in Staffordshire.

Fourteen of the nineteen J.P.s in 1636 were from medieval Herefordshire families, with most of them long established in the squirearchy. This is similar to Kent, Lancashire, Cheshire and Sussex where 75% or more of the county gentry were of pre-Tudor origins in their shires. In the East Anglian counties, however, the figure was less than 50%. As regards marriages, in Lancashire and Kent most of the gentry chose daughters of families within their respective shires; 82% did so in Kent, and around 71% in Lancashire. There is a figure of around 71% for Norfolk also, while other estimates are: Suffolk 69%, Cheshire 65%, Essex 43%,
Hertfordshire 37%, while in Glamorgan less than 17% of the leading gentry had wives from other counties. In Herefordshire, only just over 25% of the marriages of the J.P.s of the 1636 Commission were to daughters of local families, while for all the gentry involved in county government from 1625-61 the figure is about 42%. It appears in Herefordshire that the higher a man's status the less likely he was to marry into a local family.

This may argue against the idea of a self-contained county community in Herefordshire. Possibly the choice of brides was motivated by a need for marriage portions larger than those obtainable from the comparatively poorer Herefordshire gentry families. Sir Robert Harley was even dissatisfied by the amount offered by the wealthy Sir Thomas Coningsby, and the match planned with Coningsby's daughter was broken off, with Harley looking outside the shire instead. Many of the wives of the county gentry, if not from Herefordshire, were from merchant families of London and the south-east; seven of the J.P.s of 1636 married into families of this region, including Berkshire and Buckinghamshire: Powell's wife came from London; Harley's first wife was from Essex. Sir Walter Pye junior (1610-1659), Henry Lingen's brother-in-law, married twice, both times into Buckinghamshire families. An uncle of his, Sir Robert Pye, had prospered as an Exchequer official and acquired a large estate in Berkshire. John Abrahall (c.1570-1640) of Ingeston in Foy, married a daughter of Sir George Gifforde of Buckinghamshire in 1610, while his second wife was from Gloucestershire. Abrahall's land in Herefordshire was probably worth less than £150 p.a., but his personal estate on his death in 1640 was put at £2680. John Hoskyns of Morehampton in Dore had married Benedicta Bourne in 1601, the widow of a friend of his whom he had met at the Middle Temple. She came from a Kent family. Thomas Wigmore (c.1605-c.1653) of Shobdon was from a medieval Herefordshire family and had lands worth about £200 p.a., but suffered much from debt. He married the daughter of Sir Humphrey Handford, a London alderman. Another J.P. who married
into a London family was John Vaughan (c.1585-1641) of Hergest in Kington, while his eldest son James, who died in 1640, also married the daughter of a London merchant. 34

About 80% of the marriages of the J.P.s of 1636 were to families of squirearchical status or above. Those whose wives were from the lesser gentry included Wallop Brabazon and James Tomkins. Brabazon's wife might have been of the county gentry but for her family's recusancy, while the heiress who married James Tomkins came from the Boyle family of Hereford, one of the more important urban families of the time. Henry Vaughan (c.1555-c.1626) of Bredwardine also married a daughter of the Boyle family. His son Roger Vaughan (c.1588-c.1643), one of the J.P.s in 1636, married Joan Husbands, who was from a lesser gentry family of Wormbridge. Heiresses, nevertheless, could prove attractive brides, no matter how far inferior in status their families were. Brabazon's wife, for example, provided him with property to enlarge his Herefordshire estate. 35

Marriage ties could also link the county gentry more closely with other members of the Commission of the Peace. Sir John Kyrle, Bart. (1568-1650) had married a cousin of the Scudamore family of Holm Lacy. Kyrle's father, a younger son of a family at Walford, made a career as a lawyer, purchasing land at Much Marcle with his riches so that his son, a baronet in 1627, was worth around £450 p.a. 36 Married to a cousin of Kyrle's was another of the J.P.s of 1636, William Scudamore (c.1578-1649), the head of a cadet branch of the Holm Lacy family that had settled at Ballingham in the fifteenth century. Even by marrying into families of other shires, it was still possible to forge links within Herefordshire; Sir Robert Harley's third wife, Brilliana Conway, was a cousin of Sir William Croft of Croft Castle. 37

Less obvious ties of this nature in addition to direct links, such as the marriages between the Lingen and Pye families and others, can be used to include most of the magistrates in 1636 on one genealogical tree. Other examples are the
marriage of a sister of Sir William Croft to one of the sons of James Tomkins, while Tomkins had another son who married one of the sisters of Sir Walter Pye, the brother-in-law of Henry Lingen and of a son of Roger Vaughan. In addition, a grandmother of Pye had Sir John Kyrle, Bart., as a nephew. The list goes on. Such ties of kinship have been noticed within the ruling hierarchies of many English counties, but in Herefordshire the families established these relationships mainly by the marriages of their younger children, while the more important marriages were usually made outside the county. This, to some extent, may have mitigated the localism of the Herefordshire ruling class. These marriages often led to acquisition of land in other shires as well, but the majority of the J.P.s were reliant on their local estates for much the greater part of their landed income. About a third of those on the Commission of the Peace in 1636 held property outside Herefordshire that was comparable to their estate inside the county, and for all the people involved in county government from 1625-61 only about a fifth can be found to have owned extensive estates outside Herefordshire.

Other factors could erode the localism of the county gentry. For most of the gentlemen of Herefordshire the greatest break from their home county during their life was when they left to complete their education at the Inns of Court and University. It was in these establishments that friendships were made and ties fostered with families of other regions. The family connections could also be confirmed by marriages. Not all of the J.P.s of 1636, however, had gone to Oxford or Cambridge University. Eleven of the nineteen went to Oxford, none to Cambridge, while nine went on to one of the Inns of Court in London; seven of these went to the Middle Temple, in preference to Gray's Inn, Lincoln's Inn and the Inner Temple. Two (Hoskyns and Powell) qualified as barristers. Two did not go to Oxford University but did stay at the Inns of Court, with Lingen attending at the Middle Temple and Hopton going to the Inner Temple. Six went to neither the Universities nor the Inns. A preference for Oxford and the Middle Temple is
apparent, and is further indicated by only three of the people in county government from 1625-61 attending Cambridge University, while almost half of those registered at the Inns of Court chose the Middle Temple rather than the three other main Inns. Brasenose seems to have been the most popular college for the Herefordshire county gentry; almost a quarter of those of 1625-61 who went to Oxford chose to attend at Brasenose. Magdalen College at Oxford has been noted as a centre of Puritanism in the years before the Civil War, but only Viscount Scudamore of the magistrates of 1636 was educated there, and he was a supporter of Laud. The 1636 Commission contained only two certain Puritans, Harley and Kyrle; the former attended Oriel College; the latter had no background at the Inns or Universities. 40

The importance of a sound education was recognised by Viscount Scudamore. Writing to his grandson at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1667, he recommended the works of Aristotle, Euclid and Justinian, but most of all he stressed the learning of English Common Law, 'which will be a study that will make you an Englishman fit for employment'. 41 Someone who knew the worthiness of this advice was John Hoskyns (1566-1638). He was born a younger son of a lesser gentry family of Llanwarne, but he received a good education, became a lawyer and married a wealthy widow. Hoskyns also established himself as an important landowner in Hereford, often representing the borough in the House of Commons, but it was from law that most of his riches came; he gained many legal offices, eventually becoming a Serjeant-at-law in 1623, by which time he had acquired a large estate at Morehampton, worth around £300 p.a., as well as having won his way into the Herefordshire squirearchy. 42

The success in his legal career was no doubt aided by the 'prodigious memorie' that Aubrey credits to him. 43 Hoskyns was also a renowned wit, a poet and a scholar of note:
'His conversation was exceedingly pleasant, and would make verses on the Roade, where he was the best Company in the world. He was a great master of the Latin and Greke languages; a great Divine; made the best Latin Epitaphs of his time. He understood the Lawe well, but worst at that'.

Ben Jonson looked up to him as a mentor; he was a friend of John Donne and Sir Walter Raleigh; he had the misfortune of joining Raleigh in the Tower in 1614 after criticising James I in Parliament. His life in London probably increased his contacts with a Herefordshire neighbour, Sir Walter Pye senior, the Attorney of the Court of Wards, but relations between them appear not to have been amicable. A cause of the enmity may have been Pye's Catholic views; Hoskyns, though not a radical Puritan, can be described as a conservative Protestant, and he had no liking for Catholics. Aubrey, however, was content with the explanation that Hoskyns disliked the haughty nature of his neighbour. On Pye's death in the Christmas of 1635, some lines were written, credited to Hoskyns:

'If Any aske, who here doth lye,  
Say, tis the devills Christmas Pye.  
Death was the Cooke, the Oven, the Urne,  
No Ward for this, The Pye doth burne,  
Yett serve it in, Divers did wishe,  
The Devill, long since, had had this Dishe'.

Hoskyns attempted often at levity in his verse rather than solemn reflection. He may be best remembered in literature, not for his poetry, but for his 'Directions for Speech and Style', an advisory essay on modes of expression. His death in 1638, as described by Aubrey, was hardly an end befitting one of the most respected literary figures of his age: 'Being at the Assises or Sessions at Hereford, a massive countrey fellowe trod on his toe, which caused a Gangrene which was the cause of his death'. The life of a magistrate obviously had its perils.

With his legal and literary activities, and his seat in Parliament, Hoskyns spent much of his time away from his native county; although he 'was wont to say that all those that came to London were either Carrion or Crowes', Hoskyns could
be seen as much a part of the society of the capital as that of his 'county community'. Other leading gentry, such as Sir Edward Powell, Bart., of Pengethley, had interests in London; Powell was also designated of Fulham, and had interests in Somerset as well. Sir Robert Harley spent much time in London, especially after being appointed Master of the Mint in 1626.

Both Harley and Viscount Scudamore, who owned a sizeable property in London, were associated with the faction of the Duke of Buckingham in the 1620s. Harley married the daughter of Lord Conway in 1623, and as Conway was a client of Buckingham the appointment to the Mint was probably owing something to this connection. Moreover, Harley was returned as an M.P. for Evesham (Worcestershire) in 1628, possibly through his links with the Conway family. Election from boroughs outside the county of residence often indicates court or noble favour. Scudamore, married to a relation of Endymion Porter, may have found that his friendship with Laud bound him even more closely to the Buckingham faction. Both Scudamore and Harley spoke in support of Buckingham in Parliament.

While Harley was a Puritan and Scudamore a High Anglican, to complete this religious diversity was another of Buckingham's supporters from Herefordshire, Sir Walter Pye senior who can be termed a pro-Catholic; Pye's appointment in the Court of Wards as Attorney had been helped by patronage from the Duke of Buckingham. Sir John Kyrle, Bart., and Sir Edward Powell, Bart., can be linked to court patrons as well. They were both associated with Sir John Coke who rose in crown service during this period to become Secretary of State. Coke purchased an estate at Hall Court in Much Marcle, which was his country seat until he moved to Derbyshire in 1628. His neighbours in Herefordshire, Powell and Kyrle, corresponded with Coke in the 1620s and 1630s. Coke was another member of the Buckingham faction at court. Also belonging to this group for a time was Sir William Croft (1593-1645) of Croft Castle.

Croft was from one of the oldest and most respected families in the county.
His great-grandfather, Sir James Croft, had been a privy councillor of Elizabeth I while his father, Sir Herbert Croft, had led the gentry of shires bordering Wales who unsuccessfully campaigned against the authority of the Council of Wales in their area, in the early seventeenth century. By taking up this issue, Sir Herbert risked his career as a courtier and as a steward of crown manors in Wales and the Marches. The result was a decline in the fortunes of the family so that when he retired, a disillusioned old man, going to the Spanish Netherlands in 1617 and abandoning himself to Catholicism, his son was left with an estate in Herefordshire worth about £200 p.a. only. Sir Herbert died at Douai in 1629. Sir William Croft, meanwhile, tried to recover the position of the family. In his favour was his being a nephew of Lord Conway; his mother was Conway's sister-in-law. He made connections at court and apparently journeyed to Spain in 1623 with Prince Charles and Buckingham. Later he became a gentleman of the privy chamber of Charles I. Croft had been an M.P. for Launceston (Cornwall) in 1614 and represented Malmesbury (Wiltshire) in 1626 and 1628. It seems, however, that he quarrelled with the Duke of Buckingham and lost favour at court, although he was associated with another member of the nobility, Robert Sidney, the Earl of Leicester. Buckingham's assassination in 1628 and Conway's death in 1631 disrupted ties of patronage. Harley's post at the Mint was disputed and after a protracted legal case he was removed in 1635. Scudamore chose to retire from political life in London, although he did accept the appointment as ambassador to France in 1635, which was probably due to Laud's influence. One source of patronage for the Herefordshire gentry in the 1630s was that of Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, who later became commander of the main Parliamentarian army in the First Civil War. His estates in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire safeguarded his influence in the region; Sir Walter Pye senior gained the stewardship of some of these lands, as did Walter Kyrle of Ross, an M.P. for Leominster in 1640 and a
J.P. in 1641. Sir Robert Harley can also be associated with the Essex faction and he may have felt more at ease to be linked with a fellow Puritan, rather than with Buckingham as before. Pye's motives, however, appear to have been solely mercenary. Sir Walter Pye junior and Sir Robert Harley were returned as knights of the shire to the Short Parliament of April 1640, probably through links with the Essex faction; in October 1640, Harley and Fitzwilliam Coningsby wrote to the Earl of Essex asking for his support towards their election as M.P.s for the county. Coningsby, however, had other ties in London, closer to court, as was indicated by his part in the soap monopoly in 1636 which caused him to be expelled from the House of Commons in 1641.

Ties with the nobility and the court, careers in law, commerce, administration and politics, and education at Oxford, Cambridge and London were all what may be termed 'voluntary' mitigations of localism, but for the county community the most constant reminder of the world outside their 'country' and the greatest threat to its independence was the interference in the local administration from the central government. The county gentry's relations with the government of Charles I were often characterised by opposition to the various financial and administrative innovations; the gentry probably resented their local power being encroached upon, while also they disliked the crown's increasing demands on their wealth through taxation. Without the co-operation of the local rulers, the government's policies would obviously meet with difficulties.

Earlier, in the reign of James I, there had been widespread antagonism towards the Council of Wales, an extension of royal prerogative power, with legal and administrative powers over Wales and the Marches; it was this claim of the Council, based at Ludlow, to have authority over four English shires (Worcestershire, Shropshire, Gloucestershire and Herefordshire) as well as Wales (including Monmouthshire) that aroused opposition. Although the 'Four Shires' had representation on the Council of Wales, they had very little influence there,
unlike the President of the Council and his committee of judges who were in regular attendance at Ludlow; they made certain that the Council of Wales reflected the will of the crown, and not the wishes of the local gentry. The legislation that gave the Council its authority was not clear on the point of the English counties and the matter was heavily debated, especially as the interference from Ludlow with the jurisdiction of the county gentry came to be resented. 62

The main campaign of action against the Council of Wales was under the leadership of Sir Herbert Croft from 1604-1614. Most of the prominent Herefordshire gentry of the time united with their counterparts in other shires in opposition. Sir Thomas Coningsby, James Tomkins, John Hoskyns, the Scudamores of Holm Lacy and Kentchurch, the Rudhalls, the Whitneys of Whitney and the Baskervilles of Eardisley all gave their support to Croft. Notably, the Harleys did not join this group. Sir Robert was M.P. for Radnor in 1604 but he did not join in the opposition to the Council of Wales in Parliament; also in 1604, he received the appointment as keeper of Bringwood and Prestwood Forests from the king. 63

A successful test case in 1604 ('Farley's case') saw the judges at Westminster agree to the principal of the exemption of the English shires from Ludlow's rule. Attempts were then made to win the king's final ratification of the decision of the judges, but James I refused; he was determined to maintain his prerogative powers. Nevertheless, from 1605-10, the authority of Ludlow was largely ignored in the border counties while Croft, Hoskyns and others were trying to pass legislation through Parliament establishing the 1604 ruling. Lack of support from other counties hindered progress until 1606 when an act was passed by the Commons for approval in the House of Lords; there it was rejected. A second bill was dropped after the king agreed to limit the authority of the Council of Wales. He went back on this concession, however, when a new President,
Lord Eure, was appointed in 1608 with reinforced powers. The King continued to uphold the Council, but there was some hope with the negotiations for the 'Great Contract' in 1610, which also included the demands of Croft and his supporters. The failure of this attempted compromise between Salisbury and Parliament therefore saw the opposition to the Council of Wales defeated again. Around 1614, there was a plan to gain help from the Howard faction at court in favour of another attack on the Council, but once more the cause of the 'Four Shires' failed, in the 'Addled' Parliament of 1614. 64

There is evidence of hostility to Herefordshire's being included under Ludlow's jurisdiction continuing after the failure of the 'Four Shires' campaign. In 1626, the Earl of Northampton, then President of the Council of Wales, had been empowered to raise a loan from Wales and the border counties. The deputy lieutenants and J.P.s of Herefordshire wrote to him, questioning his authority to act in their county in this matter, and they stated their resentment over being included virtually as part of Wales. 65 Some of the leading gentry were members of the Council in the 1620s and 1630s, including Lord Scudamore, Thomas Harley and his son, Sir Robert, John Hoskyns and Fitzwilliam Coningsby. They played little part in the administration at Ludlow, however, and their honorary membership did not ensure their support. Sir Robert Harley had particular cause to feel indignant over the interference of the Council of Wales in his affairs: in 1630, a servant of Sampson Eure was held under arrest by Harley for poaching in Bringwood Forest. Eure was the King's Attorney in the Marches and he had influence on the Council of Wales, so he was able to obtain an order from Ludlow for his servant's release. 66 Encroachments of this sort from Ludlow in Herefordshire's local affairs probably contributed to a petition from the county in 1641 which listed the jurisdiction of the Council of Wales among its complaints. 67

The Council of Wales, an organ of central government in the localities, was only one of the grievances felt by the 'county community' of Herefordshire in this
period. There was also sustained pressure from the central government directly, in the spheres of military organisation, social welfare and taxation, with a stream of orders and directions emanating from the Privy Council instructing the county rulers in their business of local administration. The English involvement in wars on the continent during the early years of the reign of Charles I, for example, necessitated increased military activity in the counties. The deputy lieutenants were instructed to intensify training of the militia, and they had to organise volunteers and impress troops for foreign service. They were also responsible for arrangement of billeting, and for the levying of 'coat and conduct money' and other taxes for militia organisation.

The raising of troops in Herefordshire was carried out with apparent efficiency; in 1625, a hundred and fifty men were impressed and sent on to Plymouth; in 1627, one hundred men were raised from the county. Difficulties arose in the following year when three hundred soldiers were billeted in Herefordshire before their departure for Portsmouth. Many people refused to pay coat and conduct money for these troops. The problem of collecting contributions from the populace also hampered the musters and militia training. For Wales and the border region, the Earl of Northampton was lord lieutenant as well as President of the Council of Wales; in December 1626, he praised Sir John Scudamore, Bart., of Holm Lacy (Viscount in 1628) for his exertions in the organisation of the trained bands in Herefordshire. Northampton was disappointed in 1627, however, when the deputy lieutenants wrote about refusals in the county to pay towards the expenses of musters. Hugh Vaughan, the muster-master, complained in 1633 that he had received no pay for five years, but the deputy lieutenants appear to have been more concerned that traditional procedures be safeguarded rather than worrying over the effectiveness of the organisation. They wrote to the Earl of Bridgewater, Northampton's successor, asserting that the muster-master ought to be paid at the quarter sessions, with
the J.P.s working alongside the deputy lieutenants in the matter. 74 Again, in 1637, the Privy Council was informed of neglect in the collection of money for the Herefordshire muster-master, and they told the Earl of Bridgewater to investigate the matter. 75

Thus financial difficulties hampered the government's militia reforms, while the country gentry, perhaps resenting the extra burden of work placed upon them, appear not to have been over-co-operative. They did, however, show a willingness to comply with the Privy Council's attempts to improve the organisation for dealing with the unemployed and with the administration of poor relief. The 'Book of Orders' of 1631, the Council's new instructions in these matters and in other areas of social policy, was replied to by the Herefordshire J.P.s with a series of reports detailing their strenuous activities; a group of magistrates, for example, wrote from Leominster that in less than a year they had suppressed fourteen unlicensed alehouses, apprenticed fourteen children and punished over four hundred 'wandering persons'. 76 The sheriff and the visiting assize judges were used to verify the trustworthiness of these reports. 77

The J.P.s found their tasks increased following a severe outbreak of plague in 1636-7, particularly in the Ross area and in the western parishes of the county. Extra poor relief needed to be provided for bereaved families and there was some co-operation with the administration in Radnorshire in order to deal with the organisation more efficiently. 78 The overall administration of social welfare in Herefordshire was probably held back by people's reluctance to pay towards the poor rates, and with this in mind the J.P.s may have found the government's demands for increased efficiency annoying, although this grievance was not forcibly expressed; at the end of the 'Personal Rule' of Charles I, the gentry chose to voice their opinions more in other matters. Perhaps the Book of Orders and the government's social policies of the 1630s have been given an exaggerated importance, especially when considered alongside the increased
The rise in the costs of national government under James I and Charles I led to the crown needing extra taxes and loans from the country in order to satisfy its financial needs. An indication of Herefordshire's reaction to these demands came in 1622, when the magistrates replied to the Privy Council following a request for funds from the county:

'The people of the county earnestly plead to be excused from the voluntary contribution. The letters of the Council thereon urging a cheerful giving were read in a public assembly, but received with dead silence'.

Although some money was raised, there were defaulters, whose names the J.P.s did not appear too eager to send to the Privy Council. Charles I carried on this policy of asking for what was virtually taxation without the consent of Parliament, but in 1626 he received little encouragement from the response from Herefordshire. The levying of the Forced Loan in 1627 gave the government more hope of success at first. In February, commissioners in Herefordshire and Shropshire earned the praises of the Privy Council for their work, and in March it was reported that nobody in Hereford was found 'refractory or backward' in their willingness to contribute. Nevertheless, when a list of collections and names of defaulters arrived in London that summer, the Privy Council included the Herefordshire commissioners among those of other counties as worthy of disapproval. Further reports from Hereford in 1627 revealed the names of more people refusing to pay. Even when a subsidy was granted by Parliament, it did not ensure full co-operation. In September 1628, the Privy Council had to reprove the collectors in Herefordshire and other counties for their tardiness.

Without Parliament granting taxation, Charles I had to rely on loans and other financial expedients during his 'Personal Rule' of 1629-40. In 1631, £11,000 was borrowed from forty-four of the gentry in Herefordshire. Money was also raised by fines for the distraint of knighthood. J.P.s were involved as
commissioners for the collection of these fines and some, including John Abrahall, Roger Vaughan, Wallop Brabazon, Humphrey Cornwall, Thomas Wigmore and Sir John Kyrle, Bart., were fined themselves. 87

As with the rest of the populace, the county gentry suffered from the introduction of Ship Money to inland counties in 1635; they had an additional grievance, however, because of their being excluded from the administration of the tax within the shire, whereas usually the J.P.'s could be expected to be involved as commissioners for any taxation. Instead of sharing the responsibility among the J.P.'s, the task of raising a Ship Money quota of £4000 from Herefordshire in 1635 was placed upon the sheriff of the county. The following year saw the amount reduced to £3500 and it remained at this figure for 1636-40, except in 1638 when £1200 only was demanded. Further sums were levied separately from Hereford and Leominster. 88 The sheriff managed to collect most of the money due for the first year, but the annual renewal of the tax meant that large arrears began to show during the following shrievalties. In August 1638, arrears added up to nearly £3000, which was over a quarter of the total amount charged on the county since 1635. By September 1640, the arrears were over £5000. 89

Economic depression, the effects of plague and crop failures all may have prevented some people from paying, while others were simply unwilling to contribute; these problems were not mitigated by the inadequate administrative machinery in operation for raising the tax. When a new sheriff was appointed, the previous sheriff would still be required to collect arrears due from his time in office. This led to more than one official acting at the same time and there was much confusion; writs and levies of money were delivered to the wrong sheriff and the officials began blaming one another for neglect and inefficiency. 90 In 1636, to add to the confusion, John Rudhall died when still in office, to be replaced by Thomas Wigmore. Rudhall had been the only one of the sheriffs to question the Ship Money writ. The others professed eagerness to comply, while
making excuses for their not being able to raise the sums required. Often they blamed the high constables of the hundreds and the petty constables in the parishes, who were accused of obstructing proceedings rather than facilitating the work of collection. 91

It appears, however, that the major reason for the eventual collapse of Ship Money collection in Herefordshire was that opposition to the tax gained support from the gentry. In 1637, there was a petition from the J.P.s against the levying of Ship Money, pointing out that the shire was suffering from harvest failures and plague. Some of the J.P.s signing the petition were formerly sheriffs who had been in charge of the Ship Money collection. Sheriff Henry Lingen, appointed in 1637, later stated that the people's expectation of an answer to this petition severely hindered his attempts to collect the tax. 92 Lingen also complained that while the Privy Council had ordered the magistrates to allow high constables to remain in office until they had completed their accounting with the sheriff, this instruction was disobeyed; to make the sheriff's business more difficult, the magistrates had appointed new constables. Sir Richard Hopton, one of those signing the petition in 1637, was named as the instigator of this scheme. 93

The Privy Council appeared unsympathetic to any excuses from the sheriffs, but they may have realised the importance of the opposition from the squirearchy. The sheriffs appointed in 1634-7 had all been taken from the Commission of the Peace. 94 In 1638, the Council may have felt it necessary to look further afield for a man more eager to act on their behalf in the 'shipping business'; Sir Robert Whitney (c.1592-1653) of Whitney was chosen. He came from an old Herefordshire family, long established in the county hierarchy, but he had been excluded from the Commission during the reign of Charles I, possibly because of Catholic connections; his sister married a Catholic, John Wigmore of Lucton. Whitney was a wealthy man, however, with land in Herefordshire, worth over
400 p.a., as well as estates in Somerset, Gloucestershire, Warwickshire and Radnorshire. He had been knighted in 1608, the year he also married a daughter of Sir Thomas Lucy of Warwickshire. In 1614, he had been sheriff of Radnorshire so that he had some experience in the office. Nevertheless, his time as sheriff of Herefordshire could not have been a happy one. He was complaining, in 1639, of the lack of co-operation he gained locally, and he warned that if the Council summoned him for accounting, then his absence from the county would cause his subordinates to 'cool their diligence'. The replies he received were not encouraging; the Privy Council wrote that they 'cannot but much marvel' over his excuses, and he was informed that the collection of Ship Money had been neglected by him 'more than by any other sheriff in the whole kingdom'.

For the year in office of 1639-40, the unlucky successor to Sir Robert Whitney was Thomas Alderne (c.1590-c.1646) of Hereford. He had been mayor in 1624 and was involved in the city administration throughout the 1620s and 1630s. While having merchant interests, he was also a proctor in the diocesan court and worked as a chapter clerk to the dean and canons of the cathedral at Hereford.

He claimed his income was less than £120 p.a. Earlier, Alderne had been among a group of parishioners of Holmer, near Hereford, refusing to pay for land there towards the county Ship Money quota, because they regarded the parish as within Hereford and under the city's independent jurisdiction.

By 1639, cash shortages, along with the people's expectation of a Parliament to be summoned soon, which would resolve the question of Ship Money, meant that the sheriff's work now entailed not so much the collection of money but the distraining of those in the county who refused to pay. Furthermore, Alderne's progress was held up for a time, in May 1640, when he was arrested and imprisoned by the Privy Council for giving false information regarding the murder of his under-sheriff. Alderne's report had led the Council to believe that this official had been killed while collecting Ship Money, when it appears that he was
carrying out other duties at the time. Once this affair had undergone a thorough investigation, a chastised Thomas Alderne made his way back to Herefordshire and there faced widespread opposition to his efforts when he resumed the Ship Money collection. Many of 'the better sort of people', it was reported, refused to pay, and others followed their example. John Herring of Holmer went as far as to express an opinion that 'he thought Ship Money unlawful'. The constables would not assist Alderne and parishioners refused to act as assessors and collectors; he was thus forced to travel around the county himself, with his servants, and they seized goods from defaulters in lieu of payments. It was reported that Alderne was 'greatly maligned in the county' and people brought suits of law against him in order to recover their distrained possessions.

In all, Alderne managed to raise less than a fifth of the money due on the last Ship Money writ, issued in 1639; collection of arrears continued until 1641. From 1635-41, the money extracted from Herefordshire by the tax amounted to over £11,000, still a substantial sum despite the increase in arrears year after year and the breakdown in collection in the last few years. The final arrears were less than a third of the total amount charged on the shire. Therefore, as Ship Money had raised sums comparable to subsidies but without needing Parliament's consent, the expedient could be seen as a short-term success. Nevertheless, it was a tax that could not be continued indefinitely and the extortion of money from the county in the years previous to breakdown of its collection had created much ill-will. The J.P.s voiced the complaints of the populace over the tax, while also feeling alienated themselves because they were being by-passed in the administration of Ship Money.

The last few years of the 'Personal Rule' of Charles I witnessed not only a growth of opposition to the government over Ship Money, but also saw Herefordshire's military organisation in disarray. The war with Scotland in 1639 meant that men had to be provided for an army to go north. The deputy lieutenants were
ordered to raise two hundred men and prepare them for a march out of the county to a rendezvous in Yorkshire; these troops were to have equipment and supplies financed by further taxes on the populace. With the difficulties over Ship Money at this time, it might have been expected that there would be refusals to pay the military taxes. The deputy lieutenants also met with opposition to their requisitioning of horses. Such was the inadequacy of the organisation that the soldiers levied from Herefordshire were described as 'for the most part a naked, poor conditioned people, and of the meanest sort'. Not enough money had been collected for their supplies and in April 1639, when they began to march north, these troops protested because of their 'want of fit clothing or diet'. Near Ludlow they mutinied, attacking the officer in charge, and many of the soldiers returned to their homes. Unwillingness to serve outside the county perhaps lay behind their behaviour, in addition to their complaints over lack of supplies.  

The deputy lieutenants, despite all the reforms and efforts at greater efficiency in the 1620s and 1630s, had failed at the crucial moment. Possibly they were concerned more with the development of a local militia to defend the shire rather than with raising a force to fight many miles to the north, and this may also have contributed to people's reluctance to contribute money towards the cost of supplies. As with Ship Money and the Book of Orders, opposition to government instructions was motivated partly by financial concerns as well as by resentment over interference in the independence of the county community.
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CHAPTER III

The County Community, 1640-1642

After the humiliating defeat of his attempt to subdue the Scots in 1639, Charles I hoped to resume the war in 1640 and he therefore decided to recall Parliament in order to ask for a grant of money. Thus the 'Eleven Years' Tyranny' was brought to an end. Grievances that had built up during the 1630s were now given an opportunity to be expressed at Westminster. The M.P.s from Herefordshire for the 'Short Parliament' that met in April 1640 were Sir Robert Harley, the leading Puritan, and Sir Walter Pye, a pro-Catholic, who were the 'knights of the shire', Richard Weaver and Richard Seabourne, representing Hereford, William Smallman and Walter Kyrle, the M.P.s for Leominster, and William Tomkins with his brother Thomas who were representing Weobley. Harley and Pye may have been put forward as the county M.P.s because of connections with the Earl of Essex and they were apparently returned unopposed, although they took the precaution of gathering as many of their supporters as possible from the landholders in the shire to be present at the election.¹

Weaver and Seabourne, meanwhile, were both citizens of Hereford. Richard Weaver (c.1572-1642) was a younger son of a gentry family that had been at Aymestrey, in the Wigmore hundred, since the Middle Ages. He had established himself at Hereford and prospered in business there, while also investing in enterprises in the Americas. As well as property in and near Hereford, Weaver owned some land in Shropshire that he had gained by marriage. Prominent in the city government, he had been mayor in 1627 and was an M.P. for Hereford throughout the 1620s.² Richard Seabourne, a lawyer and Hereford alderman, was another younger son, from a family at Felton, a few miles to the north of the city. The Seabournes, established in the county in the late Middle Ages, were a family with Catholic associations. Richard was later referred to as a 'papist' and he...
supported the King during the Civil War. Earlier in life, he had trained at the New Inn and the Middle Temple, becoming a barrister in 1618, and he married a daughter of James Rodd, a wealthy Hereford merchant. In 1629, Seabourne was added to the Commission of the Peace but in following years he served as clerk of the peace and not as a J.P. Besides possessions in Hereford, he owned land at Felton and was worth over £200 p.a., not including any legal fees he earned.  

In 1632, Seabourne was sharing a chamber at the Middle Temple with another of the M.P.s of 1640, Walter Kyrle of Ross (c.1599-1650). Kyrle, yet another younger son, came from a family that had settled at Walford in medieval times. As well as qualifying as a barrister, he practised as an estate administrator; his service for the Earl of Essex may have been behind his nomination to Parliament in 1640. He probably shared the Puritan sentiments of his elder brother, James Kyrle of Walford. His wife was a widow from Gloucestershire, while his land in Herefordshire was worth less than £100 p.a., but other sources of income gave him about £500 p.a. in all. His fellow M.P. for Leominster, William Smallman (c.1615-1643) of Kinnersley was the son of another lawyer, Francis Smallman, who had owned land in Shropshire as well as in Herefordshire. Francis was sheriff of Herefordshire in 1614, M.P. for Leominster in 1621 and M.P. for Much Wenlock (Shropshire) in 1626, besides being on the Commission of the Peace. William, who inherited land worth over £500 p.a., married a daughter of Sir Robert Whitney and was appointed as a J.P. about 1637.  

The M.P.s for Weobley in the Short Parliament, William Tomkins and his younger brother Thomas, were sons of James Tomkins of Monnington, who had helped to regain the borough's franchise in 1628. Both Walter Tomkins and Richard Weaver died before the Civil War, while of the remaining M.P.s only Harley and Kyrle were Parliamentarian supporters during the war and the others were Royalists. In April 1640, however, the Herefordshire representatives in Parliament reflected the general political unity of the county, despite religious
differences, and joined in the demand at Westminster for grievances to be redressed. The hostility and lack of co-operation from these and other M.P.s caused Charles I to dismiss the Parliament. 7

Thus without his grant of supplies, the King was inviting failure by re-opening the war with Scotland in the summer of 1640. England was clearly unprepared for war. In Herefordshire, the deputy lieutenants were ordered to raise three hundred men and assemble them at Leominster, ready to march out of the county, but while the troops were levied successfully their departure was delayed; in June and July the deputy lieutenants wrote to the Earl of Bridgewater, the lord lieutenant of the region, complaining that the delay meant that the charges assessed on the county, to provide for supplies, were no longer sufficient. 8 Moreover, a number of people refused to pay the coat and conduct money, including John Greene of Allensmore, Richard Monnington of Sarnesfield and Thomas Traunter, all members of the local gentry; Greene became a J.P. in 1642. 9 The troops became troublesome and disorderly, and in July 1640 the exasperation of the populace over having to provide for them was expressed forcibly by the inhabitants of Leominster. They had been providing quarters for the army; encouraged by the town bailiff and other borough officials, they rose in protest, some armed, and a few of the soldiers were killed. 10

This breakdown in law and order along with the collapse of Ship Money collection in 1640 may be seen as a culmination of years of economic depression and harsh financial exactions; opposition to the government's policies included the gentry and the county as a whole. Thus, when Charles I suffered yet another defeat against the Scots and was forced to summon the 'Long Parliament' in the autumn of 1640, he found M.P.s united against him in a determination to have their grievances satisfied. Foremost among the complaints of the gentry and M.P.s of Herefordshire were the issues of the Council of Wales and Ship Money. 11

Sir Robert Harley and Fitzwilliam Coningsby were returned as knights of the
shire, spending over £150 in their election campaign and gaining the backing of the Earl of Essex. 12 Seabourne and Weaver represented Hereford again, while Walter Kyrle's fellow burgess for Leominster was now Sampson Eure. William Tomkins was M.P. for Weobley along with Arthur Jones, a son of Viscount Ranelagh and with no apparent connections in Herefordshire. 13

Sampson Eure (c.1595-1659) was a younger son of Sir Francis Eure (Chief Justice of North Wales in 1610) and a nephew of the Lord Eure who was President of the Council of Wales earlier in the century, dying in 1617. Sampson was born at Oxford and trained as a lawyer, becoming a barrister in 1617. He married the heiress of lands in Caernarvonshire and in following years prospered as a crown servant in Wales and the Marches. Beaumaris (Anglesey) returned him as an M.P. in 1621 and he was named on the Commission of the Peace for many Welsh counties, as well as receiving the appointment as the King's Attorney in the Marches. 14 His ties with the Council of Wales persuaded him to purchase an estate at Gatley in Leinthall Earls, in the north of Herefordshire, very near Ludlow. This acquisition was financed partly by the portion from his second marriage in about 1633. 15 In August 1640, Eure was appointed as a J.P. in Herefordshire but, although he resided at Gatley, he was not integrated into the county community. His land in Herefordshire was only worth near £100 p.a. and he possessed further estates in Wales as well as property in London, while most of his wealth accrued from his legal career. 16 He had earlier quarrelled with Sir Robert Harley and it is difficult to see him in 1640 as part of the opposition against the King in Parliament. Besides his link with the Council of Wales, he became a Serjeant-at-law in 1640 (receiving his fee from the King) and was knighted in 1641. During the First Civil War he was Speaker in the Oxford Parliament. 17

The return of Eure and Jones may suggest some crown influence in the borough elections in Herefordshire. Nevertheless, the other M.P.s appear to have represented the views of the county, as expressed in a petition from the quarter
sessions in January 1641, protesting against the Council of Wales and Ship Money. There were also requests for control of Spanish wool imports (which were cutting the price of the Herefordshire produce) and for action against weirs on rivers. Although in November 1640 there was a declaration from a group of ministers in the Hereford diocese in opposition to one of the Laudian Canons of that year, religion was only a major issue for a minority within the shire.

While Harley took up the Puritan cause in Parliament, the other M.P.s were less prominent in this matter. Meanwhile, in 1641, Thomas Tomkins (c.1605-1674) replaced his brother, who had died in 1640, as an M.P. for Weobley; he made a speech in the House of Commons in February 1641, attacking the faults of Roger Manwaring, Bishop of St. Davids in Wales, a supporter of absolutist government. As late as June 1642, Tomkins promised aid for Parliament's cause against the King. During the Civil War, however, he was a Royalist, while his brother-in-law, Sir Walter Pye, was another Royalist in the county, who had pro-Catholic sympathies. Tomkins had inherited an estate at Monnington worth over £600 p.a. but his background was that of a younger son, trained for a career in law. In 1631, he had qualified as a barrister. His motivations in 1641 are difficult to ascertain but possibly he was supporting the Common Law against absolutism and this, rather than Puritanism, may explain his attack on the Bishop of St. Davids. The effect of inheriting a large estate probably made him more conservative in following years, while in the 1660s, he supported the Anglican Church, but joined the opposition in Parliament against Clarendon.

Of the other Herefordshire M.P.s at the start of the Long Parliament, only Kyrle, and possibly Weaver, allied with the Puritanism of Sir Robert Harley, while in the county only one of the magistrates who signed the petition of January 1641 could be described with any certainty as a Puritan: James Kyrle (1594-1646), the elder brother of Walter, M.P. for Leominster, had sheltered a Puritan preacher at Walford. His wife, Anne Waller, was a grand-daughter of John Hampden. In
1629, he was appointed as sheriff and later, in 1637, was added to the Commission of the Peace. 21

Besides Kyrle, three of the J.P.s signing the petition were to be associated with Parliament's cause in the Civil War: Sir Richard Hopton, Ambrose Elton senior and John Scudamore of Kentchurch. Possibly they were Puritans; Hopton's will, however, was not of a Puritan character. 22 Elton and Scudamore were related, with Elton's mother coming from the Scudamore family at Kentchurch. This branch of the Scudamores has been credited with a greater antiquity than the line that settled at Holm Lacy. They were Catholics until the early seventeenth century; in 1603, Scudamore's father was arrested for sheltering a priest. John Scudamore (1603–1669) was a minor when his father died and he appears not to have been brought up in the Catholic traditions of the family. He married a daughter of Sir William Cooke of Gloucestershire; this marriage, although linking him to a family outside the county, also reinforced his ties with Elton as Cooke was an uncle of Elton's wife. Scudamore's land in Herefordshire was worth about £150 p.a., while he also had holdings in neighbouring Monmouthshire. He received the appointment as J.P. around 1637. 23

Roger Vaughan of Bredwardine also signed the petition of January 1641, but he died in 1643 and it is difficult to assess his political stance in the Civil War. His son and heir, Henry, was named on Parliamentarian committees for the shire in 1643 and thus the family could be included in the Parliamentarian faction. This, however, can only be tentative. 24 Three of the magistrates who signed the petition were definitely not Puritans and these men, Henry Lingen, Sir William Croft and Wallop Brabazon, became Royalists in the Civil War. The remaining signature was that of William Rudhall (c.1590–1651) of Rudhall in Weston-under-Penyard, the younger brother of the sheriff, John Rudhall, who had died in office in 1636. He inherited only a small annuity from his brother, with most of the estate remaining with his sister-in-law. Rudhall's appointment to the Commission
of the Peace came in 1638. He supported the King during the Civil War. 25

Magistrates not signing the petition were Sir Robert Harley and Fitzwilliam
Coningsby (both at Westminster), Sir Edward Powell, Bart. (probably in London),
Sir Walter Pye, John Vaughan, William Smallman, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., Viscount
Scudamore, William Scudamore of Ballingham and his son John, who had been added
to the Commission of the Peace in June 1640. 26 Advancing years may have
persuaded Kyrle and William Scudamore not to attend, while John Vaughan died in
1641. Viscount Scudamore may have frowned upon the petition. He was a Royalist
supporter in 1642, but so were the majority of the J.P.s, and in 1640-1 the later
allegiances do not seem to have divided the county gentry. On the issues of the
Council of Wales and Ship Money there was unity, so the legislation from
Parliament in 1641 must have pleased the Herefordshire county community to some
extent; Ship Money was declared illegal in the summer of 1641, which also
witnessed the sweeping away of the prerogative courts, including the Council of
Wales. 27

Fitzwilliam Coningsby may have felt that the reformers went too far when
legislation was passed against monopolies, and in October he found himself
expelled from Parliament because of his involvement in the soap monopoly; he was
replaced by his son, Humphrey, in November 1641. 28 Meanwhile, the majority of
the Herefordshire gentry were becoming suspicious of developments in Parliament,
particularly in the matter of religion; earlier in 1641, Sir William Croft and
other J.P.s expressed misgivings over the 'Protestation', the oath demanded from
them against 'popish innovations'. 29 In May 1641, a bill was introduced into the
House of Commons, calling for the abolition of the episcopacy, something far too
radical for most people in Herefordshire. Sir Robert Harley was a notable
exception; he joined in the activity at Westminster in the campaign for religious
reform. In October 1641, he returned temporarily to Herefordshire to attend at
the quarter sessions, perhaps in the hope of gathering support from his fellow
gentry and the populace. It is likely, however, that his attempt to enforce Parliament's Puritan policies in the county only served to arouse opposition, while also revealing to people that the political reforms they had supported earlier in the year had now given way to religious reform with which they had no sympathy. 30

The influence of Harley and the Puritan reformers in London at this time was shown by the appointment of the new sheriff of Herefordshire towards the end of the year: Isaac Seward (c.1583-1652) of Leominster was chosen. Seward was from a lesser gentry or merchant family of Leominster, with a landed estate worth under £100 p.a. He was bailiff of Leominster in 1632. He supported Harley and was probably a Puritan. Earlier in 1641, he had been added to the Commission of the Peace. 31

With the rebellion in Ireland in October 1641 and the ensuing rumours of Catholic plots in the English counties, Sir Robert Harley felt worried about the large number of recusants in the county. In November, having returned to Westminster, he wrote to his wife, warning her about the possibility of a Catholic rebellion. Following his instructions, she increased the family's store of arms at Brampton Bryan in readiness for any trouble. The fears proved unfounded, however, although a use may have been found for the weapons later. 32

Early in the following year, Lady Brilliana Harley was writing to her husband that a petition in favour of the episcopacy was being prepared in the county, promoted by Viscount Scudamore. 33 Supporters of the King and established church had clearly gained the upper hand in Herefordshire, and they were at odds with the county's leading representative in Parliament. Harley was informed in February 1642 by Isaac Seward that the J.P.s opposed his attempts, as sheriff, to secure the county magazine for Parliament. 34 In March, these J.P.s, including Sir William Croft and Wallop Brabazon, stated their disapproval to the knights of the shire, Harley and Humphrey Coningsby, over events at Westminster. They also
opposed the order for the Protestation Oath to be taken again and extended to all in the county over eighteen years old. In July 1642, Stanley Gower, the Puritan minister at Brampton Bryan, and John Wancklin, another Puritan, wrote to Harley about preachers in Herefordshire who were attacking Parliament in their sermons. Prominent among them was Henry Rogers of Stoke Edith, a canon of Hereford. A number of supporters of Puritanism in Herefordshire did manage to raise a petition in favour of Parliament and religious reform, but this was counteracted by the more representative document from the county supporting Charles I and the episcopacy.

By the summer of 1642, most of the Herefordshire M.P.'s had left the House of Commons. Richard Weaver died in May and was replaced by James Scudamore, the son of Viscount Scudamore. He was not yet in his twenties and it does not appear that he took much part in parliamentary proceedings following his election. His return as an M.P. from Hereford, however, despite his not being one of the citizenry resident there, may indicate the influence and strength locally of the Royalist faction. Of the other Herefordshire men in the House, Eure, Seabourne and Coningsby left early while Thomas Tomkins, who was named on many parliamentary committees during 1641-2, remained at Westminster until about June, when he promised his support for Parliament; he left before the start of war. Only Harley and Kyrle remained to offer allegiance to Parliament's cause.

Although Herefordshire's support for the King had been clear throughout 1642, it was not until the Royalist commission of array, in June, that forces began to mobilise. Acting under this commission in following months were Lord Scudamore, Sir William Croft, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, Wallop Brabazon, Henry Lingen, William Rudhall and Thomas Price. All of these were also on the Commission of the Peace. Thomas Price (1582-1654) of Wisteston in Marden had been made a J.P. in 1641. He was a grandson of Sir John Price of Brecon who had profited in monastic lands during the Reformation. His wife was a daughter of
the Rudhall family, while he owned lands in the Brecon area in addition to an estate of near £250 p.a. in Herefordshire. The family's possessions were increased even more by the marriage of his son and heir to a daughter of Sir George Chute of Kent; she was the heiress to further lands in the Marden area.

At the quarter sessions of July 1642, the Royalist administration moved into operation. The magistrates present included Croft, Brabazon, Lingen, Rudhall, William Scudamore and his son John, and Thomas Wigmore. Sir Richard Hopton, John Scudamore of Kentchurch and Sir John Kyrle, Bart., were the only ones at the sessions who might be described as sympathetic to Parliament at this date. Scudamore of Kentchurch stated his opposition to the proceedings at Hereford, while another magistrate, Ambrose Elton senior declared the commission of array illegal. The majority of the J.P.s, however, were enthusiastic Royalists and they produced a document making clear their support for the King and the established church. This declaration was given the title of the 'Nine Worthies Resolution'. Sir Robert Harley and Walter Kyrle, the M.P.s from Herefordshire remaining in Parliament, were expelled from the Commission of the Peace by the Royalist magistrates; Kyrle had only been appointed a J.P. in the previous year.

In mid-July 1642, a muster of the Royalist troops took place. Captains of the militia were Fitzwilliam Coningsby, Richard Wigmore, John Scudamore of Ballingham and the forebodingly named Edward Slaughter. Humphrey Coningsby, the son of Fitzwilliam, was appointed as a serjeant-major. These officers were all members of the upper-class circle in Herefordshire; Richard Wigmore of Upton Bishop, in the Greytree hundred, was a younger brother of the magistrate Thomas Wigmore, and his estate was worth about £100 p.a. Edward Slaughter's father had moved from Lincolnshire early in the seventeenth century, acquiring an estate of about £150 p.a. at Cheney Court in Bishops Frome, in the Radlow hundred. The family had Catholic associations. A younger brother married into the Price.
family of Marden. Robert Croft, a younger brother of Sir William, had recently returned from military service in Ireland, and he was placed in command of a force of two hundred cavalry raised from the county; Croft possessed only a small landholding, but he came from a prestigious family. These cavalry were sent along with a contribution of £3000 to the King's headquarters. Another officer was Captain James Barrell who was put in charge of a force of volunteers. Barrell, a tradesman and former mayor of Hereford, was one of the King's many supporters in the city administration who ensured that this important fortress declared for the Royalist cause, as did the majority of people in the rest of the shire.

Brilliana Harley warned her husband to remain in London and not to come to Herefordshire because on one occasion, when the Royalist troops were gathered together, 'a great many cried out and wished you [Sir Robert] were there that they might tear you in pieces'. Another Parliamentarian, John Herring of Holmer, was driven from his home.

Throughout the summer, the commissioners of array, with Sir William Croft, Fitzwilliam Coningsby and Wallop Brabazon the most active, continued to levy troops, money and supplies in preparation for war. A dispute between Brabazon and Captain Richard Wigmore was reported; Wigmore refused to take orders from Brabazon. Nevertheless, there was apparently no serious opposition to the Royalist commissioners in the county. One notable absentee from all these proceedings was Sir Walter Pye, the pro-Catholic, who had crossed to the continent around this time to go to Rome. In August, Lady Brilliana in a very optimistic mood, recommended to her husband that Pye could be persuaded to support Parliament. Deputy lieutenants were being considered for appointment by Parliament and she hoped that for Herefordshire some of the moderates on the 'other side' might be chosen in order to win them over.

In the midst of all these tensions and military activities, the assizes were held at Hereford at the start of August. Sir William Croft and Wallop
Brabazon purged the grand jury of any Parliamentarians, and any who turned up for the sittings were soon persuaded to leave when some Royalists entered the court with shouts of 'God save King Charles' and 'Down with the Roundheads, a pox take them all'. Among those who fled were James Kyrle, and Henry Vaughan of Bredwardine. The M.P. Walter Kyrle had taken the chance of returning to the county but, as with his brother James, he thought it safer to leave the assizes to the Royalists. Many Parliamentarians were leaving during August, or before, to shelter at nearby Gloucester where there were more people of their persuasion. Some left for London. In Herefordshire, an active Royalist majority of the squirearchy had ensured the county was in the King's control at the start of the Civil War. 52

No full list of Herefordshire J.P.'s survives from 1642, but one can be compiled by including the members of the 1636 Commission of the Peace who were alive at the start of the war and adding the names of those appointed during 1636-42. This would make a total of twenty-eight resident gentry on the Commission, although some may have been removed earlier because of opposition to government policies. Nevertheless, with two of the prominent opponents of Ship Money, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., and Sir Richard Hopton, known to be on the Commission in 1642, it appears unlikely that others were dismissed. 53 Instead, opponents of the government were among the additions: John Greene (c.1596-1642) of Cobwell in Allensmore was appointed as a J.P. in 1642 after refusing to pay coat and conduct money in 1640. Greene's background is obscure. He may have been a merchant and possibly he went to Oxford University. 54 Also placed on the Commission in 1641-2 were Thomas Price of Marden, Walter Kyrle of Ross, Isaac Seward of Leominster, Thomas Tomkins of Monnington, Bennett Hoskyns of More-hampton, Herbert Westfaling of Mansell Gamage and Paul Delahay of Urish-Hay. 55

Some of these new appointments, particularly Greene, Delahay and Seward, would have been unlikely to have won their way onto the Commission but for the
instability of this period, and possibly because of influence from Parliamentarians in the nomination of J.P.s. Only Price, Westfaling and Tomkins were to be Royalists during the war. Kyrle, Seward, Hoskyns, and possibly Delahay, supported Parliament. Delahay died in 1643. He was from a medieval Herefordshire family, settled at Urish-Hay in Peterchurch. His estate was worth about £150 p.a., while an uncle and namesake of his, from a younger branch of the family, prospered earlier in the century from a legal career and estate management in the service of the Cecil family. Delahay's son, Thomas, served in the county administration during the Interregnum. John Greene may also have been of Parliamentarian sympathy, but he died before the end of 1642. His son fought on Parliament's side.

Among the other new magistrates, Bennett Hoskyns (1609-1680) was the eldest son of John Hoskyns, the lawyer of Morehampton in Dore. He was probably a Presbyterian. He trained in law and married the daughter of Sir John Bingley, an Exchequer official. It may have been this connection that saw Hoskyns returned as M.P. for Wendover (Buckinghamshire) in the Short Parliament of 1640. Herbert Westfaling (1572-1652) of Mansell Gamage was the son of an Elizabethan Bishop of Hereford. An eighteenth century account of the family describes the Westfalings going into exile during the Catholic persecution of the reign of Mary I; their surname was acquired following a stay in Westphalia in Germany. Herbert Westfaling married a daughter of the Rudhall family, and besides land in Herefordshire he possessed estates in Worcestershire, Oxfordshire, Yorkshire and Middlesex. Much of this property was lost, however, after he had 'turned his ingenuity to fanciful projects which were attended with much loss and no profits to himself'. His heirs were left with land worth about £150 p.a. only. Previous experience in county government for Westfaling included the appointment as sheriff in 1618 and work as a subsidy commissioner in following years.

Of the twenty-eight J.P.s at the beginning of the Civil War, three (Paul
Delahay, John Greene and Roger Vaughan) were of uncertain allegiance, although they possibly favoured Parliament. Ten further J.P.s can be associated more firmly with the Parliamentarian cause, but while Herefordshire was under Royalist control some of these (Seward, Hopton, Hoskyns, Scudamore of Kentchurch and Walter Kyrle) maintained equivocal stances in order to protect their estates from confiscation. Scudamore, Hoskyns, Hopton and Kyrle were named as deputy lieutenants for Parliament at the end of September 1642, but as with the various taxation, militia and sequestration committees appointed by Parliament for Herefordshire during the early years of the war, the carrying out of their allotted tasks was rendered impossible while the county remained in the King's hands. Seward, Hoskyns, Hopton and Kyrle were later accused of delinquency because of their having conformed to the Royalist administration at times during 1642-5. They were all later excused from sequestration, however, and became willing servants of the Parliamentarian administration.

The attempts by Sir Richard Hopton to avoid confiscation of his lands are well documented. He eventually suffered from both sides, such was the difficulty of being 'neutral' in these years. Initially, he supported the Parliamentarian troops that invaded the county in September 1642; this led to his exclusion from the Royalist Commission of the Peace in the following year. One of his sons, Richard Hopton junior, fought for Parliament and plundered the estate of Wallop Brabazon, one of the leading Royalists in the shire, which did not augur well for Hopton senior in his moves to preserve the family property at Canon Frome. Another son, Edward Hopton, fought for the King and was knighted in 1645, so his father hoped this would work in his favour to save the estate from plundering by the Royalists. Nevertheless, because Canon Frome was at an important strategic point between Hereford and Worcester, Hopton's mansion was seized and used as a strongpoint by the Royalist troops. He was also imprisoned for part of 1644. Following Parliamentarian successes, Canon Frome was captured in 1645, but still
used as a garrison. Then in 1646, Hopton suffered fining and sequestration from Parliament's administration in the county, although he was reprieved shortly afterwards and took part in the new government in Herefordshire. 62

It would be wrong to call men such as Hopton turncoats or neutrals merely because they conformed to the Royalist administration in order to protect their estates. After 1645, their switch to supporting Parliament was not out of cynical opportunism; they were merely revealing their true allegiance. Sir Edward Powell, Bart., of Pengethley was another whose allegiance did not always appear certain. He was an official in the Court of Requests in London during the 1640s and his legal and commercial interests in the capital persuaded him to remain there and support Parliament. He was named on committees for London and Herefordshire by Parliament. Powell paid the price for his decision because the Royalists plundered his country estate at Pengethley. 63

Only four of the Herefordshire J.P.s (Sir Robert Harley, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., James Kyrle and Ambrose Elton senior) were particularly active for Parliament during the First Civil War. They were all among the deputy lieutenants named in September 1642 to raise troops against the Royalists. Harley remained in London for much of the war and spoke often in Parliament. He also regained the position as Master of the Mint from 1643-9. Sir John Kyrle, Bart., was appointed to a sequestration committee by Parliament in 1643 and the Royalists expelled him from the Commission of the Peace in June 1643. James Kyrle settled at Gloucester in the garrison under Edward Massey for much of the First Civil War. Elton was named on committees for Worcestershire by Parliament in 1643 and he also was removed from the Royalist Commission of the Peace. All were named in the Parliamentarian administration after 1645. 64

Thus there were in all ten J.P.s in 1642 who can be identified as Parliamentarian supporters, although their commitment varied. Apart from the three J.P.s whose allegiance cannot be satisfactorily identified, the remaining
members of the Commission of the Peace, fifteen in all, were Royalists, some fighting for the King, others serving in the administration in Herefordshire during 1642-5. These fifteen were all to suffer fines and sequestrations at the end of the First Civil War. The proportion of Royalist J.P.s to Parliamentarians, of three to two, was not unduly distorted by the additions to magistracy during 1641-2; a similar division is found in the Commission of the Peace of 1636.

Those espousing the Royalist cause were evenly distributed over the shire, as were their Parliamentarian counterparts. The Royalist J.P.s included one peer and two knights, compared to two baronets and two knights (one a K.B.) on Parliament's side. Neither party contained a greater proportion of J.P.s with experience of sitting in Parliament. One difference was in average ages, with the Royalists at roughly forty-six and the Parliamentarians averaging at about fifty-four. The four committed Parliamentarian J.P.s (Harley, Elton, Kyrle of Much Marcie and Kyrle of Walford) had an average age of over sixty, with Sir John Kyrle, Bart., of Much Marcie having passed his seventieth year. In general, therefore, the Parliamentarian J.P.s were older. Only one Parliamentarian, Walter Kyrle, was born a younger son and did not inherit the family estate. Three Royalists (Brabazon, Eure and Rudhall) fall into this category. The same fraction of J.P.s on both sides, three-fifths, could trace their ancestry in Herefordshire back to the Middle Ages, but many more of the King's supporters on the Commission came from families that had long been established in the ruling hierarchy. Only two magistrates, both Royalists (Brabazon and Eure), settled in the shire under the Stuarts, although Sir Richard Hopton, a Parliamentarian, began residing at Canon Frome only shortly before the accession of James I.

A higher proportion of the Royalist magistrates went to University, while a higher proportion of the Parliamentarians attended at the Inns of Court, with three (Hoskyns, Powell and Walter Kyrle) qualifying as barristers; only two
Royalists (Eure and Tomkins) were barristers. Parliament could boast of the support of just three Herefordshire J.P.s (Harley, Powell and Hopton) who had estates worth over £500 p.a., compared to seven Royalists (Coningsby, Smallman, Tomkins, Pye, Lingen, William Scudamore and Viscount Scudamore) who had estates of equivalent value or worth much more. Lord Scudamore, Lingen and Pye possessed property in Herefordshire bringing incomes of over £1000 p.a. in the early 1640s. Just three magistrates derived their wealth in the main from other sources besides land: the Parliamentarians Isaac Seward and Walter Kyrle owned small estates but Seward's income was largely from trade while Kyrle was a lawyer and estate administrator. Sir Sampson Eure was another lawyer, who also prospered in crown service. Powell and Hoskyns were lawyers as well, but they owned large estates in the county. A number of the Parliamentarian families had risen since the second half of the sixteenth century from relatively obscure backgrounds, using commerce and law to acquire wealth and purchasing land around their homes to build up substantial estates. Such was the background of the Powells and the Hoskyns family, along with the Kyrles of Walford and Much Marcle. 68

Almost half of the Royalist J.P.s, by contrast, appear to have been in serious debt, with some selling parts of their estates, while no such evidence is available to suggest similar financial difficulties for any of the Parliamentarians. 69

Only Powell, Scudamore of Kentchurch and Hopton on the Parliamentarian side possessed substantial landholdings outside Herefordshire that rivalled their estates in the county, compared to six of the Royalist J.P.s (Coningsby, Price, Lingen, Brabazon, Eure and Lord Scudamore) owning extensive properties outside Herefordshire. On the other hand, just one Parliamentarian J.P., Kyrle of Much Marcle, married the daughter of a Herefordshire family. The Royalist J.P.s were more parochial in this respect; eight of the fifteen married locally and most of them were linked by marriage ties. Sir Walter Pye had Henry Lingen and Thomas
Tomkins as brothers-in-law and his mother was a sister of William Rudhall; sisters of Rudhall also married Herbert Westfaling and Thomas Price. 70

In conclusion, the Royalists on the Commission of the Peace were mainly from more prestigious families and usually more wealthy than the Parliamentarians, but they were perhaps more likely to have been suffering economic decline, contrasting with the rising prosperity, through law and commerce, of many of the J.P.s who supported Parliament. Possibly conservatism was a trait that influenced the majority of the J.P.s to follow the King in 1642, while a hope of immediate financial gain, through patronage and plunder, may have persuaded some, who would otherwise have perhaps been neutral, to be active on the Royalist side. In a few instances more obvious economic factors can be discerned: Sir Sampson Eure depended on the crown for much of his wealth and he was not likely to support Parliament. Walter Kyrle, meanwhile, was a client of the Earl of Essex and might be expected to be a Parliamentarian. 71

Nevertheless, if any single issue divided the two sides in the county, then it was religion. This is what led to a split in the squirearchy during 1641-2 after religious reforms promoted by Parliament alienated the majority of a conservative local gentry. Possibly all the Parliamentarian J.P.s were of Puritan inclinations. Two Royalists, Lingen and Pye, were pro-Catholics and the rest were supporters of the established Church. 72 Only Tomkins on the Royalist side had displayed anything indicating anti-Arminianism. Of the Parliamentarians, Sir Robert Harley was the most notable example of religious zeal. He was one of the wealthiest men in the shire, from a long established and prestigious family. He had held office under the crown, with the appointment as Master of the Mint in 1626 and as keeper of Bringwood and Prestwood Forests. Harley's eventual dismissal from the Mint may have estranged him from the government, but it was his Presbyterianism that committed him to the side of Parliament in 1642. He had already been active in the cause of religious reform throughout 1641-2, and
during the Civil War he was one of the most ardent Presbyterians at Westminster. 73

As the leader of the Herefordshire Parliamentarians, Sir Robert Harley formed a sharp contrast with the most prominent Royalist of the county, the High Anglican, Viscount Scudamore, a friend of Archbishop Laud. 74 These two men, Harley and Scudamore, represented the split in the Commission of the Peace of Herefordshire in 1642. Political conservatism may have played a part in the decision of many J.P.s to support the King, but the Presbyterian county gentry were to display a similar conservatism in following years, eventually favouring Charles I in 1648 and welcoming the return of Charles II in 1660. In 1642, however, despite Cromwell's later assertion that 'religion was not the thing at the first contested for', it was the major issue that divided the Herefordshire squirearchy. 75
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CHAPTER IV

The First Civil War in Herefordshire, 1642-1646

The support throughout Herefordshire for Charles I meant that for much of the First Civil War the county was under Royalist control, except for brief periods when the contingencies of military campaigns temporarily placed it in the hands of Parliamentarians. The most vital strategic point was that of Hereford, placed on the Royalist lines of communication in the Welsh Marches and useful for its castle, city walls and its facilities for storing supplies and quartering troops. Events in the summer of 1642, including the raising of a volunteer force for the King, largely from the city, indicated the loyalty of Hereford to Charles I. It was held by the Royalists at the start of the war along with most of the other castles and fortified gentry mansions in the shire, such as Croft Castle, belonging to Sir William Croft and The Mynde, owned by Sir Walter Pye. Some fortresses were slighted, including Wilton Castle, owned by the Brydges family, near the border with Gloucestershire, to prevent their being used by invading Parliamentarian soldiers.¹

The only notable strongpoint that held out for Parliament was Brampton Bryan, where Brilliana Harley with a small garrison had refortified the castle, but the position was not of any great strategic significance. The real threat to the Royalist supremacy appeared to be the garrison at Gloucester where a number of Herefordshire Puritans sheltered during the war, waiting for an opportunity to return to their county. Edward Massey took command at Gloucester, becoming the governor in the spring of 1643, and he was to be a constant source of trouble for the Royalists in following years.²

The apparent strength of Royalism in Herefordshire was a major reason for a surprise Parliamentarian success in the autumn of 1642. Towards the end of September, the Earl of Essex, then at Worcester, detached about one thousand men
from the Parliamentarian army to attack Hereford. Throughout the summer, troops and arms had been sent from the county to the King, weakening Royalist resources in Herefordshire, and a further large supply of arms was sent from Hereford shortly before the arrival of the Parliamentarian troops outside the city walls. Thus, depleted of men and supplies, the mayor surrendered on 30 September, allowing the Parliamentarian commander, the Earl of Stamford, to enter the city and establish a garrison there. There were charges of treachery against some in the city administration and a few months later (after the Royalists recaptured Hereford) one of the aldermen was imprisoned while other Parliamentarian supporters had their property seized.

Long-standing tensions within the administration at Hereford may explain these episodes. The city government, independent of the county administration, was dominated by an oligarchy of the main citizens through a council of thirty-one members, consisting of the mayor, aldermen and other councillors. By-laws and local disputes were settled at 'law days' held twice each year when cases were passed before three juries or 'inquests'. Ostensibly, this allowed a number of inhabitants to have a say in decisions, but the first, or 'great', inquest which usually contained fifteen citizens was controlled by members of the council and these dictated proceedings. Collection of taxes and loans for the crown was carried out by city commissioners, mainly from the council, separately from the county administration; Ship Money had been raised in Hereford by the mayor, not by the sheriff. The city also had its own quarter sessions, presided over by the mayor, the town clerk and two or three aldermen as J.P.s, dealing with offences committed within the bounds of Hereford. Among the cases brought before the court were charges of assault, accusations of slander and, less frequently, trials of witchcraft.

The oligarchy at Hereford had dominated election returns from the city in the pre-war years. Although the Scudamores of nearby Holm Lacy had some
influence in city affairs and were occasionally returned as M.P.s for Hereford, it was usually members of the urban gentry who were elected. These included the Weavers and the Seabourne, and the Clarke family of Hereford which had gained a monopoly on the office of town clerk during this period. Thomas Jones, who also owned a country estate at Llanwarne, was often returned as an M.P. for Hereford as well as being a county J.P. until his death in about 1626. John Hoskyns, another person high up in the Hereford oligarchy, was a grandson of Thomas Jones. There had been rivalry in city affairs between Hoskyns and the Scudamores earlier in the century. Further hostilities within the oligarchy were apparent in the criticisms of the Clarke family and their monopoly of the town clerkship. Nevertheless, the citizenry was largely in unison on such issues as the Council of Wales, which they supported, although one of the Hereford M.P.s, John Hoskyns, had joined with the county gentry in the 'Four shires' controversy. In the matter of Ship Money, however, the city was less favourable to crown policy; the tax was collected unenthusiastically and Ship Money arrears in Hereford were proportionately higher than those of the rest of the county.

Despite most of the inhabitants and the ruling oligarchy in the city supporting the King in 1642, there were some local Puritans and a few supporters of Parliament within the administration, including the Philpotts and Lane families. In 1644, Richard Philpotts, who remained in the Royalist-controlled city, was facing charges following an incident when, 'foaming at the mouth' he had insulted John Clarke, one of the Hereford magistrates. At the city quarter sessions in January, he then accused Clarke of leading the citizens of Hereford 'in blindness'. Later, in 1647, Philpotts became mayor of Hereford when it was under Parliament's authority. It was alderman James Lane, meanwhile, who had facilitated Stamford's capture of the city in 1642 by persuading the mayor then, David Bowen, to surrender in spite of the resolve of the citizens to fight to the death. Lane had apparently told the mayor that the whole army of the Earl of
Essex was nearby, and this prospect made Bowen believe it was wiser to give in immediately.\textsuperscript{14}

Stamford's occupation of Hereford, against the will of the majority of inhabitants, lasted about two and a half months and gave Parliament a useful stronghold that hindered the communications of the King's armies in the Marches. He also used the opportunity to extort money from the city and to send out troops who could raise contributions from the rest of the county.\textsuperscript{15} Sir Robert Harley returned temporarily to Herefordshire with his eldest son Edward, who had joined Parliament's forces, while Sir Richard Hopton also gave his support for Stamford. Another from the local county gentry was a son of James Kyrle of Walford: Robert Kyrle (1618-1669) had returned from military service on the continent in order to fight for Parliament; he became a captain of horse in Stamford's regiment and was later promoted to serjeant-major before deserting to the Royalists. He was of Presbyterian hue.\textsuperscript{16} Thomas Blayney of Kinsham and Sir John Kyrle, Bart., were others from the local gentry who were active for Parliament at this time.\textsuperscript{17}

The Parliamentarians in the county were left in an increasingly precarious position, however, especially when the main army, that of the Earl of Essex moved eastwards from Worcestershire, eventually returning to London after the battle of Edgehill on 23 October 1642. The Earl of Stamford was left isolated at Hereford, in the midst of Royalist territory. In order to safeguard a possible retreat to Gloucester, he established an additional garrison at Goodrich in the south of Herefordshire, but continued attacks from Royalist forces in Wales threatened to cut off this route. This persuaded Stamford to abandon the 'vile city' of Hereford, as he described it, with its 'base and malignant' inhabitants; on 14 December 1642, he withdrew his forces to Gloucester.\textsuperscript{18}

The Royalists swiftly reoccupied Hereford. Thereafter, until the end of 1645, they were in almost full control of the county and the city apart from a brief period, of less than a month, in the spring of 1643 when Sir William Waller
marched from Gloucester and his army seized Hereford for Parliament again. These successes of Stamford and Waller, although short-lived, may indicate that something was lacking in the organisation and co-ordination of Royalist forces in allowing the Parliamentarians to capture one of the more vital fortresses in the region.  

The Royalist administration in Herefordshire during the Civil War was based on the traditional county rulers, working as J.P.s, sheriffs and commissioners of array, co-operating with the military officers and the governor of Hereford. Initially the local gentry were appointed to military commands and in December 1642 Fitzwilliam Coningsby was made governor of Hereford. Coningsby's authority, however, gave way to that of Sir Richard Cave, an outsider who was sent to the county with his own troops. Cave took the decisions for any local military matters, while the regional commander-in-chief (the Marquis of Hertford in 1642 and Prince Maurice for much of 1643) dictated overall strategy and determined the use of resources levied from the shire. The local gentry were left to raise the troops and money, and to continue the administration of justice; the quarter sessions were held at Hereford in January 1643, while in June Royalist gentry were added to the Commission of the Peace to replace magistrates who had been captured by Waller, and were still imprisoned, and to make up for those expelled from the Commission for supporting Parliament.

The new J.P.s were Fulke Walwyn, Robert Whitney, James Rodd, Richard Rodd and John Skippe, all from families of or near county gentry status. Fulke Walwyn (c.1603-c.1661) of Hellens in Much Marcle was from a medieval Herefordshire family. One of his ancestors fought and died for Henry III at the battle of Lewes in 1264. He was the son of a J.P. and a brother-in-law of Sir Walter Pye. His estate, worth about £200 p.a., suffered from the burden of mortgages and debts. He was of Catholic sympathies. Robert Whitney of Whitney was the eldest son of Sir Robert, the sheriff of Herefordshire in 1638. This family had
also been in the county since the Middle Ages. James Rodd (c.1572-1664) was
from a lesser gentry family at Rodd in the north-west of the shire. A younger
son, he moved to Hereford and enriched himself in commerce. Rodd was mayor in
1616 and an M.P. for the city in 1621. He was county sheriff in 1623, while
throughout the 1620s and 1630s he continued as an active and important member of
the Hereford council. After several purchases of land, Rodd built up an estate,
worth about £350 p.a., in the county. His nephew from the eldest branch of the
family, Richard Rodd (1608-1673) of Rodd inherited an estate worth about £200 p.a.
which had been extended following the acquisition of wealth from his father's
marriage into a Devon family. The Rodds acquired commercial interests in that
county and Richard also married a daughter of Sir William Kirkham of Devon. In
1638, Richard Rodd was a chief constable of the Wigmore hundred. John Skippe
(1604-1684) came from a family that had moved to the county from Norfolk in the
sixteenth century and settled in the Ledbury area. He was the only one of this
group of new magistrates without medieval roots in Herefordshire, but Skippe
could boast of a member of his family who had been appointed to the see of
Hereford in the reign of Henry VIII. As with the branches of the Rodd family,
the Skippes were prospering in the early decades of the seventeenth century and
they purchased much of their estate at Ledbury in the 1630s.

In all there were twenty Royalist J.P.s, most of them from long established
Herefordshire families and all with estates worth over £100 p.a., many with much
higher incomes. Only five were not registered as having attended the Universities
or the Inns of Court. Unlike the later Parliamentarian administration, the
King's party did not have to recruit its personnel from men of low wealth and
status. Chosen from the J.P.s were the commissioners of array: Viscount
Scudamore, Wallop Brabazon, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, Sir William Croft, Sir Sampson
Eure, Henry Lingen, Thomas Price, Sir Walter Pye, James Rodd, William Rudhall,
Thomas Tomkins and Thomas Wigmore. Sir Robert Whitney may have acted along with
Bennett Hoskyns and Francis Kyrle were put in Royalist commissions also, probably in the hope of gaining their allegiance. They had both earlier been named as deputy lieutenants for Parliament. Francis Kyrle (c.1600-1649) was the eldest son of the baronet of Much Marcle. He later served as sheriff in the Parliamentarian administration in 1647.

The first Royalist sheriff was Fitzwilliam Coningsby, appointed towards the end of 1642, as well as becoming governor of Hereford. In June 1643, Henry Lingen was made sheriff in his place; Lingen also commanded a garrison at Goodrich. The local gentry were still controlling the administration in the shire and the practice was for assent to be given at the quarter sessions, as in July 1642, for the commissioners of array to raise contributions. At first, much of the money was sent to the King, but as the war progressed funds came to be dispersed locally more often, to the garrison commanders. In February 1643, £3000 a month was fixed to be levied from Herefordshire; in April, the contribution was set at £1200 a month only. Money was also raised from the sequestration of property belonging to supporters of Parliament.

Warrants would be sent to the constables for the levying of taxes and soldiers might help with collection occasionally, but military involvement became more frequent as the war continued. Men from outside the county were appointed as governors of Hereford for much of 1643-4; they took on many of the duties of the commissioners of array, raising troops themselves and issuing their own warrants for the collection of taxes. In 1644, the governor of Hereford was raising about £400 a month for his garrison. Plundering also took place, by local garrisons and by other Royalist troops passing through the shire, as well as by Parliamentarians. The ravaging of parts of the north of Herefordshire by Sir Michael Woodhouse, the Royalist governor of Ludlow, aroused protests from the commissioners of array, while in October 1644 the sheriff Henry Lingen and Barnaby Scudamore, the new governor of Hereford, appealed to Prince Rupert over
the plundering carried out in the county by troops marching south to Bristol after the battle of Marston Moor and the Royalist losses in the north of England. Lingen and Scudamore described their county as already much exhausted by the war, without the additional strain of unruly Royalist troops from other regions. 31

Nevertheless, it was not the depletion of resources that ultimately led to the downfall of the King's party in Herefordshire. Nor was the defeat due to any glaring faults in the Royalist administration; the county would have most likely continued supporting the King after 1645 but for events elsewhere in England. Following the gradual gaining of the upper hand by the Parliamentarians throughout 1644-5, the Herefordshire Royalists found that the enemy was able to invade the county in strength, and it was this, and not any internal pressures, that brought about their defeat. These points can be illustrated by following events in Herefordshire during the First Civil War. 32

Although the Parliamentarians had captured Hereford in 1642, the strength of the Royalists locally and the Earl of Stamford's isolation in the Marches proved the position untenable. The Royalists recaptured the city but did not learn from their earlier strategic blunders, because once more, in 1643, they left the county open to attack: Sir William Waller had joined Edward Massey at Gloucester and they were campaigning in the surrounding region against the forces of Prince Maurice and Lord Herbert, son of the Marquis of Worcester. On 23 March 1643, Waller defeated Herbert at Highnam, near the Herefordshire south-eastern border. On 13 April, however, the combined forces of Herbert and Maurice won a victory against Waller at the battle of Ripple Field, near Tewkesbury in Gloucestershire. These campaigns resolved into a stalemate until Maurice received orders from the King to bring his troops to aid in the fighting around Reading in Berkshire; it was thought that Waller had been planning to withdraw also, to join the Earl of Essex before Reading, but he decided instead to turn on Herefordshire. The Royalists there had been left unguarded by the break-up of
Lord Herbert's army; many of his troops had withdrawn to garrisons in Wales. Thus Waller marched out from Gloucester on 23 April, with a force of over two thousand, and headed for Ross and then Hereford. Only a small army under Sir Richard Cave was there to resist him, but most of these soldiers fled when the Parliamentarians stormed the city. A truce and parley followed, while Cave tried to obtain suitable terms, and he surrendered on 25 April.33

Waller's victory heartened the Parliamentarians in London, and also had a more tangible value in providing a base for the levying of money and supplies from the surrounding countryside. As with the Earl of Stamford a few months before, however, Waller saw that he was isolated and there was a danger of his lines of communication with Gloucester being blocked. After some plundering, he withdrew in mid-May; thereafter he was to be campaigning more in the West Country.34

The Royalists, meanwhile, reoccupied Hereford and consolidated their hold on the county. An experienced soldier, Sir William Vavasour, was sent to be the new governor of Hereford in June 1643. One of his first tasks was to besiege the garrison at Brampton Bryan. Vavasour conducted operations there for July and part of August, but left the sheriff, Henry Lingen, to continue the siege. The Royalists lacked ordnance and Lady Brilliana Harley was able to hold out successfully; her husband was in London at this time. In September, the siege was abandoned; after devastating the surrounding parishes, the Royalist troops left. Lady Brilliana died the following month, leaving command of the garrison, of about seventy men, to Lieutenant-Colonel Nathaniel Wright, formerly the family physician. A second siege was undertaken in the spring of 1644, this time by Sir Michael Woodhouse from Ludlow. As Woodhouse had recently slaughtered the Parliamentarians after his capture of Hopton Castle in Shropshire, Wright decided to give in to the terms offered by the Royalists, rather than being stormed without quarter.35

Following Waller's departure from Herefordshire in May 1643 and up to the
surrender of Brampton Bryan in April 1644, the county was relatively peaceful apart from these events in the north-west uplands. Much attention was focused on Gloucester, where the Parliamentarian governor, Edward Massey, was under siege in the summer of 1643, and Herefordshire was relieved from his plundering raids during this time. Sir William Vavasour, who spent very little of his governorship in Herefordshire, joined the besieging Royalist forces at Gloucester. He then took part in the subsequent campaign against the Earl of Essex and fought at the first battle of Newbury, in September 1643. Vavasour took part in campaigns in Gloucestershire and Monmouthshire after this, helping to keep Massey in check, until being removed from his command at Hereford in the spring of 1644. The new governor was another outsider, Sir John Wintour, but the most prominent commander in the region was now Colonel Nicholas Mynne who had arrived from Ireland late in 1643; he replaced Wintour as governor of Hereford in June 1644.

Mynne had positioned himself at Ross while Lingen held Goodrich. Monmouth was occupied by Robert Kyrle who had defected to the King in 1643 and received a commission as lieutenant-colonel. As an excuse for his defection he cited the frightening radicalism of the Parliamentarian soldiers he had commanded, but a desire to protect the Kyrle estate at Walford may also explain his actions. Massey and his troops, enticed by the prospect of plunder in Herefordshire, moved out from Gloucester and manoeuvred skilfully in the Ledbury and Ross areas. In mid-April 1644, they occupied Ledbury and then forced Mynne to withdraw from Ross in May. Massey stayed at Ross for over a week while levying contributions from the populace. Further operations followed, with Massey always getting the better of Mynne, but not until late July was there a pitched battle. Here again, Massey triumphed, at Redmarley in Worcestershire, on the border with Herefordshire; Mynne was killed in this engagement.

In September 1644, Lieutenant-Colonel Kyrle thought it wise to change his allegiance again and he betrayed Monmouth to Massey's forces. As the
Parliamentarian activities in the region continued, the south and east of Herefordshire suffered from frequent exactions and plundering. A garrison was stationed by Massey at Pembridge, near Ross, and also about this time Castleditch in Eastnor was occupied by Colonel Richard Hopton, to counteract the Royalist garrison established at the home of his father, Sir Richard Hopton of Canon Frome. Some setbacks followed for the Parliamentarians: the garrison at Castleditch was swiftly attacked and defeated by a Royalist force sent from Hereford. Monmouth was recaptured and Pembridge fell also. With winter setting in, Massey decided to withdraw to Gloucester. Many Royalist troops were marching from the north of England and heading for Bristol at this time. Massey resolved to hinder their progress as much as possible and so well did he accomplish this that a number of soldiers were forced to remain north of the River Severn, causing much hardship in the area for local Royalists. Among Massey's officers at the end of 1644 were Colonel Edward Harley and a younger brother, Major Robert Harley, sons of Sir Robert of Brampton Bryan.

Colonel John Barnard had been appointed governor of Hereford after Mynne's death, only to be replaced in September 1644 by Colonel Barnaby Scudamore, the first Herefordshire man to be given the office since Fitzwilliam Coningsby in 1642. Scudamore also replaced Lingen as sheriff in 1645. Barnard was put in charge of the Canon Frome garrison while Lingen concentrated on his duties as commander of Goodrich. While many of the local gentry were serving the King in other parts of the country, some had already given up the Royalist cause; Wallop Brabazon withdrew from the county administration and, dismayed by 'the fury of soldiers on both sides' he claimed, he retired to Worcestershire in optimistic neutrality. Viscourt Scudamore, meanwhile, had been held prisoner in London since Waller's surprise capture of Hereford in 1643. It was his younger brother, Barnaby, who now ruled the shire with a garrison at Hereford of about five hundred troops. His being a local man perhaps mitigated the arbitrary military government
operating in Herefordshire at this time. Barnaby Scudamore (c.1608-1658) had fought for the King against the Scots in the Bishops' War and then joined the Royalists at the start of the Civil War. He was wounded and captured at Coventry in 1642, but escaped and then served under Prince Maurice. His conduct at Hereford during 1644-5 indicated that his earlier military career had allowed him to acquire a degree of organisational skill. He was knighted by the King for his services in 1645. 45

The loss of a great deal of the Royalist territory in England by 1645, particularly in the north, increased the pressure on the Herefordshire region, not only in the form of demands for recruits and supplies, but also because the county was coming under the threat of attack from other sides, apart from Gloucester. In February 1645, Shrewsbury fell to Parliament, seriously weakening the King's position in the Marches. Only the Royalist garrison at Ludlow protected the northern hundreds of Herefordshire from attack. Prince Rupert, however, joined his brother, Prince Maurice, the commander of the King's forces in the region, and together during March 1645 they more than kept Sir William Brereton and the Parliamentarians occupied in Shropshire and Cheshire. 46

Herefordshire was suffering internal problems at this time, with a rising of 'clubmen' or 'countrymen' in mid-March. Back in 1640, the inhabitants of Leominster had shown how people might react to the impositions of the soldiery. 47 Now, after years of warfare, financial exactions, plundering, and plague in some parts of the shire during 1644, the populace was again losing patience, especially as the prospect of peace seemed far away. In December 1644 and in the early months of 1645, there were risings and assemblies of protestors in parts of Shropshire; then similar outbreaks occurred in February 1645 in some western parishes of Worcestershire. 48

The rising that followed in Herefordshire started in the Broxash hundred, where the inhabitants were probably encouraged by the events across the county
border. This western part of Herefordshire had also been suffering from the plundering by soldiers from the nearby garrison at Canon Frome. The immediate cause of trouble was an attempt by Royalist troops from Hereford to raise contributions in Broxash. They met with fierce opposition and some of the people were killed while others were taken as prisoners back to Hereford for punishment. Anger over this provoked a gathering of 'countrymen' and a decision was made to march on Hereford to put their grievances before the governor, Barnaby Scudamore. Protestors from Worcestershire, probably including some of those involved in the risings during February, and others from Radnorshire joined in the rebellion, so that around 18 March 1645 a large army of fifteen thousand was reported to be outside Hereford. The force included some horsemen and it was reckoned that about six thousand of the people possessed firearms. 49

Those named as leaders of the rising were members of the lesser gentry or yeomanry of the hundreds of Broxash and Radlow. They included Thomas Wootton of Marden and Thomas Careless, probably of Preston Wynne; Careless was appointed as a captain of infantry for Parliament in July 1645 and he later served in the county administration, becoming a J.P. in the mid-1650s. 50 Also named were two sons of Alexander Walwyn, probably of a family at Lugwardine and from a lesser gentry branch of the Walwyns of Hellens in Much March. 51 Another of the leaders was a 'Mr. Lawrence of Cowarne', possibly the Richard Lawrence of Much Cowarne who died a few years later. 52

Their demands related to the incident that sparked off the rising: they sought the release of prisoners, return of goods seized, and some compensation and provision for the widows and children of those slain by the soldiers. In addition, they requested a fairer collection of any contributions in the future and also asked for the removal of the garrison from Canon Frome. They claimed that they could capture Hereford easily if they tried, because the citizens were 'of one minde with them'. Barnaby Scudamore prevaricated for a while until
Massey moved into the county in the hope of recruiting the countrymen to the Parliamentarian cause. Some of them negotiated with Massey at Ledbury but a neutral stance was maintained, and after Scudamore made some concessions, including the remittance of one month's contributions, they dispersed, most of them returning to their homes. Nevertheless, about two thousand remained in the Ledbury area around the beginning of April; Prince Rupert arrived to deal with them, by hanging three of the leaders and crushing the remnants of the rebellion. Rupert stayed in Herefordshire for a short while and after manoeuvring cleverly, his forces surprised Massey at Ledbury on 22 April, inflicting a rare defeat on the governor of Gloucester.

Both Massey and Rupert then left the region to join with the main Parliamentarian and Royalist armies for what was to be the decisive Naseby campaign. Colonel Thomas Morgan replaced Massey as governor of Gloucester. The Royalist position in Herefordshire appeared secure again and in June 1645 Barnaby Scudamore moved on to the offensive by combining with Sir Michael Woodhouse against a garrison that the enemy had established at Stokesay in the south of Shropshire. There, a battle took place on 8 June; the Royalists were defeated and one of their number, Sir William Croft, was killed. Croft was among those few members of the Herefordshire county gentry killed during the Civil War; another was John Scudamore of Ballingham who received a knighthood in 1643 and a baronetcy in 1644 following his services in the Royalist army. His death occurred not in battle but in a duel with another Royalist at Bristol in 1645.

Following the defeat at Stokesay, and the overwhelming victory of the New Model Army at Naseby on 14 June 1645, the pressure on the Herefordshire Royalists was renewed. Charles I retreated into the county and for part of June he was raising troops there as well as collecting a sum of near £5000. He went on to South Wales in July. Scottish forces were moving from the North of England and invading the region in support of their Parliamentarian allies. The Scots
numbered about fourteen thousand and as Charles I had only about five thousand under his command, he was anxious to avoid a battle. The Scots then marched into Herefordshire from the north-west and, unopposed, they advanced to Canon Frome, storming the garrison on 22 July. They massacred all the Royalists there, including Colonel Barnard, the governor; a new garrison was then established, under Edward Harley at first, then under a Scottish officer, Major Henry Archibald. The main army then marched further south in the hope of trapping the King, but he escaped north along the Welsh border and then turned back to his Oxford head-quarters in order to regroup and gather his forces. 58

The Earl of Leven, the Scottish general, decided to turn on Hereford and he began to lay siege to the city at the end of July. The garrison under Barnaby Scudamore was greatly outnumbered, but the defences of the city had been strengthened while the Scots possessed no cannons until well into the siege when some were brought up from Gloucester. Moreover, the Scots detached their cavalry from the main force and sent them back north. Thus Leven had difficulty in collecting supplies further afield than the neighbouring parishes. Shortages of food were reported among the besieging forces after a few weeks. There was some plundering, however, and losses in the shire were later assessed at over £30,000 in value. For over a month, the Hereford garrison defended resolutely, forcing back the Scottish attacks on the city walls and occasionally sallying forth themselves. Early in September, the news of a reinforced Royalist army marching from Oxford to relieve Scudamore persuaded the Scots to abandon the siege and to withdraw to Gloucester. 59

The King entered Hereford in triumph on 4 September 1645, then left for South Wales again. He was soon dismayed by news of Rupert's surrender of Bristol to the New Model Army on 11 September. He gathered his forces for a rendezvous at Dorston, west of Hereford, and marched north to Cheshire where on 24 September his cavalry suffered a heavy defeat at Rowton Heath. 60
Despite the setbacks for the main Royalist army, the position of the governor of Hereford, after his spirited defence of the city, now seemed secure. For much of the summer of 1645, Herefordshire had been a major centre of campaigning, but with the removal of the Scots and the departure of the King, relative calm returned to the county. Nevertheless, Scudamore's position had greatly changed since the beginning of the year: Charles I was being chased around England by the Parliamentarian forces and the remnants of the Royalist armies were being mopped up. Very little of the country remained in Royalist control; Canon Frome was held by the enemy; Scudamore could expect no relieving army if he had to face another siege; much of South Wales had fallen, and on 24 October, Monmouth was captured by Thomas Morgan, the governor of Gloucester, and Robert Kyrle, now a Parliamentarian colonel.\(^{61}\)

As winter set in the Royalists at Hereford may have felt safe despite the collapse of the King's forces elsewhere. Many Royalists from South Wales, and parts of England, sought refuge in Scudamore's garrison. Meanwhile, plans were being formed at Gloucester for a surprise attack. Morgan had been joined by Colonel John Birch (1615-1691) with a small army from Bristol. Birch was from a Puritan lesser gentry family of Ardwick in Lancashire that had trading connections in Manchester. Although he was the heir, Birch left his home, with his younger brother Samuel, and went to Bristol where he prospered as a merchant in the decade before the Civil War; his wife was a widow of a Bristol grocer. In 1642, he supported Parliament, probably because of his Presbyterian beliefs. The fall of Bristol to the Royalists in July 1643 ruined his merchant business and Birch began a military career. He was involved in campaigns in the West Country, serving under Sir William Waller for a time. Among the encounters in which he then fought were the storm of Alton in December 1643, the capture of Arundel in January 1644, the battles of Cheriton in March 1644 and Cropredy Bridge in June 1644, and the second battle of Newbury in October 1644. Birch then served in the Plymouth
garrison until his next notable engagement when he took part in the fall of Bridgewater to the New Model Army in July 1645. His experience and administrative ability won him the governorship of Bridgewater, then Bath, and then Bristol in September 1645. In search of further success, he left with his troops and met with the governor of Gloucester to combine against the Herefordshire Royalists. 62

Aiding Birch and Morgan, informing them of conditions in Herefordshire, was Sir John Brydges, Bart. (1623-1652) of Wilton Castle in Bridstow, near Ross. He had inherited his baronetcy from Sir Giles Brydges, Bart., his father, who had been prominent in the county administration during the 1620s and 1630s, dying in 1637; John's youth had prevented him from succeeding his father on the Commission of the Peace. He married the heiress of a lesser gentry family of Aconbury in Wormilow, thus increasing the value of his estate to near £300 p.a. During the early years of the Civil War, Brydges served in Ireland. On his return to England, he was prepared to support the King but the Royalists in Herefordshire burnt down his family home at Wilton Castle, to prevent the Parliamentarians using it as a garrison, and this action made Brydges switch his allegiance. 63

Also helping in the scheme for the capture of Hereford were two Royalist officers, Major Epiphany Howorth and Captain Daniel Alderne; they had quarrelled with the governor of Hereford and then defected to Parliament, giving information concerning the strength and defences of the Royalist garrison in return for money and pardons for themselves, their relatives and friends. 64 Alderne was a younger son of Thomas Alderne, the sheriff in 1639; Howorth was from a lesser gentry family of Holmer, near Hereford. 65

Colonel Birch led the expedition, leaving Gloucester in mid-December, with a force of about one and a half thousand, and he marched to Canon Frome, to the east of Hereford. The Parliamentarians then feinted to continue north but instead quickly turned back and advanced on the unsuspecting Royalists at Hereford. Following a stratagem, one of the city gates was opened and Birch's men were able
to pounce on the garrison, capturing it by storm but with little bloodshed. Scudamore and many of his soldiers fled while a number of Royalists of high rank, who had sought shelter at Hereford, were taken prisoner by the victorious Parliamentarians. 66

The fall of Hereford led to the end of the Royalist hold on the county. Unlike Stamford and Waller earlier in the war, Birch found that he could hold the city because Parliamentary successes elsewhere meant his position was not isolated and there was little danger of serious attack from the dissipated Royalist forces. The garrison at Canon Frome protected a route to Gloucester, thus Birch was not immediately concerned with Lingen's garrison at Goodrich in the south of Herefordshire; Lingen, knighted in July 1645 by Charles I, formed the only notable resistance to the Parliamentarians in the county after December 1645, although there was another Royalist garrison at Ludlow, near the Shropshire border with the north of Herefordshire. Colonel Birch, meanwhile, was appointed governor of Hereford, reinforced by additional troops and supplies sent to the county, and a Parliamentary administration moved swiftly into operation in order to raise taxes and seize property belonging to delinquents. In the new year, this administration was backed by an army of about two thousand men under the new governor, including a cavalry force of five hundred commanded by Major Richard Hopton. 67

In March 1646, however, Colonel Birch took much of his army to join with Sir William Brereton and Colonel Thomas Morgan against the Royalists under Lord Astley in Worcestershire. After tracking Astley down, they defeated him at Stow-on-the-Wold in Gloucestershire on 21 March. Taking advantage of Birch's absence, Sir Henry Lingen moved out from Goodrich; he attempted to recapture Hereford but the troops remaining there were able to repulse the small Royalist force and Lingen returned to the temporary safety of the castle at Goodrich. 68 Following the defeat of Astley, Birch was campaigning in the north of Herefordshire, first
of all securing his control over Leominster, a town important not for any fortifications but for its wealth and facilities for quartering troops. Birch then encountered a force from Ludlow under the governor Sir Michael Woodhouse and Sir James Croft of Croft Castle; Croft, knighted in 1644, had inherited much of the family estate from his elder brother Sir William, killed in 1645. Birch defeated these Royalists at Eyton, near Leominster, consolidating his authority in the northern part of the county. On 18 May, Ludlow fell to Birch and he then turned his attention south towards Goodrich, but the Parliamentarians were feeling so safe in the region, especially with the King's surrender to the Scots in May, that the troops at Canon Frome were withdrawn and a garrison that had been established at Pembridge, near Ross, was also disbanded. In July, Lingen's isolated garrison at Goodrich finally surrendered to Birch's besieging forces, marking the end of the First Civil War in Herefordshire.

While causing hardship generally in the county, the war had also badly damaged the finances of many of the gentry on both sides, with estates being plundered and family homes destroyed. Viscount Scudamore estimated his losses at over £27,000; Sir Robert Harley put his at around £13,000. He had dismantled his castle at Wigmore himself, to prevent the Royalists using it, and his castle at Brampton Bryan was slighted in 1644 while the surrounding estate was devastated. Other gentry homes suffering damage during the war included Croft Castle, Whitney Castle, Eardisley Castle (owned by the Baskervilles), The Mynde (belonging to Sir Walter Pye) and Wilton Castle (belonging to the Brydges family). Wallop Brabazon of Eaton claimed he had been plundered to the value of £5000; Herbert Aubrey of Clehonger stated that Royalists, Parliamentarians and Scottish soldiers had caused losses of about £3600 to his estate; Edward Alderne of Hereford claimed his property had been damaged to the value of over £1000; Thomas Rawlins of Kilreege in Llangarren, a Parliamentarian, estimated a loss of goods worth £1500. The frequent levies of contributions from the shire, along with the plundering,
may have been a factor in the non-payment of rents during this period, although some tenants were perhaps using the confusion wrought by the war to withhold money owing to their landlords; Brabazon complained that for four years he received no rent from his estates, while Richard Rodd's tenant at the manor of Kinsham had ceased payment, depriving Rodd of an income of about £80 p.a. 73

The Royalists suffered further with the sequestration of their goods and estates. The sequestration process involved first of all charges being brought against a delinquent and the case would be presented before the local Parliamentarian committee for sequestrations. At Hereford, it was ruled that the sentence against a Royalist needed the authorisation of at least two committeemen. 74 A survey of the delinquent's estate was usually carried out beforehand and if he was found guilty the personal property and the lands would be forfeited to the state, although some allowance was usually made for the upkeep of the family. A delinquent could appeal to the central committee in London, or he might regain his estate by paying a fine based on the value of his lands and the extent of his Royalist activities; those who had fought for the King, as opposed to merely offering money and supplies, would be fined at a higher rate. It was also possible for a Royalist to confess his crimes before sequestration took place and he was then able to compound for his lands in order to safeguard his ownership. 75 Confiscated land would be leased at low rents or later sold cheaply to supporters of Parliament unless a delinquent managed to raise the money for a composition fine and thus retain hold of his estate. Sir Henry Lingen, one of the county's most notorious Royalists, was fined over £6000 in 1649 following his involvement in both the First and Second Civil Wars; Fitzwilliam Coningsby compounded at £3600; Viscount Scudamore and Sir Walter Pye had to pay about £2700 each; Thomas Tomkins paid £1400, while Thomas Price was charged over £1200. 76

With the release of their estates from sequestration, the Royalists regained the most important source of their wealth. It was not until later that the full
effects of the composition fines became apparent, when debts and mortgage payments, brought about by the need to borrow in order to pay the fines, had to be met by selling land. Sir Henry Lingen sold parts of his estates in Herefordshire and Shropshire during the 1650s. Similarly, Sir Walter Pye, whose home at Much Dewchurch was attacked and destroyed in the war, was in debt in the 1650s and forced to sell some lands. Nevertheless, many of the Royalist county gentry families in Herefordshire survived with their estates relatively intact in the 1660s and 1670s; some of them used the ploy of marriages into wealthy merchant families to offset any financial pressures. Fitzwilliam Coningsby married one of his daughters to Sampson Wise, a merchant of London; John Skippe of Ledbury arranged for his eldest son, George, to wed a daughter of Esa Risby, another London merchant, with a £2000 portion. George Skippe's second marriage, in 1669, was to a daughter of Hugh Norris of Battersea, this time with a £3000 portion.

The Royalist county gentry who were in economic difficulties after the Restoration could only partly blame the sequestrations and fines of the 1640s and 1650s for their misfortunes. Thomas Wigmore of Shobdon was already complaining of severe indebtedness before the Civil War. Following his death, around 1653, the estate was held not by his son but by his brother-in-law John Handford. This is the only instance of the lands of a Royalist J.P. passing out of the possession of the head of the family in the twenty years or so after the War, except for a few cases where there was no son available to inherit the estate. William Rudhall died in 1651 without an heir, but the family estate had already been entailed on his elder brother's death in 1636 to be eventually inherited by his sisters and their heirs. The estate of William Smallman, who died in 1643, also passed to heiresses and out of the family. Sir Henry Lingen, although fined so heavily and selling some lands, may have felt confident of his dynasty's future on his death in 1662, but in following years his sons all died without issue and the estate passed to their sisters, much of it eventually being sold.
In contrast, the problem for the Walwyn family was too many heirs. Having to provide for his many sons and daughters exacerbated Fulke Walwyn's indebtedness, and after his death, in about 1661, the wealth of the family was dissipated. Another Royalist county gentry family in difficulty were the Pyes of The Mynde. Sir Walter Pye died in 1659 leaving a reduced inheritance, but the family estate recovered after the Restoration through lucrative marriages. The eldest son, Walter, openly declared his Catholicism and to protect the estate he devised it to his younger brother, Robert, in around 1668. Probably it was the long term effect of loans and mortgages needed to pay delinquency fines in the 1640s and 1650s that led to Robert Pye later dying much in debt. Also suffering considerably from the Civil War were the finances of Sir Sampson Eure. Besides the ensuing sequestrations and fines, he lost his position in crown service which had provided the greater part of his income. Eure died in 1659 and the estate at Gatley passed to his widow and then his son, John, who failed to emulate his father's legal career. John Eure died without an heir and the estate passed out of the family.

With these families, other factors such as death, absence of heirs and pre-war debts have to be balanced with the financial misfortunes of the Civil War in order to explain their decline. The names of Wigmore, Rudhall, Smallman, Walwyn, Pye and Eure were all absent from the Commission of the Peace in the years immediately following the Restoration. Nevertheless, still over half of the J.P.s supporting the King during the war had returned to the Commission in the summer of 1660, and their families had coped adequately with the vicissitudes of the 1640s and 1650s, surviving to be well qualified in terms of wealth and status to resume their place in county government.
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CHAPTER V

The Presbyterians in Control, 1646-1648

It was not until after the capture of Hereford by Colonel Birch in December 1645 that the Parliamentarian system of local government by county committee was established in Herefordshire. When the county had been under Parliament's rule for brief periods in 1642 and 1643, an arbitrary administration was operated by the military commanders. Some of the deputy lieutenants appointed for Parliament in September 1642 may have acted at the end of the year, when the Earl of Stamford occupied Hereford and exercised control over parts of the shire; Sir Robert Harley, his son Edward, and Sir Richard Hopton were in Herefordshire giving their support to Stamford, but there is no evidence of extensive recruiting of troops by them, and the raising of money and supplies mainly involved forced contributions and plundering by the soldiers of Stamford's army. 1

Around the time of Waller's occupation of Hereford in the spring of 1643, members of the local gentry were empowered by commissions from Parliament to levy the assessment tax and to sequestrate Royalist property, but again the initiative was with the military commander rather than the local Parliamentarians. Waller directed warrants to chief constables who were aided by soldiers in the collection of funds which were then paid in to a receiver, appointed by Waller, at Hereford. A fine of £3000 also was charged on the city. 2

The administration that was to take over at Hereford after December 1645 had its origins at Gloucester when Edward Massey was governor. In May 1644, commissioners were appointed for the raising of troops in an associated region of Gloucestershire, Herefordshire and South-East Wales. 3 Sir Robert Harley, his son Edward, James Kyrle of Walford, Edward Broughton of Kington and Henry Jones of Mainstone in Pixley were among those named although their county was under Royalist control at the time. Kyrle and the Harleys were from the pre-war county gentry;
Broughton and Jones had lesser gentry backgrounds. Henry Jones (c.1580–1649) inherited an estate at Putley but in about 1630 he settled at Mainstone in the neighbouring parish of Pixley, near Ledbury. He had been greatly influenced by Thomas Thornton, a Puritan minister in charge of Katherine's Hospital at Ledbury; Thornton’s will was taken to probate by Jones in 1631 and his eldest son was named after the clergyman. During the Civil War, Jones was named a Herefordshire sequestrator in 1643 but he was at Gloucester for most of the time, involved in the Parliamentarian government under Massey.  

Both Jones and Broughton had been subsidy commissioners in 1641. Edward Broughton (c.1566–1650) was from a family that had medieval origins in Shropshire. He trained in law, becoming a barrister in 1597, and received the position as escheator for Herefordshire in 1610. Aubrey wrote of him as 'a very wise man, and of an admirable elocution'. He was friendly with the Harleys of Brampton Bryan, and probably shared the Presbyterians views of Sir Robert Harley. In July 1642, he was one of a group of Puritans excluded by the Royalists from the grand jury at Hereford, and in September his name was on the list of deputy lieutenants appointed by the Earl of Essex to act for Parliament in Herefordshire. Broughton was also named on committees nominated for the county in 1643, but for much of the First Civil War he served as a comissaary under Massey and on the Gloucester committee.  

In 1644, Broughton and possibly Jones, Kyrle and Edward Harley, all Puritans, were levying contributions for Massey in parts of the south-west of Herefordshire, depending on the successes of Parliamentarian troops in the area. The capture of Canon Frome by the Scots and their siege of Hereford, in the summer of 1645, further encouraged the exiled Parliamentarians. In August, there was an order from Edward Harley, James Kyrle and Henry Jones, at Gloucester, appointing three co-treasurers for a Herefordshire county committee. Moreover, extra men from the county were named as committeemen for the association of Gloucestershire,
Herefordshire and South-East Wales. The new members were Thomas Blayney, John Flackett senior, Robert Higgins, Martin Husbands, Herbert Perrot, Thomas Rawlins and Nathaniel Wright.\(^6\)

These commissioners were all from lesser gentry families: Thomas Blayney's family had moved from Radnorshire in about 1500 and they settled at Kinsham in the north-west of Herefordshire. Blayney was under-sheriff for the county in 1628. His estate was worth under £100 p.a. He was a client of Sir Robert Harley and was committed to Parliament's cause in 1642, when he served as a collector of revenues under the Earl of Stamford at Hereford. From 1643-5, Blayney was treasurer of the Gloucester committee.\(^7\) John Flackett's family was established at Buckenhill in the parish of Norton, near Bromyard, by 1600. He was one of the Parliamentarian deputy lieutenants in 1642 and was named a sequestrator for Hereford in 1643.\(^8\) Robert Higgins (c.1603–c.1678) was the son of a clerk in the King's Remembrancer office in London who died in 1637 leaving an estate, worth under £100 p.a., at Eastnor, near Ledbury.\(^9\) Martin Husbands was from a family that moved from Cornwall to Herefordshire in the sixteenth century and settled at Wormbridge, in the Webtree hundred, early in the reign of James I. Husbands supported Parliament in 1642 and he was another of those purged from the grand jury by Royalists in July. In 1643, he was named as a sequestrator for Herefordshire, while in following years his service in the Parliamentarian cause saw him in Cambridgeshire before his return to the West Midlands region by 1645.\(^10\)

The Perrots of Moreton-upon-Lugg were another lesser gentry family. Herbert Perrot (c.1616–1683) was the grandson of Hereford's mayor of 1589 and son of the county escheator of 1640. In the mid-1630s, he inherited the lands of Sir James Perrot of Haroldston in Pembrokeshire. He was educated at Brasenose College and Gray's Inn, eventually becoming a barrister in 1651. At the start of the Civil War, he was residing in Pembrokeshire and his first two wives came from Wales. Royalist successes in the region persuaded Perrot to support the King during the
early years of the war, but following Parliament's victories in Pembrokeshire in 1644 he switched his allegiance and received appointments as a magistrate and committeeman in the county. Perrot returned to Herefordshire around 1645-6, but not until 1657 or thereabouts did he inherit the Moreton estate from his father. His Pembrokeshire inheritance had already raised him to the rank of esquire. 11

Thomas Rawlins (1587-1676) of Kilreege in Llangarren owned an estate, worth about £100 p.a., in the south of the county. There was a Rawlins family at Hereford in the sixteenth century, including mayors and councillors. Rawlins was a deputy lieutenant for Parliament in 1642 and left the shire before the end of the year. Then in 1643, he was named as one of the Herefordshire sequestrators. 12

Nathaniel Wright's family may have had Essex origins but his father was a resident of Shrewsbury. Wright served as a physician for the Harleys at Brampton Bryan and was captured by the Royalists after his defence of the garrison in April 1644. He managed to obtain his release, so that in 1645, with the other committeemen named by Parliament, Wright was ready to take part in any new administration in Herefordshire. He was probably a Presbyterian, and could at least be described as a Puritan along with the other Herefordshire committeemen. 13

In September 1645, committeemen were again named for the county, with the appointments repeated for Sir Robert Harley, Edward Harley, James Kyrle, Edward Broughton, Henry Jones and Thomas Blayney, while John Flackett junior, the son of John Flackett of Norton, was also named. 14 These seven, with the other six added in August, John Flackett senior, Robert Higgins, Martin Husbands, Herbert Perrot, Thomas Rawlins and Nathaniel Wright, were the men who carried out the administration of the shire when it was under Parliament's control in 1646. Most of them had served under Massey at Gloucester, though not always to the governor's approval. In March 1645, Massey complained to Edward Harley about 'old choleric Mr. Kyrle' (who was probably James Kyrle, who died in 1646) and others who formed 'a multitude of Janus Breede' at Gloucester; Massey resented the difficulties they
were causing for him:

'They had out studdyed themselves so much in the things and ordinances of Parliament that they have quite cast them aside and now have found a new rule of their own by which they resolved to walk'.

All but five (Blayney, Flackett junior, Higgins, Perrot and Wright) of the thirteen Herefordshire committeemen of 1646 had been appointed as deputy lieutenants or committeemen for the county earlier in 1642-3. A number of leading gentry that were named on those probably ineffective bodies did not gain a place on the county committee of 1646. Notably absent were Sir John Kyrle, Bart., possibly because of his being in his late seventies, Sir Richard Hopton, Walter Kyrle and Bennett Hoskyns. The latter two were probably in London for much of the time. Besides their legal careers, Walter Kyrle was an M.P. for Leominster, while Hoskyns was elected as an M.P. for Hereford in 1646. Hopton's absence may have been due to rivalry with Sir Robert Harley who was the leading Herefordshire Presbyterian and had influence in Parliament as well. Another Parliamentarian not on the committee was Ambrose Elton. His son, however, who had been named on the sequestration committee of 1643, was appointed sheriff of Herefordshire shortly after Birch's capture of the city. Ambrose Elton junior (1621-1689) had married a daughter of Sir Giles Bray of Gloucestershire. He may have been a Royalist at the start of the war before changing his allegiance.

Many of the county gentry families supporting Parliament were to be represented on the committees of 1647-8, but their omission in 1646 meant that the overall wealth and status of the personnel of the county committee was not as high as it could have been. There was only one man of title, Sir Robert Harley, and only two others, Edward Harley and James Kyrle, were of county gentry status in Herefordshire before the war. These three were the only members of the committee from families established as gentry in the county since the Middle Ages; the others were of obscure origins or established in Herefordshire after 1485. Just
over half of the committee had been to university and just under half had been to the Inns of Court; about a third had been to neither the Inns nor university.  

The committee men from families with incomes under £500 p.a. formed 85% of the personnel, and most of the members owned estates bringing them only about £100 p.a. or less. Sir Robert Harley alone possessed an estate worth over £500 p.a. in Herefordshire. Back in 1642, when Lady Brilliana Harley was recommending men for the service of Parliament in county government, she had warned her husband, 'If you choose men of little estates you will make them odious to the country'. This advice had not been followed. 

Of the marriages of the committee men, eleven can be traced: only 18% of their wives were from Herefordshire; 27% came from bordering shires; 55% were from other regions. Apart from Ewias Lacy and Stretford, all the Herefordshire hundreds had at least one resident on the committee. The average age of the members was a little under fifty, but this included wide variations such as Edward Broughton, aged around eighty in 1646, compared with Edward Harley, in his early twenties. The committee contained one former Royalist, Herbert Perrot, whose compliance with the King's party earlier in the war had probably been designed to protect his Pembrokeshire estate. 

A list of sixteen J.P.s also can be compiled for Herefordshire in 1646. This would include four men of title (Sir Robert Harley, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., Sir Edward Powell, Bart., and Sir Richard Hopton) and only two magistrates from families not of county gentry status before the war. One of the magistrates was William Scudamore of Ballingham. He had supported the Royalist administration while his son fought in the King's army. Thus in 1646, Scudamore was assessed to pay the 'fifth and twentieth part', a fine levied from Royalists, Catholics and neutrals, but he appears to have escaped sequestration. Despite this background, he was one of the J.P.s signing a quarter sessions petition in 1646. Scudamore and four other J.P.s, Powell, Hopton and the Harleys, were all from families with
incomes of around £500 p.a. or more from their Herefordshire estates. The J.P.s known to be acting in 1646, however, were mostly men of small estates, including John Flackett senior and Thomas Rawlins, while Thomas Baskerville, as with Edward Harley, had not yet inherited his patrimony.  

Thomas Baskerville (c.1620-1683), the heir of Eardisley Castle in the Huntington hundred, was from a family that had been prominent in the county since the Middle Ages. The Baskervilles were in financial decline in the seventeenth century, however, and they lost their place in the magistracy in 1626 when the father of Thomas, Sir Humphrey Baskerville (c.1586-1648), was left out of the Commission of the Peace, possibly because of Catholic connections: Sir Roger Bodenham, an uncle of Sir Humphrey, had been dismissed because of his Catholic wife in about 1605. Sir Humphrey was a Royalist during the Civil War while his son supported Parliament and regained his family's place on the Commission in 1646. 

A picture emerges of a group composed mainly of lesser gentry, with some men of the pre-war squirearchy class, in charge of the Herefordshire local government in 1646. Many were Puritans, usually Presbyterian in character, with the leading figures, both Presbyterians, being Colonel John Birch, who controlled the army in the county, and Sir Robert Harley who directed the administration from Westminster, when not in Herefordshire, through his son Edward and his clients in the local government. The absence of a number of Parliamentarian J.P.s from the county committee may indicate that some of the gentry did not consider the committee work prestigious enough to warrant their membership. Moreover, the complex and tedious work involved in the administration of sequestration revenues may particularly have deterred many from taking part. A record of this work is provided by an order book of the committee, covering March 1646-May 1647, in which were placed copies of committee documents relating not only to sequestrations but also to the other financial, military and religious functions of the county.
committee. This book, along with about a hundred of the original orders that have survived from the 1646–8 period, can be used to give an insight into the activities of the committeemen. 28

Sessions of the county committee were held at the 'Palace of Hereford', formerly the Bishop's residence, and they took place daily, apart from Sundays, until February 1647 when it was decided that the reduced volume of work demanded only three meetings each week. 29 In addition to any bribes received, the committeemen were paid five shillings for each day's service; they could also grant sequestrated houses and lands to themselves at reduced rents. Dealing with confiscated lands and revenues was the business that took up most of the committee's time. Lands and goods were seized from delinquents and from the episcopal estate, then leased, usually at low rents. Royalists sometimes became tenants of the estates they formerly held, while others paid composition fines in order to regain their lands. 30

On one occasion, in December 1646, the committee's authority was challenged when sub-tenants of sequestrated episcopal land at Colwall refused to pay their rents to John Flackett who had leased the estate from the county committee, of which he himself was a member. After Flackett seized cattle from the defiant tenants, they took the case to the county court in the hope of redress. A few months later, it was decided by the committeemen to revoke Flackett's lease and they ordered the rents to be paid directly to the committee. In about 1648, however, the land was purchased outright by John Flackett junior and the family held it until the estate reverted to the see of Hereford at the Restoration in 1660. 31

The committee's work also involved regulating the assessment tax, a direct tax levied for the purpose of financing the Army. An example of difficulties here was a case before the committee in October 1646 concerning Robert Croft of Yarpole, a Royalist and a younger brother from the Croft family of Croft Castle.
He had been using his influence on local collectors to persuade them to levy money charged upon himself from a neighbour instead. The sufferer of this was Thomas Higgins, reported to be a man 'well affected to the Parliament', and possibly a relation of the committee member, Robert Higgins. The committee ruled that Croft should repay the money and, after he refused to do so, the collectors were told to enforce the order.  

Other tasks of the committee included the administration of the 'fifth and twentieth part', organisation of the militia, supervision of the removal of Royalist clergy and the appointment of replacements, and ordering payments to local troops, to the clergy and to schoolmasters in the county. Thus it can be seen that the committee's functions covered much of the financial, military and religious organisation in Herefordshire. The authority of the committeemen had arisen from the earlier ordinances of Parliament that defined separate bodies to act in the matters of the militia, taxation, sequestration and so on, but following the example of many other counties, these separate committees had amalgamated into one Herefordshire 'county committee'. Occasionally, the committee was referred to as the 'Committee for Hereford and Gloucester' and some Gloucestershire men, such as Isaac Bromwich, took part in the administration when in Herefordshire. This probably derived from the ordinance of May 1644 that appointed men to raise troops and supplies in Gloucestershire and South-East Wales as well as in Herefordshire. Committeemen from Wales also shared in the work of the committee at Hereford at various times. 

Committee orders were usually signed by three to five members; the most active committeemen in 1646 were Edward Harley, Flackett senior and junior, Blayney, Broughton, Higgins, Husbands, Jones, Rawlins and Wright. Only Harley was from the pre-war county gentry. As the transactions often involved money, the signature of the county treasurer was found on most of the documents. In August 1645, three treasurers were named for Herefordshire: John Herring of Holmer,
Thomas Seabourne of Hereford and Miles Hill of Leominster, but it was Hill alone who acted as treasurer of the committee once the county fell under Parliament's control at the end of the year.  

Miles Hill, a mercer, had been bailiff of Leominster in 1637. From the early years of the war, he supported Parliament and in 1643-4, he served as a collector of revenues for the committee at Gloucester. In the summer of 1645, he acted as a commissary for the Scottish army besieging Hereford. As treasurer of the Herefordshire county committee in 1646, he had overall responsibility for revenues collected and disbursed in the shire, but there were also various sub-treasurers, all subject to Hill's authority: there was a treasurer for the 'fifth and twentieth part', a 'high collector' for the Irish assessment (money raised for regiments serving in Ireland), and a 'receiver of the cathedral revenues', responsible for income derived from the episcopal estate. Nathaniel Coggan, a man of obscure background, was the 'fifth and twentieth part' treasurer in 1646, while Thomas Careless, a clubman leader in 1645, was high collector for the Irish assessment from about 1646-9. Thomas Rawlins held the office of receiver of the cathedral revenues also from 1646-9 and he added to his duties by taking over from Hill as county treasurer in the autumn of 1646.  

While tasks were delegated to these sub-treasurers, the county treasurer's main functions were the administration of both the money raised on the assessment tax for the Army and the revenues from delinquents' estates. Owing to the widespread Royalist support in Herefordshire during the First Civil War, the sequestration business was of particular importance, especially from 1646-8 before many of the local delinquents had completed the compounding for their estates with the central committee at Goldsmiths' Hall in London. Sequestration accounts for Herefordshire show that over £4000 was received from renting delinquents' lands in 1646, while the personal estate seized was valued at about £1000. Even more, about £7000, was gained from the episcopal estate and near £2000 was raised on the
'fifth and twentieth part'. This total of about £14,000 from sequestration and fines in 1646 can be compared with the sums charged on the county for the assessment tax, which varied in the late 1640s from £850–£1500 a month. There was also the excise, an indirect tax, which along with the assessment revenue was to be paid into central government. Sequestration funds, however, could be disbursed locally to pay the wages of the committeemen and their agents, to pay clergymen and schoolmasters, and for the upkeep of garrisons in the shire. The latter item accounted for the larger part of the revenue.

For the administration of confiscated lands and the collection of rents, the treasurer and the committee used sequestration agents who operated throughout the county. The sequestrated lands were in effect dealt with in the way a wealthy landlord with stewards and bailiffs would run his estate. For the assessment tax, however, the traditional county administration was used; as with the pre-war collection of subsidies the committeemen, taking the place of the subsidy commissioners, would firstly allocate quotas to be raised from each hundred. Assessors, often the chief constables, then fixed the amount due from each parish and then sub-collectors, or petty constables, assessed and levied the money from the inhabitants. The sums raised were paid to the chief constables, who in turn handed over the money from each hundred to the county treasurer. There were reports of negligent collectors and constables in Herefordshire, with some being imprisoned for defaulting on payments.

The committee's part in the assessment work, judging from its own record of proceedings, was one of scrupulous attention to detail and fairness. In September 1646, following complaints against a constable of the Webtree hundred that he had raised too high a contribution from the parish of Kentchurch, the committee adjudged that the pleas were justified and it was ordered that the parish's quota should be reduced. This role of the county committee as a court of appeal against the constable was repeated in January 1647, when John Norgrove, a constable of
Wolphy, was charged with raising excessive amounts from the parish of Hope. Norgrove explained that he needed to do this to ease the levy on the neighbouring township of Edvin Ralph, and the committeemen recognised the problem by ordering the charge on the parishioners to be reduced while an investigation was conducted into by how much the tax on the township needed to be abated.\textsuperscript{43} Earlier, in June 1646, the committee was actually planning to refund money; sums had been collected for the raising of cavalry in the shire, but these were not needed because, stated the committee, 'it hath pleased God to settle this county in more peaceable condition than we expected in so short a time'.\textsuperscript{44} Another example of their profession of fairness came in March 1646, when they promised to remit to Thomas Mayo, a delinquent of Bodenham, any sum by which he might have inadvertently overpaid a composition fine for his personal estate.\textsuperscript{45} The religiosity of the committeemen is perhaps indicated by an order of theirs in June 1646, telling the chief constables to ensure that ordinances for the correct observing of the sabbath were published in each parish, while in November any prisoners held by order of the committee were to be allowed, under custody, to go to church on Sundays and at any other time they wished. In February 1647, in accordance with a custom of the cathedral at Hereford to give money to the poor each year, the committee decided that since the episcopal revenues had been appropriated it was right to give £35 to the mayor and citizens of Hereford for distribution amongst the poor.\textsuperscript{46} Also showing the members of the committee to have other concerns besides the acquisition of money and the security of the shire was an expression of their worries in October 1646 about the spoiling and plundering of books in the cathedral library. In order to keep a check on the books and prevent further harm, they told the ministers in Hereford to make a catalogue of the collection.\textsuperscript{47} There is always the suspicion, however, that the county committee was more aware of the price the books might fetch, as opposed to their intrinsic value.
Certainly investigations into the procedures of the committee and its treasurers were to involve accusations of malpractice that suggest the committee order book needs to be read between the lines to obtain a full picture of the members amassing riches for themselves. Parliament had already instituted a body to audit the accounts of local committees and officials. This Presbyterian-dominated 'Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom' in London had sub-committees throughout the realm operating alongside the county committees. The sub-committee in Herefordshire, established in 1646, conformed to the political and religious views of the central body, and as with the county committee it was under the control of the Presbyterian Sir Robert Harley. Both the sub-committee and the county committee had their meetings at the 'Bishop's Palace' and evidence suggests, unlike in other shires, that relations were amicable between the two bodies.  

Appointments to the sub-committee at Hereford followed nominations by Sir Robert Harley. There was some initial confusion over procedures and around September 1646 the members of the sub-committee received a rebuke from London; they had been too zealous in their issuing of warrants for the delivery of excise accounts, before the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom had decided upon the correct method by which these were to be dealt with. Another problem was that the personnel of the sub-committee could not be drawn from people involved in local government already. Following queries from Hereford, the central body in London wrote to their sub-committee in Herefordshire ordering that only people with accounts not yet audited need be excluded; once a person's earlier service in the administration had been examined and certified, he could be appointed to the sub-committee.  

The members of the sub-committee at Hereford were men of lesser gentry or plebeian backgrounds, owning small estates with the greater part of their incomes deriving from law or commerce. Only Richard Herring of Burghill, near Hereford, may have had an education at university. He was probably also the county
escheator of 1626 and 1640. Another member of the sub-committee, Richard Wootton of Marden, went to the Inns of Court, establishing himself by 1642 as a scrivener in Fleet Street. Wootton returned to Herefordshire at the start of the war to support the Royalist cause, but despite his delinquency he was serving on the sub-committee by November 1646. Both Herring and Wootton came from families that had early Tudor origins in the county. Similarly, Francis Woodhouse of Shobdon was from a lesser gentry family that had been in Herefordshire since the early sixteenth century. The ancestors of another sub-committee member, Arthur Cockerham of Atforton, migrated from Devon in about 1550 to settle in the north-west of Herefordshire. His father married a daughter of the wealthy Salway family of Worcestershire, but the Cockerhams were in financial decline until Arthur's marriage in around 1640 to a co-heiress of a lesser gentry family of Trippleton in the parish of Witton, neighbouring Atforton. He sold his wife's inheritance and repurchased land at Atforton that his father had lost, so that his estate was worth about £150 p.a. in the area.

Only two other members of the sub-committee besides Cockerham possessed land worth £100 p.a. or more: Francis Lill of Much Marcie had an estate worth £100 p.a. in 1663. Andrew Greenly (1611-1690) of Titley, in the Wigmore hundred, was from a lesser gentry family of medieval origins in the county, possessing an estate worth near £150 p.a. He married in 1646 a daughter of Thomas Davies of Wigmore, a client of the Harley family. The four remaining members of the sub-committee were, as with Francis Lill, men of obscure backgrounds: William Aubrey of Grendon Bishop, Thomas Eaton of Pencombe, Richard Marston of Eyton and Richard Tyler of Goodrich were all nevertheless designated gentlemen in the subsidy rolls of 1641. The Awbrees of Grendon Bishop may have been a branch of the same Herefordshire family from which John Aubrey, the antiquary, was descended. Thomas Eaton of Pencombe, neighbouring Grendon Bishop in the Broxash hundred, was a steward of the Coningsby estate before the war and he served the Presbyterian
Colonel John Birch in a similar role during the 1650s. Richard Marston, of Eyton, near Leominster, had been appointed clerk of the county committee in December 1646 and then from around 1647-9 he was clerk of the peace in Herefordshire. Richard Tyler possessed land at Goodrich worth only around £10 p.a. in 1663, though it is possible that he and other members of the sub-committee and the Parliamentarian administration generally in this period acquired confiscated estates at low rents or bargain prices, which were usually restored to the original Royalist owners in 1660. Richard Wootton, for example, held sequestrated property in the Marden area during the 1650s.

The work of the sub-committee consisted of sending warrants to county officials and army officers for their accounts, which were then audited and certified as having been examined before being sent to the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom in London. The investigations covered not only the period following the fall of Hereford in December 1645, but also included any Parliamentarian activities in the shire during the early years of the Civil War. Thus Nathaniel Wright had to produce the accounts of his governorship at Brampton Bryan, and so did the commissary there, Samuel Shilton. Minor officials such as Robert Delahay, a sequestrations clerk in 1646, and Nathaniel Coggan, a sub-treasurer, also needed to face the auditors. Accounts of chief constables were audited as well.

The main business, however, was to check the dealings of the county treasurer. Following his term of office, Miles Hill was called to appear with his accounts before the sub-committee at Hereford in November 1646. Hill prevaricated but eventually arrived with his books of receipts and disbursements in December. According to the sub-committee, he 'entered in a promiscuous and confused manner' and it soon became apparent that the accounts he brought were incomplete. Hill was called before the sub-committee at least three more times during December 1646 and the following January. Although he was reported to be
refractory and always 'pretending haste and other business' the proceedings made some progress for at one stage the audit revealed a discrepancy of £15.10s. on one of the accounts, which he was ordered to pay back. Towards the end of January, however, the process was halted when Hill was imprisoned by the under-sheriff, following a suit brought against him for a debt of £153. The sub-committee was of the opinion that he preferred to stay in gaol rather than help to complete the examination of his accounts. Nevertheless, in about the middle of February, Hill was forcibly released by Major Samuel Birch, deputy governor at Hereford for his brother Colonel John Birch who was in London at the time. Hill was one of Colonel Birch's main supporters in the county; the power of Birch and his army at Hereford was resented by Sir Robert Harley, and this may explain the hostility shown to Hill by the pro-Harley sub-committee.

Despite his release, Hill's trials were not over. Early in March 1647, the sub-committee wrote to him from Hereford about his defective accounts. He was also accused of having spoken insultingly of the members of the sub-committee. Hill's reply obligingly put these insults in writing. He stated that one of the members had been a Royalist and described another as 'not being responsible for what wrong he may do in an account'. Hill finished this letter by answering rumours he had heard that his opposition to Sir Robert Harley and Edward Harley had ruined his career: 'If I could have but justice done', he wrote, 'I did not fear any man'. The sub-committee's reply to these 'many impertinences' from Hill denied the charge of delinquency and ignored the accusation of incompetence. He was summoned to appear again a week later. It seems he did attend but, after refusing to pay any money that was adjudged to be owing on his account, he left the meeting angrily. Hill then departed from the city with a guard of soldiers, and these prevented any attempt by a messenger of the sub-committee to serve a warrant on him to be at the next meeting for further auditing. Both parties decided to appeal to London; Hill put his complaints before
Parliament while the sub-committee wrote from Hereford asking for the protection of the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom. Evidence of malpractice was gathered against the former county treasurer: Robert Jeynes, a collector of revenue in the hundreds of Radlow and Greytree, made a deposition that Hill had refused to give receipts for money paid in by the collectors in the county.  

How these squabbles continued is not clear, but Hill did not feature in the county administration again until after the fall of the Harleys with the Revolution of December 1648. The arguments between Hill and the sub-committee, however petty, do serve to illustrate the part political divisions played in local government. Hill was probably attacked by the sub-committee because of his links with Colonel Birch. When dealing with the accounts of subsequent treasurers, who were in the Harley faction, the sub-committee proved to be more amenable. Then, with the fall of the Presbyterians and the replacement of the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom in 1649 by a smaller body of professional auditors, while some duties reverted to the Exchequer, the local sub-committees were scrapped, and the work of the sub-committee at Hereford came under criticism. The solicitor for sequestrations in Herefordshire, George Thorne, a government agent who reported on sequestration activities in the region, dismissed the auditing of the sub-committee as worthless. In March 1649, he accused them of having been of 'notorious behaviour and dishonesty'. It was thought that they had allowed Thomas Rawlins, in his role as receiver of the cathedral revenues, to filch much money for himself. Corruption was not unknown in seventeenth century local government, but possibly it was increasing during the 1640s and 1650s owing to the additional temptation provided by the sequestration revenues. Moreover, the number of men with low incomes coming to take part in the administration may also help to explain the trend. Another explanation of the apparent rise in corruption, however, is that the comparatively stable 'county community' of the pre-war years had been replaced by a local government of differing factions ever eager to accuse
members of other groups of malpractice. Thus illegalities that were hidden before the Civil War were being brought into the open. 73

Following the removal of the sub-committee at Hereford in 1640, most of the personnel returned to obscurity. Only two members, Thomas Eaton and Arthur Cockerham, were named on other committees; Cockerham even managed to obtain a place on the Commission of the Peace in the 1650s. As with other departments of Parliamentarian local government, some Royalists had managed to infiltrate the accounts administration. Apart from Richard Wootton, there was John Cooke, a Hereford man experienced in accounting, whom the sub-committee wanted as treasurer of the auditing activities. Despite the members being 'confident of the gentleman's integrity' and his having served previously as a treasurer to Sir William Waller at Hereford in 1643, the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom had turned down his appointment because 'of his late several misemployments'; it appears that he had taken part in the Royalist administration as well. 74 Cooke did, however, join in the Parliamentarian administration, although no authorisation was given to the sub-committee's repeated request for him to be a member. 75

A further example of the acceptance of Royalists in the county administration was the continued presence of William Scudamore of Ballingham on the Commission of the Peace. Scudamore also found himself at the centre of another tussle between the Birch and Harley factions. One of Colonel Birch's officers, Major John Humphries, had in 1646 distrained some oxen from the Ballingham estate. Scudamore appealed against this action and the case was taken up in London by the M.P.s from Herefordshire, Sir Robert Harley, Edward Harley, Walter Kyrle and Bennett Hoskyns. Local committeemen also, such as John Flackett junior, offered their support to Scudamore, rather than backing the local soldiery. 76

Hostility from the populace towards the occupying army in Herefordshire was represented not by the defeated Royalist gentry but by the Presbyterian faction in control of the administration. Sir Robert Harley and his supporters stood for
the old order and localism against the outsider and upstart Colonel Birch. As in
the case of William Scudamore, the county committee was in favour of reconciliation
and leniency to Royalists. In many ways the situation in Herefordshire resembled
the political struggle between the Army and the Presbyterians in Parliament during
this period. One important difference, however, was that while Parliament's
policy was to attempt to weaken the county committees and possibly remove them
completely, in Herefordshire the county committee, along with the sub-committee
for accounts, remained in the control of the Harley faction and reinforced
Presbyterian authority in the shire. With their hold on local finances, the
militia and appointments to church livings, the Presbyterians were able to enforce
their political and religious policies in Herefordshire. 77

In 1646, the most widespread grievance in the county against the soldiery
was the cost of the upkeep of garrisons. Birch's troops had not been particularly
popular ever since their capture of Hereford in December 1645, when they carried
out some plundering, while Colonel Birch also levied arbitrary fines from the
citizens. 78 The problem of wages for the occupying army emerged as early as the
following February, when soldiers in the Hereford garrison protested over arrears
in pay and accused the county committee of holding money back. 79 Also in February
1646 was an indication that Colonel Birch and Sir Robert Harley had already fallen
out, although Birch was writing in the hope of ending any quarrel. 80

Birch was a Presbyterian in religion himself, and in later years he revealed
political conservatism also. He had some supporters in the local administration,
including Miles Hill, and in March 1646 members of the county committee expressed
recognition of Birch's 'care and frugality and wisdom'. 81 Writing in 1655,
Major-General James Berry stated that 'the man is popular in these parts... He
is taken for a great wit and guilty of some honesty'. 82 Birch's military
successes had won him favour in London, including an order from Parliament for
reparation of his merchant losses at Bristol in 1643; he was thus able to purchase
an estate at Leominster and to establish himself as a country gentleman in Herefordshire, but although he was elected as an M.P. for Leominster in 1646, the popularity that Berry referred to had not yet been attained. Instead he was resented as the leader of a costly army. 83

Birch's campaigns outside Herefordshire in March 1646 may have eased matters in the county. Furthermore, around May 1646, the garrisons of Canon Frome and Pembridge were withdrawn. There was still, however, a force of about 2000, including the cavalry under Richard Hopton, quartered at Hereford and throughout the shire. 84 The presence of such a large army was seen as an unnecessary burden by many people, but while pay was in arrears the possibility of disbandment was deterred by the government's inability to provide the money needed to obtain the co-operation of the soldiers. Birch was apparently levying money on his own initiative, when in July 1646 the Committee of Both Kingdoms, the central executive body, ordered him to refrain from collection without the authorisation of ordinances of Parliament. 85

In August 1646, Sir Robert Harley was recommending that Birch's regiment be sent to serve in Ireland. From the quarter sessions in October, there resulted a petition, supported by the sheriff Ambrose Elton junior and the J.P.s, asking Parliament for a reduction in the number of troops in Herefordshire. There was also a request for leniency towards Royalists. 86 The county committee meanwhile successfully appealed to General Fairfax for the departure of some of the cavalry quartered in the county. 87 Also in October 1646, there was a notable instance of members of the committee consorting with a Royalist. Sir Henry Lingen, the commander of Goodrich Castle who surrendered to Birch in July, appeared in Hereford wearing his sword and was thus breaking his parole. He was joined by two committeeemen, Isaac Bromwich and Herbert Perrot, the latter an ex-Royalist himself. Birch was absent from Hereford at the time, but an attempt was made to arrest Lingen while he was drinking at the 'Falcon Inn' with Bromwich and Perrot. Lingen's
Parliamentarian comrades resisted the officer and it was reported that a drunken brawl ensued.

When Colonel Birch returned, he began to investigate the episode. Lingen and Perrot escaped without charges; Bromwich, however, who was an army officer as well as a committee, was called before Birch's 'council of war', a meeting of his officers at Hereford Castle. Bromwich had a record as a troublemaker; when serving on the Gloucester committee in December 1644, he was facing charges of misconduct and during the subsequent months General Massey and others complained of his behaviour there. His reaction to the council of war at Hereford in October 1646 confirmed his disputatious nature; he challenged Birch to a duel. As Birch was a superior officer, the challenge could be interpreted as mutiny and the council swiftly tried Bromwich and found him guilty of this offence. He was then sent under custody to London to face possible execution. The county committee did not take kindly to these measures, and a statement was issued against Birch and his council:

'Forasmuch as it is the opinion of this Committee that the Governor of Hereford hath no power nor authority given him from the Parliament by himself or his council of war to proceed in judgment against any member of this Committee or to convict any of us before his council of war, it is therefore hereby ordered that Isaac Bromwich Esq. one of our members be forthwith discharged and set at liberty from any restraint put upon him'.

Any complaint against Bromwich, ruled the committeeen, should be brought to them in order that the matter can be presented to Parliament, 'whom we conceive to be the proper judges in such cases'.

The affair did reach Parliament's jurisdiction, and in the House of Commons Sir Robert Harley supported Bromwich, presenting a petition from Herefordshire levelling counter-charges against Colonel Birch. Less than a week later, towards the end of October, Bromwich was released from imprisonment. It was also about this time that Miles Hill was replaced as county treasurer; thus the Harley
faction appeared to be in full control of the administration. The new treasurer was Thomas Rawlins, one of the committeemen who signed the statement against Birch and the council of war at Hereford. The power of the Harleys and the Presbyterian faction was further revealed in the 'Recuiter' elections for new M.P.s in place of the excluded Royalists. Apart from Birch, the native Herefordshire M.P.s in 1646 were all supporters of Sir Robert Harley, a knight of the shire in Parliament since 1640. Bennett Hoskyns and Edmund Weaver were returned by the City of Hereford in 1646. Hoskyns was one of those supporting the Royalist William Scudamore against Birch. In 1647, and in later years, he came under charges of delinquency himself. His fellow M.P. for Hereford, Edmund Weaver (1610-1672), was the son of Richard Weaver, who represented Hereford in the Long Parliament until his death in 1642. Edmund had qualified as a barrister in 1637 and may have practised at Hereford. He married a sister of the sheriff Ambrose Elton. He was also accused of having supported the Royalist government. One of the M.P.s for Weobley elected in 1646 was Robert Andrews, not resident in Herefordshire but a Northamptonshire man. The other Weobley M.P., William Crowther (c. 1598-c. 1653) came from a Ludlow family and established himself as a merchant in London. Then in 1629, he purchased land in the Wormsley area, near Weobley. Crowther was one of a group of Parliamentarians who fled from the county in the summer of 1642.

Representing Leominster with Colonel Birch was Walter Kyrle, who had retained his place in Parliament from 1640 despite accusations of Royalism. He supported William Scudamore also against Birch and his army. Kyrle had been a steward of estates belonging to the Earl of Essex in Herefordshire and following the death of his patron in 1646, he now acted for the new owner, Essex's sister the Marchioness of Hertford, a Royalist; this brought Kyrle under further suspicion.

Besides Kyrle, only Sir Robert Harley had held his seat in Parliament
throughout the First Civil War. The vacant place for a knight of the shire in 1646 went to his eldest son, Edward, confirming the prestige of the Harley family in the county. Edward Harley (1624-1700) had been educated at Magdalen College, Oxford which was noted at that time as strongly Puritan; he was probably influenced by his Puritan tutor, Edward Perkins, thus reinforcing the Presbyterianism he had imbibed from his parents. Although he went on to Lincoln's Inn, any continuation of studies was interrupted by the start of the Civil War. He joined the Parliamentarian side and during the war he served under Sir William Waller and Edward Massey, often campaigning in Herefordshire and bordering counties. By 1645, Edward Harley had gained the rank of colonel but throughout 1646 he was also one of the more active committeemen at Hereford, providing a useful link between the county administration and his father in London. 99

The county election was due to be held on 14 November 1646 at Leominster. Elections of knights of the shire were supervised by the sheriff at the county court and were usually held at Hereford. Ambrose Elton, however, had moved the county court to Leominster, possibly in order to lessen the influence that Birch and the Hereford garrison might have on proceedings. Early in October, Birch asked for the court to be moved to Hereford, but Elton refused. 100 Sir Richard Hopton had joined with Birch in this request, and probably he was an ally against the Harleys at this stage. In November, both Hopton and Sir John Brydges, Bart., who had earlier helped Birch in the capture of Hereford, were sequestrated by the pro-Harley county committee, possibly because of their links with Birch. Miles Hill also mentioned Hopton and Brydges as supporters of Birch against the Harleys. 101 They were later discharged from sequestration, in March 1647. 102

Shortly before the election was due to take place, the committee made its plans to travel to Leominster, most likely to vote for Edward Harley, one of the members of the committee. On 12 November, some of the committeemen thought it was best to depart early from Hereford 'for that the daie is short' and they suspended
sessions of the committee. Later in the day, however, other members reopened business, deciding that there was plenty of time remaining for travelling to Leominster. The dismissal of the clerk of the committee, Nicholas Philpotts, on 13 November when many of the members were absent may suggest there were some rivalries and scheming on the committee. Possibly Robert Higgins, Martin Husbands and Henry Jones, who had not signed the earlier declaration in favour of Bromwich and were among those who reconvened the sessions on 12 November, were supporters of Birch and used this opportunity to remove the pro-Harley clerk of the committee, Nicholas Philpotts. 103

Nevertheless, most of the committeemen along with the sheriff supported the Harleys. With careful management of the election and the disbursing of a sum of over £400 on the campaign, Edward Harley was duly elected as knight of the shire to join his father at Westminster. 104 It was suggested that support had been canvassed from many Royalists in the county in order to be sure of winning the election. At this stage, the Presbyterian faction in Herefordshire, under Sir Robert Harley, was clearly identified with the causes of localism and leniency towards Royalists, in opposition to the Independents and the soldiery. 105

Ironically, the army faction in Herefordshire was still led by a man of Presbyterian beliefs, Colonel John Birch. The complaints against Birch and the Hereford garrison continued throughout 1646 and 1647. In December 1646, William Phillipps, mayor of Hereford, petitioned Sir Robert Harley for relief from the financial exactions the city was suffering. 106 Both Harley and Birch were in London, as M.P.s at Westminster. Early in January 1647, Birch made an attempt to draw opinion in Herefordshire on his side by sending a letter to the county committee which, besides attacking the committeemen for claiming authority over the local garrison, also accused them of seizing property in Hereford that was too low in value to come under the sequestration ordinances. A copy of this letter was fixed by the deputy governor Major Samuel Birch to the door of the market house
at Hereford. Colonel Birch further stated in the letter that he was in favour of disbanding the troops, but the process was delayed because of arrears in pay. If the committee put forward any resolutions for the organisation of disbandment, Birch promised to give these his support. The committeemen explained Birch's professions of concern for the county to be merely attempts at winning favour and they complained to Sir Robert Harley that the soldiers were still busily extorting money for themselves from local delinquents despite the governor's statement of good intentions. 107

January 1647 also saw Birch's agents in Herefordshire promoting a certificate, claiming to be from the 'gentry and commonalty' of the county, in which the governor and his troops were cleared of any charges of malpractice. A petition from the quarter sessions to the House of Commons disowned the certificate and protested against Birch's exactions, especially the quartering of soldiers in the county. 108 Birch may have been forced to respond to this, because on 22 January he wrote to his officers in Herefordshire, warning them not to quarter troops on people friendly to Parliament, but to make delinquents and neutrals, or people owing taxes, their victims instead. The complaints went on, however, and early in February the county committee sent a letter to Parliament appealing against the quartering of soldiers and their illegal raising of contributions. On 10 February, the committee condemned the action of a local officer, Captain Piggot, who had threatened Herbert Westfaling of Mansell Gamage, a Royalist, with the quartering of troops on his estate if he refused to pay money instead. 109

The soldiery gave further cause for resentment with the rescue of Miles Hill from Hereford gaol, disregarding the authority of the under-sheriff who then wrote pleadingly to Ambrose Elton, stating that he wished the soldiers would 'demean themselves more civilly according to the laws of the land'. Elton sent the description of this incident to Sir Robert Harley. A few weeks later, at the start of March 1647, Harley and the other native Herefordshire M.P.s, excluding
Birch, were given by the county committee a detailed account of the excessive expense of keeping the troops in the shire. 110

Some of the soldiers were quartered in the Ewias Lacy hundred under the command of Captain Thomas French, apparently against the orders of the county committee. Local people protested over the exactions and when French tried to impose his authority a fight ensued in which four people were killed, including one of the soldiers. According to a version of the affair sent by Edward Harley to his father in May 1647, this provoked a 'countryman' rising and a force gathered at Longtown, desirous of revenge against the army. The countrymen were led by a former Parliamentarian soldier and the troubles appear not to have been inspired by Royalism. 111 As in 1645, it was an instance of harshly treated people reacting to military occupation. Ewias Lacy was one of the least prosperous parts of the shire, an economically backward area, with rocky and infertile soils in the uplands of the hundred. Dairying was the main form of agriculture, distinguished from the mixed farming of the rest of the county. Later, in the nineteenth century, the inhabitants, many of whom were more Welsh than English, were described as the most quarrelsome and violent people in the shire, always showing hostility to strangers. 112

The people of Ewias Lacy do not appear to have suffered reprisals similar to those inflicted on some of the countrymen of Broxash and Radlow in 1645. French's commander, Major Samuel Birch, merely reported the matter to the county committee and Edward Harley was sent to investigate. He found that he was able to sympathise with grievances in the area against the soldiery; the countrymen were only expressing the same complaints that had been frequently voiced in the county committee and quarter sessions over the past year. Edward Harley promised to redress their grievances and the countrymen dispersed. 113

Meanwhile, more positive steps were being taken to disband the troops in Herefordshire. There was an overall plan by the Presbyterians at Westminster to
reduce the number of soldiers in the country, disbanding some and sending others
to serve in Ireland. Besides helping to bring down taxation, this strategy had
the advantage of weakening the power of the Independents and their allies in the
Army. Colonel John Birch, a Presbyterian himself, was linking himself more
closely to the Presbyterian party in London and in March 1647, possibly working
with Sir Robert Harley despite their previous differences, he took part in the
formulation of measures for the disbanding of the soldiers in Herefordshire. 114

It was decided to offer two months' arrears and a month's advance to the troops
in order to persuade them to agree to the plans. Many of the men were detailed
for service in Ireland, while a small garrison of about one hundred and fifty was
to be left at Hereford Castle under a new governor, Colonel Samuel More. 115

Samuel More (1594-1662) was the head of a county gentry family of Shropshire.
He also possessed land worth about £100 p.a. in the Wigmore area in the north-west
of Herefordshire. During the Civil War he fought for Parliament and as governor
of Hopton Castle in 1644 he had been spared while his garrison was massacred by
the successful Royalist besieging force. After this setback to his military
career he was released by his captors, in return for a Royalist prisoner held by
Parliament, and in 1645 he was appointed governor of Montgomery and of Monmouth.
He was also named a J.P. and included on committees for Shropshire and for
counties in Wales. In 1646, More was made governor of Ludlow, which Colonel Birch
captured in May of that year. More was another Presbyterian, but unlike Birch he
was on good terms with Sir Robert Harley and after his appointment as governor of
Hereford in 1647 he wrote to Harley and other M.P.s, thanking them for their
support. 116

More was unable to establish himself as governor, however, because the dis-
bandment did not go as planned, despite the initial encouragement of Richard
Hopton's cavalry regiment dispersing in March 1647 after opposition from some of
the men was overcome. During following months, money was collected locally and
funds were sent from London, but whatever arrears were paid they did not satisfy the remaining infantry troops in the shire. The soldiers, moreover, were reluctant to obey the order to leave Hereford and march to Chester for transportation to Ireland. Colonel Birch was sent from London to supervise proceedings but he was unable to persuade his men to depart. Instead, in July, they mutinied against their commander, seizing him and Major Samuel Birch, and appropriated money and stores held at Hereford Castle. Colonel Birch was released soon afterwards, but the soldiers kept his brother to act as an intermediary between them and the county committee.  

The mutiny at Hereford may have been encouraged by the actions of Fairfax's troops in the summer of 1647. In June, Cornet Joyce removed the King from Parliament's control, bringing him under the Army's custody, and there followed the 'Declaration of the Army' which defended the soldiers' rights and defied Parliament. Also in June, charges were made against some of the M.P.'s who were considered the most hostile to the Army; Edward Harley was one of these 'Eleven Members' and his removal from the House of Commons was demanded by the soldiery. In August 1647, Fairfax and his troops occupied London. Owing to these events the soldiers in Herefordshire went unpunished for their mutiny as the Presbyterians had no military power to impose their authority. Quartering continued in the county while the soldiers made claims for the full satisfaction of their arrears in pay. John Humphries, formerly an officer under Birch and now a colonel, was left in charge of the troops. Further attempts were made by Parliament to disband the forces in Herefordshire in January 1648 and the following month, with Major Robert Harley (a younger brother of Edward) playing a part. Another attempt was made in October 1648 but still many supernumeraries remained in the shire during the winter that followed. In about November 1648, Wroth Rogers, a radical Independent, was appointed to be governor of a reduced garrison at Hereford.
The Hereford army was not involved in the suppression of local Royalists during the Second Civil War in 1648. While Cromwell, Fairfax and other military commanders were defeating the invading Scots and the other supporters of Charles I elsewhere in the country, in Herefordshire it was the county militia that acted. The administration of this force, as with the rest of local government remained largely in the control of the Presbyterian faction, which still dominated appointments to the county committee in 1647–8. For much of the time, however, the administration was concerned with raising money for the upkeep of Army forces and for the arrears of the local troops. There were new assessment commissions for the shire in June 1647 and in the February and March of 1648, while new militia commissions were named in the spring of 1648 and in the following December. These two areas of committee government were beginning to be made more distinct, with the more exclusive militia commission resembling the pre-war deputy lieutenancy (but containing more members) and the assessment commission showing a similarity to the old commissions for raising subsidies and loans for the crown. Many people named on the commissions were also probably appointed as magistrates in 1647–8.

The committeemen of 1647–8 can be viewed in three groups: there were those surviving from the 1646 county committee, those appointed from June 1647 onwards and known to be active in the administration, and those appointed in this period but who were absent from committee work, judging by the signatures on orders issued by committeemen. Of the committeemen in 1646, James Kyrle had died that year and Martin Husbands died in 1647. John Flackett senior died in about 1648. Herbert Perrot, meanwhile, probably returned to his Pembrokeshire estate and he was not included in the Herefordshire commissions of 1647–8. Sir Robert Harley was included, often at the head of a commission, but he spent most of the time in London. Also named on the committees were Edward Harley, Thomas Blayney, Edward Broughton, John Flackett junior, Robert Higgins, Henry Jones, Thomas Rawlins and
Nathaniel Wright and they continued to be active in the sequestration, assessment and militia administration. Thomas Rawlins remained as county treasurer until about November 1647, when he was replaced by Thomas Careless, who in turn made way for Thomas Blayney in 1648.124

Of the new appointments in 1647-8, those signing committee orders were Robert Harley junior, Francis Pember, Thomas Baskerville, Bennett Hoskyns, Ambrose Elton senior and his son Ambrose Elton junior, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., and his son Francis Kyrle, Walter Kyrle and his nephew Robert Kyrle, William Littleton, John Cholmley and Thomas Eaton. Apart from Eaton and Cholmley these committeemen were all from pre-war county gentry families. Eaton was a member of the sub-committee for accounts in 1646-7, and came from a local lesser gentry family. John Cholmley (c.1603-1661) had a Middlesex background but by 1641 he had acquired an estate at Credenhill, near Hereford. Early in the Civil War, he fled from the county to Nottinghamshire, only to return after the fall of Hereford to Parliament in 1645.125

Cholmley later proved to be a supporter of the Independent faction, but the others can be linked to the Presbyterian, conservative group in Herefordshire. Robert Harley junior (1626-1673) was the second son of Sir Robert. He had been in arms for Parliament, serving under Edward Massey for a time and reaching the rank of major. In 1647, he was elected as the M.P. for Radnor.126 Francis Pember of Newport in Almeley, in the Stretford hundred, was from a family established in Herefordshire in the sixteenth century. He was most likely the sheriff of 1624 and county escheator in 1633. His family had links with Lord Conway, the father-in-law of Sir Robert Harley. Pember's land was worth over £200 p.a. He supported Parliament in the First Civil War and was appointed a sequestrator in 1643. At the siege of Hereford in the summer of 1645, he joined to help the Scottish army. A daughter of his was married to another of the committeemen, Thomas Baskerville of Eardisley.127
Bennett Hoskyns, Ambrose Elton senior, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., and Walter Kyrle were all magistrates before the war. Ambrose Elton junior was sheriff from December 1645 to November 1647 when he was succeeded by Francis Kyrle (c.1600-1649), the eldest son of the baronet. Robert Kyrle had inherited the estate of his father James Kyrle of Walford who died in 1646. As he had fought for the King during 1643-4, Robert needed to obtain a pardon for his delinquency in May 1647, which was granted in recognition of his having been on Parliament's side since late 1644. He had been commander of the garrison established at Pembroke until its disbandment in about May 1646.

William Littleton (1591-1653), the remaining Herefordshire committeeman whose signature can be found on the orders of the committee, was a younger son of a Shropshire family who established himself at Moor Park in Richards Castle, in the far north of Herefordshire. His eldest brother Edward Littleton, an M.P. for Leominster in 1625 and 1626, was a successful lawyer and politician, created Lord of Mounslow, in Shropshire, and a member of the Privy Council in 1641. The brothers had earlier practised on the Oxford circuit and both were made serjeants-at-law in 1640, but while Edward supported the King in the war, William was a Parliamentarian. In June 1642, Lady Brilliana Harley described an encounter William Littleton had with Royalists at Ludlow who shouted insults at him. Littleton's reply was firm; he turned to one of the men and 'he gave the fellow a good box of the ear and stept to one who had a cudgel and took it from him and beat him soundly'. Lady Brilliana added that 'they say they are now more quiet in Ludlow'.

Those men named on commissions in 1647-8 but whose signatures are not found on committee orders during this period were Sir Edward Powell, Bart., William Crowther, John Birch, John Scudamore, Isaac Seward, Samuel Trottman, Francis Hall, Priamus Davies, Thomas Dannett, John Pateshall, John Herring, John James and Edward Freeman. Crowther and Birch, both M.P.s, were probably in London for
much of this period and the same may apply to Powell also. John Scudamore of Kentchurch, a pre-war J.P., was appointed sheriff in 1648. Isaac Seward, also a J.P. before the war, faced charges of delinquency but was discharged from these accusations. 131

Samuel Trotman (c.1600-1684), a barrister in 1635, was a younger son of a Gloucestershire family. By 1641, he was residing at Saint Weonards, in the south of Herefordshire. He had family ties with Isaac Bromwich, the Gloucestershire man who was an honorary member of the county committee at Hereford in 1646. Trotman had been appointed a sequestrator for Herefordshire in 1643. By the 1650s, he may have returned to settle in Gloucestershire and he was named on the Commission of the Peace there. 132 The family of Francis Hall of Ledbury had moved into the county from Lincolnshire in the late sixteenth century. Hall was a clothier who also possessed a landed estate worth about £150 p.a. in the Ledbury area. 133 Priamus Davies of Buckton had fought for Parliament at the siege of Brampton Bryan and he reached the rank of captain. His estate was worth under £100 p.a. in 1663. 134 Thomas Dannett (c.1595-1677) came from a Surrey family but he had settled in the Bosbury area by 1641. Dannett fought for Parliament and in 1646 he was renting sequestrated property from the county committee. His lands were worth about £100 p.a. in 1663. 135

John Pateshall was from a Leominster merchant family and he was bailiff of the borough in 1633 and 1653. 136 John Herring (c.1605-c.1657), an opponent of Ship Money and a Parliamentarian who was driven from his house at Holmer, near Hereford, in 1642, came from a family of the city of Hereford. He fought for Parliament, attaining the rank of captain, and joined the Scots at the siege of Hereford in August 1645. A religious radical, Herring was later involved in Quakerism. 137 John James (c.1609-1681) was the heir of a lesser gentry family of Astley in Worcestershire, but in about 1634 he married the co-heiress of lands at Tripleton in Witton in the Wigmore hundred of Herefordshire. In July 1642, he
was excluded by the Royalists from the grand jury at Hereford and during the Civil War he was in arms for Parliament, eventually reaching the rank of colonel. He was also named on committees in Worcestershire. Edward Freeman was also from a Worcestershire background; he was a younger son of a lesser gentry family at Blockley. Freeman trained as a lawyer at Gray's Inn and by 1641 he had settled at Norton, near Bromyard, in Herefordshire. In the Civil War, he rose to the rank of colonel in the service of Parliament. From about 1648 onwards he was active on the South Wales assizes.

Of this group of thirteen named on commissions in 1647–8 but not found signing committee orders, only Scudamore and Powell were from the pre-war county gentry. The others can mainly be described as merchants or lesser gentry. Freeman, James, Herring and Pateshall were to be associated with religious radicalism at times in the 1650s; the others appear to have been more conservative. The active Herefordshire committeemen from 1646–8, twenty-six in all, included a number of lesser gentry, such as Thomas Blayney, Thomas Rawlins, Robert Higgins, Henry Jones and the Flacketts of Norton, and these were among the most busy of the committee members, but the majority of this group can be linked to the Harley-led Presbyterian faction, defending the established social order against the Independents. Moreover, with the additional appointments of 1647–8, more prominent families, such as the Kyrles and Eltons, came to be involved on the committees as well, and of the active committeemen, fourteen out of twenty-six were from families that included magistrates or sheriffs in the pre-war years.

This then was the administration in the county at the time of the Second Civil War in 1648. It was predominantly conservative and Presbyterian, and thus it could have been expected to have some sympathy with Charles I and the Scottish Presbyterians who invaded England in his favour in the summer of 1648. Nevertheless, it appears that most of the Presbyterians in England did not want a settlement imposed on the country by Royalists and Scots. Such was the case in
Herefordshire where the Harley faction played its part in defeating Royalists locally and in organising troops to be sent north against the Scots. In July there were rumours of a rising planned by Royalists in the West Midlands, in which Sir Henry Lingen was implicated. Some of the ringleaders were arrested, but Lingen was not taken and in August he gathered a cavalry force, including Robert Croft of Yarpole and probably John Skippe of Ledbury also, and they went on to attack the local militia near Leominster, taking some prisoners. The militia regrouped, under Major Robert Harley, and prepared to strike back against Lingen. With the assistance of Colonel Thomas Horton, who had recently taken part in the defeat of a 'Presbyterian-Royalist' rising in Pembrokeshire, Harley and the militia tracked down the Herefordshire Royalists under Lingen and defeated them in Radnorshire.

Also in August 1643, the Scots were defeated by Oliver Cromwell in the Preston campaign, and with the end of the Second Civil War the Herefordshire militia dispersed. Thus any military power of the Presbyterians in the county gave way to the army garrisoned at Hereford, under the command of Wroth Rogers by November 1648. Rogers, formerly a tailor, was a radical Puritan from Llanvaches in Monmouthshire, where his grandfather had been rector in the sixteenth century. His father, John 'ap Roger' or 'Rogers', probably named his son after a later rector at Llanvaches, William Wroth. Wroth Rogers was a witness to the will of this leading Welsh Puritan, who died in 1642. Rogers married sometime before 1639, with his wife coming from a Glamorgan family; later he married a daughter of the Salways of Worcestershire, a Puritan county gentry family. During the Civil War, he served in the army of the Eastern Association under the Earl of Manchester and then became a captain of infantry in the New Model Army in 1645; he probably fought at the battle of Naseby. By 1648, Rogers was a major in the garrison at Gloucester where Sir William Constable was the governor at this date. Constable, who signed the death warrant of Charles I later, probably detailed
Rogers to take over at Hereford in order to safeguard the control of the region for the Independents. In November, Rogers showed his allegiance by signing a petition opposed to Parliament's negotiations with the King. Therefore, when Parliament was purged by the Army in December 1648 and the Independents seized control of the central government, there was a force in Herefordshire, under the command of one of their party, ready to implement the orders of the new regime against the local Presbyterians and Royalists.
Notes to Chapter V


13. Al. Oxon., II, 1687; Webb, Civil War, I, 320; H.M.C., Bath, I, 1-41; H.M.C., Portland, III, 199; Duncumb, Collections, V, part 1, p. 83. Wright and other committeemen are also described in Aylmer, 'Herefordshire, 1645-1661'.


15. H.M.C., Portland, III, 1137.


17. It was probably Harley's influence over the local committeemen that led to their sequestration of Hopton in 1646. See B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 117.

18. Mayo, Mayo and Elton Families, p. 18; Robinson, Mansions, pp. 168-9; C.C.A.M., III, 1216-7; J. R. Phillips, Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and the Marches, 1642-1649 (1874), I, 64-5; H.M.C., Portland, III, 153-4; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 99, 103. Some of the committees of 1643 included 'Richard Hobson' and 'John Brocket', names that cannot be traced elsewhere in connection with Herefordshire during this period. They were probably from Hertfordshire and included on the lists of Herefordshire committeemen by mistake. See A. & O., II, 36, 300, 468, 665, 917; Gray's Inn Adm., pp. 73, 139. Also on one of the 1643 committees but not appointed later was Thomas Davies, who can be more positively identified as a resident of the county, from the parish of Wigmore. See A. & O., I, 170; P.R.O., E. 179/119/479; H.M.C., Portland, III, 92; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 138, 140, 147.

19. Compare with the J.P.s, 1636-60. See Appendix XIII.

20. The figure of 85% excludes Edward Harley who, as in Appendix XIII, is credited with the family estate for the purposes of this analysis. Herbert Perrot's estate in Pembrokeshire may have brought his landed wealth near to the £500 p.a. mark.

21. H.M.C., Portland, III, 97. This infiltration of the 'county community' by men of small estates was a national trend. See, for example, D. H. Pennington, 'The County Community at War' in E. W. Ives (ed.), The English Revolution, 1600-1660 (1968), pp. 64-75, especially pp. 72-4. See also other county studies, supra, note 1.
22. The figure for the average age does not include three of the committeemen whose date of birth has not been traced.


24. See Appendix VIII. Flackett and Rawlins were the two from lesser gentry families. Quarter sessions and assizes took place under the Parliamentarian administration in 1646. See H.M.C., Portland, III, 145; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 67v; Loan 29/175, Petition of Herefordshire quarter sessions, 6 October 1646.

25. Ibid. See also B.M., Add. MS. 11051, ff. 161-6.

26. In 1645, the Baskerville estate was reported to be worth £300 p.a., but in 1663 it was valued at just over £100 p.a. only. See Long, Symonds' Diary, p. 196; Faraday, Assessment, p. 85. Thomas Baskerville's son and heir was said to have died in poverty. See T.W.C. (1904), p. 261. Reasons for the reduction in value included the destruction at Eardisley during the war, while some property passed to a younger branch of the family. See Faraday, Assessment, pp. 85-6.

27. Duncumb, Collections, V, part 1, p. 39; Burke's Gentry (1833-8), I, 90-2; Robinson, Mansions, pp. 154, 256; Robinson, Castles, p. 47; Al. Oxon., I, 82; Shaw, Knights, II, 147; Inner Temple Adm., p. 164; N.L.W., Mynde Park MS. 356; B.M., Harl. MS. 1622; P.R.O., E. 163/18/12; Ham, County and the Kingdom, pp. 112, 117; Mathias, Whitsun Riot, p. 33; C.C.C., III, 2070.


30. Ibid., passim.

31. Ibid., ff. 112v, 130v, 148; Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica, I, 123; Price, Hereford, p. 85.


33. For county committees elsewhere, see other local studies, supra, note 1.

34. A. & O., I, 428; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 110.

35. Ibid., ff. 47, 118, 119v; B.M., Loan 29/176; P.R.O., S.P. 28/228/4; S.P. 28/229, passim.
36. B.M., Loan 29/175, Order of the Herefordshire county committee, 11 August 1645.


43. B.M., Add. MS. 16178, ff. 89v, 90v, 135v.

44. Ibid., f. 47v.

45. Ibid., f. 3v. See further P.R.O., S.P. 23/218/622; Mayo, Mayo and Elton Families, pp. 34-7.

46. B.M., Add. MS. 16178, ff. 50v, 121, 141.

47. Ibid., f. 113.

48. See D. H. Pennington, 'The Accounts of the Kingdom, 1642-1649' in F. J. Fisher (ed.), Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 182-203. For the sub-committee at Hereford, see the audited accounts in P.R.O., S.P. 28/154; S.P. 28/209 B. See also the books of orders and letters of the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom in S.P. 28/252 (1); S.P. 28/253 (A). See further S.P. 28/256-8, Papers of the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom. These sources provide the names of the sub-committeemen at Hereford.

50. P.R.O., S.P. 28/256, Letter of the sub-committee at Hereford, 12 November 1646; S.P. 28/253 (A), f. 27.


52. Middle Temple Adm., I, 131; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 131v; C.C.C., III, 2069; C.C.A.M., II, 766; Robinson, Mansions, p. 204; Duncumb, Collections, II, 138; Faraday, Assessment, p. 37; Brigg, Abstracts of Wills, VII, 31.

53. Will proved 1653 (P.C.C.); Robinson, Mansions, p. 213; Faraday, Assessment, p. 114 (for his widow's land in 1663).


56. For Greenly, see Parry, History of Kington, p. 243; Robinson, Mansions, p. 254; Burke's Gentry (1833-8), I, 293; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 116, 142, 145 (including land held by his son John in 1663). For Davies, see supra, note 18.

57. P.R.O., E. 179/119/459; E. 179/237/44; Dick, Aubrey's Brief Lives, p. 19; Brigg, Abstracts of Wills, VI, 97; C.C.C., IV, 3016.


59. P.R.O., E. 179/119/475-6; Stephens, Clerks of the Counties, p. 99; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 162, 167. Marston replaced as clerk of the county committee Nicholas Philpotts, who was facing charges of delinquency, but after a search of Philpotts's home was carried out, and his estate was surveyed as a preliminary to sequestration, he was cleared of the accusation in February 1647. It was probably after this that Marston joined the sub-committee. See B.M., Add. MS. 16178, ff. 117v, 118v, 122v, 125, 132v, 143; P.R.O., S.P. 28/257, Letter of the sub-committee at Hereford, 2 March 1647. Philpotts was from a yeoman background but he settled at Hereford and was described as an 'exceedingly rich' lawyer. He also built an estate, worth about £200 p.a., in the Peterchurch area, in the Webtree hundred. He was clerk of the peace in 1649-52 and 1660-70. See Stephens, op. cit., p. 99; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 74, 79, 116, 123, 129, 130; H.M.C., Bath, IV, 242; H.R.O., B. 47/H. 30; F. 94, Snodhill MSS., passim.

60. For Tyler, see P.R.O., E. 179/119/471-2; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 60, 173.

61. C.C.C., III, 2069. Wootton's own estate had earlier been sequestrated and leased to John Wootton of Marden, possibly his brother. See B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 131v.


64. P.R.O., S.P. 28/257, Letter of the sub-committee at Hereford, 8 April 1647. This report to the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom gives the sub-committee's version of the dealings with Miles Hill. Used with the correspondence between Hill and the sub-committee, it helps to provide a reasonably full account of the former treasurer's examination from November 1646 to April 1647.


66. Webb, Memoir of John Birch, p. 149; Webb, Civil War, II, 417-8. Later in the year, in December 1647, Colonel Birch was at the head of the Committee for Indemnity in London when a petition from Hill was presented. He was appealing against a charge that while distraining the goods of a Francis Smith in Gloucestershire, in about 1643, in lieu of unpaid taxes, he had struck his mother who died shortly afterwards. The case appears eventually to have been resolved in Hill's favour. See P.R.O., S.P. 24/1, f. 102; S.P. 24/54, Petition of Miles Hill, 3 December 1647.


73. For similar examples of charges of corruption and political struggles within the local administration, see other county studies, especially Underdown, Somerset, pp. 121-74.


77. The term 'Presbyterian' is primarily a religious description, usually covering supporters of an established church with Calvinist uniformity, without an episcopal organisation, under lay control through the ownership of tithes and advowsons. The description also includes, however, supporters of localism and conservativism against centralised government and radical Independents. For further distinctions, and for an analysis of factions in London, as well as in the counties, see Underdown, Pride's Purge.


79. H.M.C., Portland, III, 145.

80. Ibid., III, 142.

81. Ibid.

82. Thomas Birch (ed.), A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe (1742), IV, 237.

83. Heath-Agnew, op. cit., p. 70. Birch later purchased land at Garnstone in Weobley, and confiscated property at Whitbourne, along with other parts of the episcopal estate, some of which he retained after 1660. His Herefordshire property was put at about £400 p.a. in 1663. See Faraday, Assessment, pp. 45, 116; Price, Hereford, p. 85; Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica, I, 288; H.R.O., L. 57, passim.; H.R.O., O. 57, passim.

84. Supra, p. 94.

85. C.J., IV, 582; H.M.C., Portland, III, 144.

86. Ibid., I, 387; ibid., III, 146; B.M., Loan 29/175, Petition of Herefordshire quarter sessions, 6 October 1646.


88. Webb, Memoir of John Birch, pp. 140-3; Webb, Civil War, II, 288-9; Heath-Agnew, op. cit., pp. 64-5; H.M.C., Egmont, I, part 2, p. 343. Bromwich, a Gloucestershire man, was possibly related to Perrot. See Robinson, Mansions, p. 287. For Bromwich, see also B.M., Add. MS. 11044, f. 207.

89. H.M.C., Portland, III, 134-5, 137; ibid., VII, 4.
90. B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 110.


93. See Appendix II.


95. Al. Oxon., II, 1587; Robinson, Mansions, p. 18; C.J., V, 376; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 70.

96. Ibid., p. 391 n.

97. H.R.O., Downton 609; P.R.O., E. 179/119/474; Duncumb, Collections, IV, 185; Robinson, Mansions, p. 315; Brigg, Abstracts of Wills, V, 90; B.M., Harl. MS. 7189, f. 241v.

98. Underdown, Pride's Purge, pp. 48, 71.

99. D.N.B.; Al. Oxon., I, 651; Lincoln's Inn Adm., I, 246; Lewis, Letters of Lady Harley, passim.; H.M.C., Portland, passim.

100. Ibid., III, 146.


103. B.M., Add. MS. 16178, ff. 117v-119v. The orders of the committee at this time were also signed by a number of Welsh committeemen, who were in the county probably to be at the election. For Nicholas Philpotts, see supra, note 59.

104. H.M.C., Portland, III, 147.


108. Ibid., VIII, 5.

109. Ibid., III, 151-2; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 142v.

110. H.M.C., Portland, III, 153-4.


112. Webb, Civil War, I, 12. See also supra, p. 2. For a study of connections between farming regions and forms of livelihood with risings against Royalist and Parliamentarian armies, see Underdown, 'English Clubmen'.

113. H.M.C., Portland, III, 158.

114. Birch was involved in central committees for the disbandment of the Army, and before the end of 1647 he had been appointed to the central accounts administration. See C.J., V, 400; Heath-Agnew, op. cit., p. 73.

115. H.M.C., Portland, III, 154; C.J., V, 101, 126. A garrison at Goodrich, probably established after its capture in 1646, was to be removed also and the defences to be slighted. In July 1647, it was necessary to repeat the order for the disbanding of the garrison. See ibid., V, 250.


118. See D.N.B. Harley was disabled from Parliament in January 1648, but was allowed to return in the following summer.

119. C.J., V, 472; ibid., VI, 59; H.M.C., Portland, III, 161; C.C.C., I, 132; Webb, Civil War, II, 295; C.S.P.D., 1648-9, p. 311.

120. C.C.C., I, 140-1; H.M.C., Portland, III, 167; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 179; C. H. Firth and G. Davies, A Regimental History of Cromwell's Army (Oxford, 1940), II, 398, 400.


122. See Appendices VIII, XVI.

124. See the sources in supra, notes 121, 123.

125. Gray's Inn Adm., p. 176; Lincoln's Inn Adm., I, 94; C.C.C., IV, 2721; P.R.O., E. 179/119/474; Al. Cant., I, 335; Faraday, Assessment, p. 75 (for land held by Cholmley's widow in 1663).

126. C.S.P.D., 1644-5, p. 131; H.M.C., Portland, VIII, 8-14. In April 1648, Robert Harley was appointed a sequestrator for the county along with Robert Kyrle. Harley was also added to the assessment committee at this time. See C.J., V, 533, 536.

127. For Pember, see Al. Oxon., II, 1139; Wood, Escheators; H.R.O., B. 16/13; P.R.O., E. 407/35, f. 86v; Robinson, Mansions, pp. 9, 62-3; C.S.P.D., 1625-6, p. 317; A. & O., I, 170; Webb, Civil War, II, 219, 390; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 83, 107, 111. Pember sold land at Canon Pyon in about 1660 to Ralph Darnell. See ibid., p. 75.


130. Not included in this list are commissioners appointed in March 1648 to act only for the raising of the assessment in the city of Hereford. See A. & O., I, 1112. See further Appendix XVI. Also excluded are honorary figures, Sir Robert Pye of Faringdon in Berkshire, an uncle of Sir Walter Pye, and Walter Devereux, Viscount Leicester. Another non-Herefordshire man named for the county was Colonel Samuel More.

131. C.C.C., I, 86.


133. Will proved 1668 (P.C.C.); Robinson, Mansions, p. 167; P.R.O., E. 179/119/469; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 87v; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 5, 80-1, 96, 110, 112. He was probably the Francis 'Hill' named as a sequestrator in 1643. See A. & O., I, 170.

134. P.R.O., E. 179/119/479; E. 179/237/45; C.J., II, 775; H.M.C., Bath, I, 22-33; Notestein, English Folk, p. 298; Faraday, Assessment, p. 134. He was possibly the son of David ap John of Tegloys. See Grazebrook and Rylands, Visitation of Shropshire, p. 89.

135. Gray's Inn Adm., p. 203; P.R.O., E. 179/119/469; B.M., Add. MS. 16178, f. 79v; N.L.W., Belmont MS. 2; Kentchurch MS. 9790; Robinson, Mansions, p. 34; Faraday, Assessment, p. 92.
136. He was also sometimes designated of 'The Ford' in Pudleston. See Robinson, Mansions, pp. 7, 237; Weaver, Visitation of Herefordshire, p. 54; P.R.O., E. 179/119/476, 478-9; Townshend, Leominster, pp. 294-5.


140. Of those appointed 1647-8, John Cholmley, Robert Harley junior, Robert Kyrle and Walter Kyrle appear most among the signatures on committee orders. See sources in supra, note 123.

141. H.M.C., Portland, III, 163; C.S.P.D., 1648-9, p. 219; B.M., Loan 29/176, Order of Herefordshire militia commissioners, 30 June 1648.

142. C.J., V, 642; C.S.P.D., 1648-9, pp. 197, 206; Webb, Civil War, II, 301.

143. C.S.P.D., 1648-9, pp. 246, 248, 341; Webb, Civil War, II, 301-2; C.C.C., III, 2000; The Declaration of the Gentlemen and others now in Armes in the County of Hereford (1648), B.M., 669, f. 13 (4); Young and Holmes, English Civil War, pp. 276-7.


145. Gray's Inn Adm., p. 275; Burke's Gentry (1833-8), I, 153. See also H.R.O., G.H. 2/40.

146. Firth and Davies, Regimental History, II, 398, 400; Webb, Civil War, II, 304; D.N.B., Sir William Constable; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 179; C.C.C., I, 140-1.
CHAPTER VI

The Administration in Herefordshire, 1649-1653

Colonel Pride's purge of Parliament on 6 December 1648 included the arrest and temporary imprisonment of three Herefordshire M.P.s, Sir Robert Harley, his son Edward, and John Birch, all prominent Presbyterians. Walter Kyrle and Bennett Hoskyns were prevented from entering the House of Commons, and two further Herefordshire M.P.s, William Crowther and Edmund Weaver, refused to conform to the Commonwealth government; they withdrew from Parliament. Only one representative from a Herefordshire constituency remained, Robert Andrews, the Northamptonshire man sitting as a burgess for Weobley. The Army and the Independents were now in control. They abolished the monarchy and the House of Lords, and ruled the country through the Council of State and the 'Rump' Parliament, purged of most of the Presbyterians.

Meanwhile, Major Wroth Rogers enforced the new regime in Herefordshire, supplementing his garrison forces with volunteers from the supernumeraries remaining in the county. Robert Harley junior, in Herefordshire after the purge, was held under arrest by these troops for a short time. In January 1649, there was a petition from the quarter sessions pledging support for the Commonwealth. Shortly after this, money was allocated for the soldiers' arrears in pay and the disbandment of the supernumeraries in Herefordshire was at last completed. Wroth Rogers, promoted to colonel in 1649, was left in command of about a hundred men at Hereford castle.

Only a small minority, mainly religious radicals, supported the new administration. In the spring of 1649 the governor of Gloucester, Sir William Constable, reported on conditions in the neighbouring county and wrote that 'few of the people of Hereford are well affected to the present government'. Earlier that year, a clerk of the assessment committee was attacked and wounded;
committeemen were said to be 'in danger of their lives'. The purge of Parliament had not at this stage been fully emulated in the counties. Members of the Harley faction remained in the Herefordshire administration; Walter Kyrle and Bennett Hoskyns, for example, were included on the Commission of the Peace. Commissions for the assessment and sequestrations, issued before December 1648, were still in force for part of 1649. A letter from Herefordshire committeemen, complaining about extortion of money from their treasurer by Wroth Rogers, indicates there was some conflict between members of the local administration and the military government in the county during these first months of the Commonwealth regime.

Purging of the Herefordshire administration began with new Commissions of the Peace issued in February and April 1649. A new assessment committee, probably based on the Commission of the Peace, was named in the spring and it contained twenty-six Herefordshire men. Only fourteen remained from the thirty-one in the assessment commission of March 1648. Among those excluded were the M.P.s, Birch, Crowther, Hoskyns, Kyrle and the Harleys, and others linked to the Harley faction, such as Thomas Blayney, Edward Broughton and Nathaniel Wright. Of those particularly active in the 1646-8 administration, only John Cholmley, John Flackett, Robert Kyrle and Thomas Rawlins remained. Ambrose Elton junior was also named on the commission, despite his earlier support for the Harleys.

Newcomers to the administration on the assessment commission were Thomas Cooke, Richard Dolphin, Rudhall Gwillym and Richard Nicholetts, although the latter had been named by Parliament on the Herefordshire sequestration committee in June 1643, when the county was under Royalist control. He was probably a relation of the sheriff of 1640, William Nicholetts, but his background is obscure. In 1646 he held some minor sequestration posts in the county. He owned a small estate at Stanford Bishop, worth under £100 p.a., and as with the others he must be ranked among the lesser gentry. Thomas Cooke (c.1600-c.1665) came from a Worcestershire family. He qualified as a barrister and by the 1640s acquired land, by marriage, at Stretton Grandison. Around May 1649, he was accused of
having helped the Royalist cause during the Civil War, but nothing came of these charges. The background of Richard Dolphin of Leominster is obscure. In the summer of 1648 he was captain of a troop of cavalry in the county. In later years he appears to have been a Quaker. Rudhall Gwillym's family had been in Herefordshire since the early sixteenth century. His father, a younger son, gained land at Whitchurch, by marriage, and he was escheator for the county in 1612. The family possessed an iron forge on their estate at Whitchurch which added to their income. As with Cooke, Gwillym was also accused of delinquency in 1649, but they both continued to serve in county government for much of the 1650s.

Also on the new assessment committee was Miles Hill, the former county treasurer and enemy of the Harleys. These lesser gentry and men of obscure backgrounds formed almost half of the committee. Only three men of title (a knight and two baronets) were included. Sir John Brydges, Bart. and Sir Richard Hopton had been rivals of Sir Robert Harley in 1646-8. A new commission in December 1649 added, among others, the new governor, Wroth Rogers, and John Birch, who during the 1650s was to make a career for himself in central government despite his Presbyterianism.

Although most of the Harley faction was removed from the local administration in 1649, there was a certain continuity in that officials found to be signing assessment orders after the appointment of the new commission were men on the county committee before the purge. John Cholmley, Thomas Baskerville, Thomas Rawlins and Robert Kyrle took part in much of the work in 1649 and were assisted by Thomas Blayney who retained his position as treasurer until later in the year. Similarly, in the sequestration business for much of 1649, members of the previous administration remained active, including Edward Harley and his younger brother Robert, along with John Flackett, Robert Higgins and Henry Jones, as well as Rawlins, Blayney and Robert Kyrle. In the autumn, Blayney was replaced as treasurer by Robert Flackett, possibly a relation of the Flacketts of Norton.
New sequestration commissioners were appointed in September. John Herring, John James, John Pateshall, Richard Nicholetts, John Scudamore of Kentchurch and Bridstock Harford were named, and of the previous sequestrators only John Flackett was retained. Scudamore was the sole member of this committee from the pre-war county gentry class. Bridstock Harford (c.1607-1695) had been named on the assessment committee for the city of Hereford earlier in the year and in July he had been added to the Commission of the Peace. He was descended from a younger branch of the Harfords of Bosbury, a family that had been in the county since the Middle Ages. His father was a clergyman who obtained a living in Wiltshire, but Bridstock qualified as a doctor and practised at Hereford. He was in Hereford on the city's fall to Parliament in 1645 and a fine of £10 was levied from him by Colonel Birch. In 1663 he held land worth around £100 p.a. in the Colwall area.

In 1650, the central sequestration administration was reorganised with an increase in the functions of the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee for Compounding. This latter committee was now, despite its title, mainly responsible for confiscated lands in the country, many of which had already been regained by Royalists through composition fines. In Herefordshire, the sequestration revenues had steadily fallen, because of compositions mainly, from roughly £4000 p.a. in 1646 to around £1000 p.a. by 1650, although attempts were made to offset the loss of estates by renewing leases at increased rents. The episcopal estate was also sold during 1647-50, for around £9000 in all.

The reduction in confiscated estates held by local sequestration committees, meant that fewer commissioners were needed. The administration was also made more centralised with money now having to be sent to the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee rather than being disbursed by local treasurers. The post of county treasurer was abolished, thereby removing the link between the assessment and sequestration committees. The new sequestrators, appointed in February 1650, were Matthew Barrow and Walter Merrick. John James was named also, but as with John Herring,
appointed in December 1650, he played only a minor role; Barrow and Merrick carried out most of the day-to-day business. Both men owned estates worth well under £100 p.a. Barrow came from a lesser gentry family of Collington, established in the county in the early sixteenth century. Merrick was of lower social origin, from a minor Hereford family. In 1646 he sat on the grand jury at the quarter sessions in October, and in December 1649 his name appeared among the county assessment commissioners.

Merrick was also one of the new militia committeemen in 1650. The militia commission of 2 December 1648 had been repealed by the Rump on 16 December; not until July 1650 was a new Militia Act passed. There was no urgent need for a militia organisation in Herefordshire during 1649 because of the presence of Colonel Rogers and his army. Nevertheless, as many of his soldiers were gradually disbanded a standby force became necessary, and it was convenient that towards the end of 1649 a draft of the Militia Act was used as a basis for new commissioners to proceed. These were appointed by the Council of State and they had the tasks of training militiamen, organising their quarters and collecting militia taxes. They also had to be ready to repress any conspiracies in the shire. In April 1650, the members of the committee included Merrick, along with Thomas Careless, John Cholmley, Thomas Cooke, Richard Dolphin, John Plackett, Bridstock Harford and Miles Hill. These were active in the following year, as were John Herring, John James, John Pateshall, Wroth Rogers, Stephen Winthrop and John Woodyate. Cholmley, Herring and James, and Francis Pember of Almeley were also appointed by the Council to be captains of militia cavalry.

Once again the Harley faction was excluded. Moreover, not one of the committee was of the pre-war county gentry in Herefordshire. John Woodyate of Hatfield was not of gentry status before the Civil War, although he was related to one of the lesser gentry, the committeeman Henry Jones. In 1650 he sat on the grand jury. His land was valued at under £100 p.a. in 1663. Stephen Winthrop
was not a native of the county. Born in 1619, a younger son of a Puritan family in Suffolk, he migrated with them to New England. His father prospered and became governor of Massachusetts, but Stephen returned to England during the Civil War and served under Thomas Harrison. In the early 1650s, he was stationed at Leominster as a major in command of a cavalry troop. He was also appointed to the local assessment committee in December 1649.29

Although the assessment, militia and sequestration commissions continued to include members appointed on all of the committees, the three were now clearly separated and no longer a single 'county committee'. The organisation was more centralised than before with each committee tied to London more strongly, dependent on the government for any authority in the county. Gradually, in 1649 and 1650 the Harley faction was removed and the active committeemen now tended to be Independents, in religion as well as politically, and many were of lesser gentry or plebeian backgrounds. Some, such as Flackett and Rawlins, who were associated with the Harley administration in the county, may possibly have been time-servers, but all at least professed allegiance to the Revolution of 1649 as they had to take the Engagement Oath to hold office. This was brought in early in 1650 and called on people to swear loyalty to the Commonwealth.30

For an overall picture of the personnel of county government in 1650, it is useful to look at the Commission of the Peace for that year.31 This included many of those named on committees also. Only 12% of the J.P.s of February 1650 were men of title (two baronets and one knight), compared to 37% of those in 1636, the last full Commission surviving from before the Civil War. Sir Richard Hopton was the sole J.P. with an estate worth over £500 p.a. on the 1650 Commission. Just 35% of the magistrates were from families established in the county in the Middle Ages, compared to a figure of 74% for the 1636 Commission. The figure for those who had educations at the universities or the Inns of Court was also lower, but in some cases this may have been due to war interrupting
Thomas Baskerville, for example, might have gone to Oxford but for his decision to support Parliament in the Civil War. A greater proportion of the J.P.s of 1650 married into local families and those of bordering shires, 83% in all, compared to 1636 when half of the J.P.s' wives were from other regions. An explanation for this is that families of greater wealth and status, as were those in the 1636 Commission, had more opportunity of forming links with gentry of other regions and with the rich merchant families of London. Perhaps the most significant figure for assessing the magistrates of 1650 is that only 54%, fourteen out of twenty-six, were from families that had been on the Commission before the Civil War.

In March 1650, further J.P.s were appointed, including the governor, Wroth Rogers, along with the sequestrator, Walter Merrick, Arthur Cockerham, formerly on the accounts sub-committee, Charles Darley and John Steward. Charles Darley, of Ross, was only of yeoman status in 1646. He had been included on the assessment committee in December 1649. John Steward was probably from the parish of Little Hereford. His background is obscure, but he may have been the son of a Worcestershire yeoman. With the appointment of such men and the death of Sir John Kyrle, Bart. and Walter Kyrle in 1650 the quality and prestige of the Commission of the Peace was further reduced. At the quarter sessions of October 1651 only two of the ten magistrates known to be present were from pre-war county gentry families. These were Bennett Hoskyns and Isaac Seward, both of families added to the Commission as late as the seventeenth century. Seward, along with the other eight J.P.s, Darley, Dolphin, Cooke, Gwillym, Harford, Pateshall, Rawlins and Rogers, all owned estates worth only about £100 p.a. or less.

One of these J.P.s, Colonel Wroth Rogers, appears to have been the leading figure in the county during these years. He was named on most of the commissions of the 1650s and had replaced Sir Robert Harley as the head of the local administration. The removal of most of Harley's supporters in 1649-50 had
provided Rogers with a county government more amenable to his cause. In contrast to the complaints from committeemen early in 1649 about Rogers's behaviour, in March 1650 they were writing to London asking for more money to be sent to the governor for his needs, and they gave him a glowing testimony:

> 'Besides his singular vigilance in discharge of the duty of his place, he has demeaned himself with moderation and integrity, abstaining from the injustice and oppression by which many others of like place have heaped up good sums'.

In following years, Rogers, with others in the local administration, addressed petitions to the government calling for radical religious reform. Among those signing these documents were John Cholmley, John Herring, Miles Hill, Walter Merrick, Richard Nicholetts, John Pateshall and John Woodyate. In the spring of 1650, these radicals used their influence over the county government to have one of these petitions for religious reform produced from the quarter sessions. Here, the support for the Commonwealth was reiterated. There was a request for 'godly' preachers to be sent to Herefordshire and for laws against adultery to be passed by Parliament. Reform of the legal system and land tenure was also requested. The J.P.s hoped for a reduction in the Army and taxation as well. Other, more traditional, pre-war concerns were included in the petition, such as complaints about iron forges depleting wood supplies and weirs blocking river transport.

The Independents could not, however, feel secure in 1650. The local administration was not completely dominated by radicals. There were a number of time-servers and a few Presbyterians remaining even after the Harleys and most of their faction were removed. It was the Presbyterians, rather than the defeated Royalists, who appeared to be the main threat, especially with the alliance that Charles Stuart had made with the Scottish Presbyterians around this time. Sir Robert Harley, now in his seventies, was mostly in London or Shropshire until his death in 1656, and the effective head of the family was his eldest son, Edward,
who had returned to the Brampton Bryan estate. In August 1650 he was arrested by Major Winthrop, by order of the militia committee, and taken prisoner to Hereford. He was only released by Colonel Rogers after promising to leave the county. His younger brothers, Robert and Thomas Harley, were arrested also and imprisoned at Bristol. 39

These repressive measures were most likely designed to prevent the Harleys leading or taking part in a Presbyterian rising to support the Stuarts. The situation was alleviated temporarily when Cromwell defeated the Scots at Dunbar on 3 September 1650, but in the following year a Scottish army, led by Charles Stuart, invaded England and eventually reached Worcester in August 1651. There, they hoped to gather support from a region that had largely been Royalist in the Civil War. Little help arrived, however, and Charles found himself trapped and defeated by Cromwell's forces on 3 September 1651. 40

A measure of the success of the Independents in Herefordshire was that there was no serious rising in the county at the time of the battle of Worcester. The bailiff of Ledbury, near the Worcestershire border, declared his allegiance to Charles II, while John Birch left his estate at Whitbourne, also in the east of the shire, and with his brother Samuel he joined the Royalists at Worcester but left before the battle began. Colonel Birch was sequestrated and imprisoned for this by order of the Council of State, but the charges were eventually dropped. An indication that some of those in the administration were not fully reliable and that further purging might be needed was the refusal of members of the militia committee to take part in raising troops for use against the Scots. Commissioners of greater loyalty had raised a force, however, and this was sent along with supplies to aid Cromwell in the Worcester campaign. 41

The 'Third Civil War' led to a temporary increase in the activities of the local sequestrators, with the militia committee gathering depositions for Barrow and Merrick to use against those in the county who had supported Charles.
Nevertheless, the main work for these sequestration commissioners still involved the collection of rents from lands already confiscated (and not compounded for) and renewing leases at increased rates. These tasks were only accomplished with difficulty. In May 1650, Barrow and Merrick complained of the problem of making sense of the records of the 'many treasurers and committees' of previous years, and in following months they found it necessary to ask repeatedly for instructions from the Committee for Compounding in order to clarify their procedures. In October 1650, Barrow wrote angrily about officers on the militia committee who were raising militia taxes from sequestrated lands, a practice which had been forbidden by the Committee for Compounding. When Barrow had pointed out this order the reply from the officers offended him enough to make him offer to resign his post. He complained, '... if the soldiers do not govern all with us, they will take it unkindly'. The Committee for Compounding responded by writing to Colonel Rogers, telling him to abide by the order.

In 1651, receipts from sequestrations in Herefordshire were still only around the £1000 p.a. mark and the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee appeared dissatisfied with the low rents that their sequestrators were charging. In 1652, Barrow and Merrick were dismissed and in March two new men began activities. These were Benjamin Mason and Silas Taylor. Mason's origins are obscure, but he was possibly a native of Herefordshire. Although accused of fighting for the King at the second battle of Newbury in 1644, other testimonies suggest he was on Parliament's side throughout the Civil War. He attained the rank of captain. In 1646, he was at Hereford and was renting sequestrated property in the Kilpeck area in July. Around 1648 he married the daughter of a Catholic Royalist in Somerset, thereby discrediting himself to a certain extent but he gained financially by the marriage and the Royalist connection did not prevent his being appointed as a sequestration official in Somerset. He lost this position before being appointed as one of the Herefordshire sequestrators. Mason was also named
on the assessment commission for Hereford in December 1652 and became a J.P. in 1653. By the mid-1650s he acquired an estate, mainly in the Pixley area, worth over £100 p.a. in addition to other lands in Somerset and Essex. 45

Silas Taylor (1624–1678) was born at Harley near Much Wenlock in Shropshire. His father, Silvanus, was a Presbyterian who prospered as a financier in London and was active in government finance departments in the 1640s and 1650s. Silas fought under Edward Massey during the war, rising to the rank of captain, and later, in 1645, he may have been at the capture of Hereford by Colonel Birch. During 1646 he was a commissary for troops at Hereford, and in the late 1640s his father purchased confiscated episcopal land in Radnorshire, Monmouthshire and Herefordshire. The Herefordshire land, worth under £100 p.a. probably, was held by Silas Taylor. His appointment as sequestrator most likely came through his father's influence. As with Mason he was also named on the assessment commission for Hereford in December 1652 but his Presbyterian background may have prevented his being nominated for the Commission of the Peace. Besides his administrative work, Taylor was also an historian and a lover of music; Samuel Pepys later wrote of him as 'a good scholar' and 'a great antiquary' and as a man 'that understands musique very well and composes mighty bravely'. During his time as sequestrator he researched and collected material towards a history of Herefordshire, which was not rewarded with publication. 46

Mason and Taylor on taking office immediately criticised their predecessors for having leased the confiscated lands at rents far below the real value of the estates. They also faced the problem of Barrow's refusal to accept his dismissal and, in May 1652, he was still posing as a sequestrator, interfering in the work of the new officials. Also in May, when they were attempting to evict a tenant, William Hill, from land in Marden following the expiry of his lease, he hired a group of 'desperate rogues' who were said to have been in arms with Scots at Worcester, and these held the place for him against the sequestrators. Hill and
his men were, however, eventually driven out. Despite local resentment, Mason and Taylor continued the policy of raising rents in the hope of increasing revenue, but, towards the end of 1652, sequestrations were bringing in only £1200 p.a., compared to sums of £2000 a month being raised on assessment commissions in the county around this time.

Criticisms of their activities caused Taylor to write at the end of August to the Committee for Compounding, stating that Mason and himself hoped for justice against their 'libellers'. Ironically, in the ensuing months their harshest critics were to be themselves, each accusing the other of corruption and malpractice. The squabble had its beginning in November 1652 when the Committee for Compounding suspected someone in the local administration for forging one of their orders. Mason had returned to Somerset for a short time, so Taylor alone replied, blaming an agent of theirs in the county, Matthew Price, who was reported to have already been cashiered from the army for drunkenness. It was ordered that Price be dismissed unless he could disprove the charges. Mason returned and supported the agent when the case was heard in London in the following spring. Richard Hopton was appointed in March 1653 to aid the sequestrators and he took Taylor's side against Mason and Price. In April, Taylor wrote to the Committee for Compounding that 'Mason's temper is so violent that he says he will not act unless we keep the late agent in'.

By the summer of 1653, the original affair of the forged document took second place to the quarrel that had broken out between Taylor and Mason. In June, Mason wrote to Goldsmiths' Hall accusing Taylor of speaking against the government, filching money for himself and showing leniency to Catholics and delinquents. Mason complained that 'the soldiers have to stand to their arms because of the flocking of Papists and delinquents to him'. There was some truth in these charges; Aubrey later wrote of Taylor that he used his sequestration powers 'civilly and obligingly' and 'he was beloved by all the King's party'.
Following further complaints against him in July, including evidence by Colonel Rogers, Taylor was suspended and a new commissioner, Thomas Seabourne, was appointed to act with Mason and Hopton. 51

Seabourne, a Hereford apothecary, may have been related to Richard Seabourne, the earlier M.P. for Hereford. His wife was from the Harford family of Bosbury. Although he helped the Scots at the siege of Hereford in August 1645, he continued to reside in the city during its final months under Royalist control before Colonel Birch's successful assault in December 1645. In the following year, Seabourne served as an agent for the county committee and he also sat on the grand jury. In January 1647, he rented sequestrated land from the committee. After the Revolution, he replaced the ejected mayor of Hereford and continued in this office for the 1649-50 term. He was on the city assessment commission in the spring of 1649 and in following years. Later, in May 1653, he was among those signing a petition from the county asking for religious reform. 52

It was around this time that the religious radicals seemed to be at the height of their power. After the expulsion of the Rump in April 1653, the Barebones Parliament assembled at Westminster in July and in the counties it was men such as Seabourne, along with Mason, Rogers and others (who also signed the May petition) who gave full support to the reformers in the capital. This may explain the initial success of Mason, ostensibly a radical Puritan, over Silas Taylor, the Presbyterian. Taylor did not let the case rest. He brought counter-charges against his rival, including an accusation that Mason had forged his handwriting in order to pass sequestration orders without his knowledge and consent. Commissioners from Gloucester were detailed to examine witnesses in the case and to prepare depositions for the Committee for Compounding. In August 1653, Mason put forward formal charges in which he accused Taylor of 'being in arms against Lord Fairfax when he came to London to protect Parliament', most likely referring to events in the summer of 1647. 53
The depositions were received at Goldsmiths' Hall in September 1653 and the case proceeded. Mason confessed to forging Taylor's signature, excusing himself by claiming it was a necessary practice that facilitated business when Taylor was absent (perhaps collecting material for his county history). The most damaging charge against Taylor was the suggestion of his friendship with Catholics and Royalists, again true. In November, after further examination of witnesses by the Gloucester commissioners, the Committee for Compounding decided that the charges did not warrant dismissal for either man. They were both acquitted and allowed to continue in office as sequestrators. 54

It may be imagined that there was not much harmony in the Herefordshire sequestration business that winter. Mason and Taylor did not, however, work together for long. In February 1654, there was a reorganisation in central government with the Committee for Compounding being changed and given the more accurate name of 'the Committee for Sequestrations'. The Barebones Parliament had been dismissed and the radicals had lost much of their influence over Cromwell; the overall trend in following years was conservative. The new Committee for Sequestrations appointed new local commissioners and at first only one, Taylor, not Mason, was chosen for Herefordshire in March 1654. Thomas Rawlins was then nominated by Taylor and appointed as his fellow commissioner in June 1654. 55 Mason's removal may have been due partly to the radicals' loss of power in London, but there was another cause: investigations were being carried out into earlier sequestration accounts and his work in Somerset came under scrutiny. The inquiries eventually led to his being fined £200 in February 1655, which, along with a discrepancy of over £400 on his Somerset account, was ordered to be levied by Taylor from Mason's Herefordshire estate. In March, however, following a petition from Mason to Oliver Cromwell, it was decided to reopen investigations into his case. 56

In the meantime, Taylor continued as sequestrator, carrying out most of the
work himself throughout 1654-5, although he was hindered by Mason's refusal to hand over certain accounts and documents. The Committee for Sequestrations was receiving reports from Taylor through to March 1656, but already the Exchequer department had taken much of the business upon itself. Revenues had been paid directly to the Exchequer since December 1654; in 1656, it took over the administration of the confiscated estates and the traditional county agent, the sheriff, became responsible for the local running of affairs. The Committee for Sequestrations fell into disuse until 1659 when Royalist risings saw a revival of activity and local commissioners were needed to undertake the seizure of delinquents' estates.  

The importance of the Herefordshire sequestrations in the 1650s can be overstressed. The victims were no longer the leading Royalist gentry, but Catholic delinquents and minor Royalists who were unable to compound for their estates. Revenues had fallen drastically since the heydays of sequestrations in the county from 1646-8. Nevertheless, being responsible for an income of around £1000 p.a. gave the sequestrators a certain prominence. Moreover, as with the dispute between the accounts sub-committee and Miles Hill in 1647, the Mason-Taylor case serves as an indication of the general political tensions in the administration. In the later episode, however, it is possible that religious differences motivated the political struggle. During 1650-3, the local administration under Colonel Rogers continued to be dominated by the Puritan radicals. This group controlled the militia committee, and also gained more appointments to the assessment committee. New appointments to the latter were Robert Mynors, John Pateshall, John Wancklin, Thomas French, Thomas Holmes, Roger Lechmere and Sir John Kyrle, Bart., of Much Marcle, the grandson and heir of the previous baronet who died in 1650.  

Of this group, only Kyrle and Mynors were from pre-war county gentry families. Robert Mynors (1616-1672) was the heir of a family from Treago in
Saint Weonards. They had been in the county since the Middle Ages. In the early seventeenth century, his grandfather was dismissed from the Commission of the Peace because of having a Catholic wife, while his father, also a Catholic, was fined for recusancy. The family estate declined and was worth only around £100 p.a. in 1663. Robert's mother, a daughter of Sir Percival Willoughby of Warwickshire, was a Protestant and she brought her son up in her religion. In 1653, he was one of those signing a petition for Puritan reform. Also signing radical petitions were John Pateshall and John Wancklin, both elders for an Independent congregation at Leominster. Wancklin, an ironmonger who supported Parliament, was plundered by the Royalists after the Earl of Stamford's departure from the county in December 1642. He was an agent of the county committee in 1646 and obtained a lease on beneficial terms for sequestrated land in the Leominster area.

Thomas French had been an army captain in Herefordshire during 1646-8. In the 1650s, he possessed land at Kingsland, probably purchased from the sequestrators, and he appears to have been involved in a dispute over this with the Harleys. Thomas Holmes of Hereford also rented confiscated property from the county committee. In 1652 he was an assessment commissioner for the city of Hereford and gained a place on the county assessment committee in the following year. Roger Lechmere (c.1610-1664) married a sister of his fellow commissioner, Sir John Kyrle, Bart. His family was descended from yeoman stock in Worcestershire, enriching itself with the purchase of church lands in the reign of Henry VIII and thereby gaining gentry status. The Lechmeres declined later in the sixteenth century, however, because of recusancy fines and involvement in costly law suits. Roger's father settled at Fownhope in Herefordshire early in the reign of James I, and was in debt at this time. The Fownhope estate was worth over £150 p.a. in 1663. As well as his place on the assessment commission, Roger Lechmere was appointed a J.P. in 1653. A cousin, Nicholas Lechmere, of another branch established at Hanley in Worcestershire, prospered as a lawyer and
was M.P. for Bewdley from 1648-53, having conformed to the Commonwealth despite his Presbyterian bias. Around 1654, Nicholas was implicated in a Presbyterian plot in favour of Charles Stuart (in which the Harleys were also said to have been involved). Perhaps it was because of this Presbyterian connection that Roger Lechmere was removed from the Commission of the Peace later. 64

Some Presbyterians and established gentry families had conformed to the Commonwealth and were on the Commission of the Peace in the early 1650s. Many of these were purged from the administration at the time of the Barebones Parliament. 65 Among those omitted by around October 1653 were the Eltons, Job Charlton, Bennett Hoskyns, Richard Reed, Robert Kyrle, Thomas Baskerville and Richard Hopton junior; Sir Richard Hopton died in 1653. John James was appointed 'custos' and those added to the Commission included his son Higgins James (1634-1709) along with other Puritan radicals, Richard Nicholetts, John Woodyate, Robert Weaver, Benjamin Mason, Richard Walsham, Morgan Watkins and Howell Vaughan. Many of these appointments were probably a direct response to a letter from Herefordshire sent to Cromwell in May 1653, supporting the removal of the Rump Parliament and eagerly anticipating the 'rule of saints' to follow. Six of the radicals signing the letter (Nicholetts, Woodyate, Weaver, Mason, Watkins and Walsham) were named as J.P.s in 1653, while others who signed, Colonel Rogers, John Herring, Walter Merrick and John Cholmley had been appointed J.P.s earlier. 66

Besides having religious radicalism in common, many of the new magistrates were from lesser gentry or plebeian families. Howell Vaughan was of obscure origins. He sat on the grand jury in 1646. In July 1653, he attended a meeting of Baptists at Abergavenny (in Monmouthshire) and later, around 1656, he was signing a radical petition. 67 Morgan Watkins was from Wigmore. He turned towards Quakerism later in the 1650s and suffered persecutions after the Restoration. 68 Richard Walsham also came from the Wigmore hundred. There had been a Walsham family at Knill since the early seventeenth century. 69 Robert Weaver of Aymestrey
in the Wigmore hundred was an exception to the other new J.P.s in that his estate was worth over £100 p.a. and his family were already established as gentry in the county at the start of the Tudor period. His father, a cousin of Edmund Weaver (one of the 'recruiter' M.P.s for Hereford) had been sheriff of Radnorshire in 1647 and can be included in the Harley faction. 70 Also appointed a J.P. in 1653 was Edward Rawlins, of Kilreege in Llangarren. He was probably a younger brother of Thomas Rawlins. Before the Civil War, he had been involved in the administration of the city of Hereford and in 1646 he was appointed registrar of probates for the Hereford diocese. 71

Almost a third of the Herefordshire J.P.s of October 1653 were from the Wigmore hundred. This unusually high proportion may have been due to the fostering of Puritanism in the area, by Sir Robert Harley, which had by the 1650s advanced beyond his own conservative Presbyterianism. Only one (John Scudamore of Kentchurch) of the twenty-five J.P.s of this time was on the Commission of the Peace before the war. The others were all from families new to the Commission. Over half were of Stuart origins in the county or from obscure backgrounds, in contrast to the 1650 Commission where less than a quarter of the magistrates were in this category. All the J.P.s of 1653 owned estates worth under £250 p.a. while a far lower proportion than in 1650 (or compared with the pre-war Commission) had been educated at the universities or the Inns of Court. Of their marriages that have been traced over half were made with other families in the county and less than a quarter of the wives were from outside Herefordshire and the bordering counties, confirming the trend that as the Commission was filled by more men of lower social status then membership was more parochial, in their marriages at least. 72

Similar purges and appointments had taken place in the administration of the city of Hereford, with men such as Wroth Rogers, Bridstock Harford, Thomas Seabourne and Miles Hill dominating offices there by the early 1650s. An act of
Parliament in 1652, expelling Royalists from corporations, probably accelerated the changes in personnel after the fall of Hereford to Colonel Birch in 1645. In the great inquests (made up of city councillors) of 1638-40 there were around thirty families present. Only about five of these survived to be included in the great inquest lists of 1655-9. Other aspects of Hereford’s separate administration continued but the Independents appear to have extended their control over these as well. Wroth Rogers often presided over the city quarter sessions and the assessment commissions issued for Hereford were largely made up of men from his faction and excluded most of the pre-war oligarchy.

One motivation for the new men in county and city government in these years may have been to achieve a rise in social status for their families. The opportunity of profiteering in the administration could also have been in their minds. Religion, however, was ostensibly the main concern for most of them. These radical Puritans wanted to safeguard their Independent congregations from any attempts by the government to establish religious uniformity. They also sought to divert the revenues of the Church of England towards financing preachers of their own persuasions. 'Independent' is a term covering Protestants often of wavering religious opinions but distinct from Presbyterians and Anglicans. It also has the political connotation in that those supporting the Commonwealth can be described as Independents, as opposed to the Presbyterian Parliamentarians who were prepared to negotiate with the Stuarts. With these terms having political and religious implications there can be some confusion, but in Herefordshire the division between the two groups was reasonably clear-cut. Some of the Independent groups developed a congregational uniformity equal to the rigidity of the Presbyterians; most recognised, however, that being in such a small minority they needed to ally and tolerate other groups in order to protect themselves. The predominant Independents in Herefordshire during the 1650s were the 'Fifth Monarchists' and the 'Baptists', with many of the former persuasion often
eventually joining the congregations of the latter, while some later became Quakers. Besides being influenced by developments elsewhere in England, the radicals in Herefordshire had strong ties with Puritans in Wales, which may not be surprising considering that Wroth Rogers himself, the leader of the Herefordshire Independents, was a Welshman from Llanvaches, a centre for Puritanism in Wales before the Civil War. 75

A petition from the Herefordshire quarter sessions of the spring of 1650 had reflected these increasing religious concerns. The need for 'godly' preachers to be sent to the county was stressed and a similar system to that introduced into Wales with the Propagation Act of February 1650 was advocated. Commissioners appointed by this Act to remove unsatisfactory ministers and schoolmasters in Wales included some of the Herefordshire administration in Wroth Rogers, John Herring, William Littleton, and Major Stephen Winthrop. Thomas Harrison was also on the commission, and he used his influence in central government to promote Puritanism in the region. 76

The radicals faced problems, however, with the established Church in Herefordshire. This was shown by the refusal in 1650 of some ministers in the county to take the Engagement Oath, while many of those conforming to the Commonwealth carried on their Anglican or Presbyterian practices. A number of Royalist clergy had been removed from their livings at the end of the First Civil War. During 1646-60, thirty-three benefices (out of over two hundred parishes) were placed under sequestration, and most of these were filled by Presbyterians, under Sir Robert Harley's direction, in 1646-8. The Presbyterians had also used the confiscated episcopal revenues to establish a group of preaching ministers at Hereford. An ordinance of 1646 appointed new ministers for the city parishes, and three cathedral preachers with a payment of £150 p.a. for each; these latter positions were given to William Low, George Primrose and William Voyle who were thus able to form a continued Presbyterian influence at Hereford during the late
1640s and the following decade. 77

Therefore, although the Independents had seized political power in December 1648, most of the clergy in Herefordshire remained either Anglicans or Presbyterians. When in the early 1650s the radicals (the Fifth Monarchists particularly) were calling for drastic religious and social reform, there were only a few ministers established in local benefices from whom they could expect support, even though members of the radical faction were appointed to any livings that fell vacant under the Commonwealth. Richard Delamaine, who signed the petition of May 1653, was the most notable example of this policy. He appears to have been a customs official formerly, who was invited into the county by Miles Hill and obtained the post of pay master to the militia. He also gained local church livings and an appointment as an extra cathedral preacher at Hereford. 78

Such a policy, however, depended on benefices becoming available and, in the short term, could only have a limited effect unless a practical system was also introduced to remove the conservative clergy in order to create more vacancies for radical candidates. A realisation of these difficulties probably, persuaded Independents to make demands for extra preachers to be introduced. Miles Hill was a member of the congregation at Leominster that also included John Pateshall and John Wancklin. At the time of the Barebones Parliament they petitioned Cromwell and Harrison, promising to assist in promoting 'the peace and prosperity of the Godly' and asking for ministers to be appointed to preach the gospel outside the established Church. 79

The Barebones Parliament, recognising a need to spread the gospel to the 'dark corners' of Herefordshire, acceded to these demands and approval was given for the system of itinerant preachers in Wales to be extended to the county. 80 The new Parliament, however, while being looked upon by the radicals as the culmination of their hopes, turned out to be a disappointment. Four M.P.s were returned from Herefordshire in July 1653. The Independents Wroth Rogers and John
Herring represented the county while Bennett Hoskyns and Edmund Weaver, two less radical M.P.s, sat for Hereford. Hoskyns and Weaver had not sat in Parliament since Pride's Purge and their return in 1653 suggests the radicals did not have a complete hold on the city administration. John James was also in the Barebones Parliament, as an M.P. for Worcestershire, and by the end of the year he was on the Council of State. James was an ardent follower of the Fifth Monarchists' belief in the necessity for preparation in expectation of a forthcoming millenium.

These preparations were to include social as well as religious reform, and Parliament duly made attempts to change the imperfections of English law and social organisation. Part of the legislation was the Act for the relief of poor prisoners and debtors, passed in October 1653. Appointed to administer this in Herefordshire were John Pateshall, Richard Nicholetts, John Woodyate, Thomas Seabourne, Thomas Rawlins, John Flackett and Hugh Jenkins. Flackett and Rawlins were members of the 1646-8 administration who had conformed to the Commonwealth government and continued in state service. Pateshall, Nicholetts, Woodyate and Seabourne were more closely associated with the radical faction. Hugh Jenkins was of an obscure background. Possibly he was from a minor Hereford family. In 1659 he was serving under Wroth Rogers as second-in-command of the garrison at Hereford.

Despite the good intentions, not all the members of the Barebones Parliament supported the policies of reform. Moreover, Harrison's influence over Cromwell was waning and by the end of the year the forces of conservative reaction were able to cause the Parliament to be dissolved. The Herefordshire radicals, who had gained power locally because of events in London, now found themselves disillusioned with the way the English Revolution was to develop.
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CHAPTER VII

Herefordshire and the Protectorate, 1653-1658

The Instrument of Government, the new constitution accepted in December 1653, established Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector. Central government was to be controlled by Cromwell, the Council of State and a Parliament, held at regular intervals. The dismissal of the Barebones Parliament and the setting up of the Protectorate indicated the beginning of a period of conservatism and compromise with the county gentry. Many radicals were afraid that the influence of the Presbyterian gentry would bring an end to the religious toleration of previous years. In Herefordshire, meanwhile, the faction of Colonel Wroth Rogers remained in control. Following the defeat and disillusionment of the Fifth Monarchists, the predominant Independent group under the Protectorate was the Baptists. Many in the local administration, including Rogers probably, can be linked to the Baptist congregations that were being founded in the shire. In south-west Herefordshire, Baptist enclaves in the Olchon valley and at Moccas and Bredwardine had close ties with the Welsh congregations of John Miles. Baptist groups at Hereford and Leominster looked more to neighbouring Midland counties for their influences. Leominster in the 1650s, with its Baptist congregation, and Quakers and Presbyterians, earned the name of 'Little Amsterdam'.

Some of the Baptists were prepared to work within the established Church. John Tombes, who had been removed from his living at Leominster by Royalists early in the Civil War, returned in the early 1650s and his powerful preaching was important in the development of Puritanism. John Pateshall, Miles Hill, John Wancklin and John Woodyate, all residents of the Leominster area, were among those in the administration probably influenced by the sermons of John Tombes. He also received the appointment as master of Katherine's Hospital at Ledbury, where his presence was not liked by the more conservative local trustees. Richard Harrison,
another Baptist preacher, was appointed a minister at Hereford in November 1653, most likely through the influence of Wroth Rogers; Harrison at Hereford emulated Tombes's feats of conversion at Leominster. Another Puritan preacher receiving the patronage of the local administration was Richard Delamaine. Backed by Miles Hill and Wroth Rogers, and already a cathedral preacher, Delamaine was made governor of the Coningsby Hospital at Hereford in March 1654. Stephen Chamberlain, who had signed a radical petition along with Tombes, Hill, Pateshall and others, was appointed minister of the hospital under Delamaine. 3

While Delamaine and Chamberlain must be left with the description of 'Independents', Tombes and Harrison can be more closely assigned at this time to the 'Particular Baptist' group which was prevalent in Herefordshire, as opposed to the 'General Baptists'. John Miles was also one of the Particular Baptists. They shared the practice of adult Baptism with the General Baptists, but differed on other important doctrines. The Particular Baptists had Calvinist concepts of predestination and 'elect' congregations, while the General Baptists believed in 'free will' and the possibility of general redemption. Many of the Particular Baptists were also critical of any preachers who accepted state pay, through benefices, and in Herefordshire this led to a split between the local congregations and their preachers. Tombes and Harrison, although following the Particular Baptist dogmas in many respects, were benefiting from livings in the established Church. By around 1656, the more stringent members of the Hereford and Leominster Baptist congregations separated from their preachers and founded new congregations. They joined the Midlands Association of Particular Baptists; John Pateshall was the leader of the Leominster group. 4

All these Independents, those belonging to closed congregations and those, such as Colonel Rogers, who worked to impose their Puritanism on the established Church, combined in the fear of conservative trends in central government. Earlier, when the Presbyterian Silas Taylor was appointed a sequestrator for
Herefordshire by the Committee for Compounding in 1652, Rogers took Mason's side in the disputes that followed. Delamaine also testified against Taylor. Mason's dismissal in 1654 can be seen as part of the decline of the influence of the radicals in this period. In May 1654, Rogers and Delamaine made another attack on Taylor, making him again face the charges of favouring Papists and Royalists. He was also accused of the authorship of a pamphlet that abused Delamaine and the Independent faction. Taylor denied these charges and was allowed to remain in office.

In following months, Delamaine was ordered by the central government to be dismissed from his position as preacher at Hereford cathedral (after a petition from his rival Presbyterian preachers) and Chamberlain was removed from the Coningsby Hospital, because he did not fulfil the terms of the foundation deed, by which it was stated that the minister had to be an Oxford graduate. The pamphlet against Delamaine, which can be ascribed to Taylor, portrayed the preacher as an opportunist, concerned more with money than religious welfare. Yet although the sincerity of some radicals can always be questioned, many were not careerists. Instead they were prepared to risk all in opposition to the Protectorate government if it threatened their religious freedom. Toleration was an important principal for the Independents; Aubrey later wrote of John Tombes:

'I have heard him say (though he was much opposite to the Romish Religion) that truly, for his part, should he see a poor zealous Friar going to preach, he should pay him respect'.

In September 1654, Parliament was due to be held, and there was a concern that a Presbyterian majority at Westminster could seek to establish religious uniformity once again. A letter written to John Pateshall, towards the end of July 1654, from Robert Breton, a Puritan minister at Pembridge, expressed the fears of the 'godly party' over the Parliament, and reported the feelings of others, including an officer who is described as saying to Colonel Rogers, 'You
see those that hate us begin to rule over us; and therefore we must resolve to fight it out in the field, or suffer'. Breton ended the letter with encouragement to Pateshall, desiring that 'the father of lights furnish you and the rest of your brethren with wisdom and courage, that you may foresee and prevent the intended evil'.

During the election campaigns of that summer, an ordinance in August appointing commissioners for ejecting unsatisfactory ministers and schoolmasters may have given the radicals further cause for concern. These 'ejectors' complemented the 'triers', a group established in London in the previous March to approve new appointments nominated to livings by local gentry. Nineteen 'ejectors' were named for Herefordshire, including many of the radical faction, such as Pateshall, Rogers, James, Mason, Nicholetts, Seabourne and Cholmley. These were probably grateful for a machinery by which they could exert their control over the Church, but in the ensuing years few ministers were ejected, compared to the 1646-8 period, and the established gentry maintained their influence over new appointments. Edward Harley, for example, owned the tithes and advowson of Leintwardine, and was able to ensure his nominee received the benefice when it fell vacant in 1659. Even more important, however, and worrying for the radicals, was that Sir Robert Harley and his son Edward were also appointed ejectors in 1654. Supporters of theirs, including Thomas Blayney and Priamus Davies, were on the commission as well, along with Silvanus Taylor, a Presbyterian central official and father of the sequestrator. Ministers appointed to assist the ejectors further strengthened the Harley influence as many of the Presbyterians, appointed before 1649, such as William Low, George Primrose and William Voyle, were included.

The return of the Harleys to the local administration with the ordinance of August 1654, despite their having been implicated in a Presbyterian plot in favour of Charles Stuart at the start of the Protectorate, confirmed the reversal
of the purges of 1653. Moreover, there had been legislation in January 1654, repealing the Engagement Oath. Presbyterians, and Royalists, could now hold offices not having to swear allegiance to a government without the King and House of Lords. Ejectors were also prevented from using the Engagement Oath to remove ministers from their benefices. 10 While Sir Robert Harley remained in Shropshire, dying in 1656, his eldest son, Edward, returned to Herefordshire. The second son, Robert Harley junior was working as a Royalist agent in Presbyterian plots of the 1650s. 11

The radicals still controlled the rest of the local administration in 1654. A petition from the quarter sessions, calling for the removal of weirs from the Wye and Lugg rivers, was signed by eleven J.P.s. Four of these, Wroth Rogers, John Pateshall, John Woodyate and Benjamin Mason had signed radical petitions in the previous year. Four others, Rudhall Gwillym, Thomas Cooke, Francis Hall and Thomas Careless, were appointed as J.P.s after the Commonwealth was established. John Flackett may have been a magistrate before 1649, but only Thomas Rawlins and John Scudamore of Kentchurch were definitely so. Scudamore was alone among these magistrates as having been on the Commission of the Peace before the Civil War. 12

Nevertheless, the M.P.s returned to the first Parliament of the Protectorate in September 1654, and the magistrates appointed from this time onwards, continued the trend shown in the commission for ejectors. Central government was facilitating the return of the established gentry to the county administration in the hope of achieving compromise and settlement. 13 The county representatives in the Barebones Parliament, Wroth Rogers and John Herring, were not elected in 1654, despite the availability of four shire seats in the new franchise. 14 Of those who signed the radical petitions, only one, John Pateshall, was returned as an M.P., and two further magistrates, John Flackett and John Scudamore, were elected also. The fourth shire M.P. was Richard Reed, who had been removed from the Commission of the Peace in 1653. The Reeds were a county gentry family that had moved from
Worcestershire to Herefordshire in the late sixteenth century following the marriage of Richard's grandfather to an heiress of land at Eastnor. His father, William, purchased further land at Lugwardine. William Reed (c.1565-1634) was sheriff in 1627 and a J.P. in the 1630s, but on his death Richard was not of age to succeed him on the Commission of the Peace. Around 1648, Richard was voted a delinquent but received a discharge from sequestration and served on committees, and as a magistrate, under the Commonwealth.¹⁵

In the late 1650s, Richard Reed was the steward for part of John Birch's estate in the county. In 1654, they were both returned as M.P.s, with Birch elected as burgess for Leominster. He was, however, prevented from sitting in the House of Commons because of his outspoken Presbyterianism, although he still served in the central government's excise department where his usefulness outweighed any criticism he might make of the Protectorate.¹⁷ The new franchise gave no representation for Weobley and only a single M.P. each for Leominster and Hereford. Bennett Hoskyns was again elected for Hereford. He too had been removed from the Commission of the Peace in 1653, but he regained favour in 1654 when he was appointed as a circuit judge in Wales.¹⁸

The election of Hoskyns and Reed led to charges of delinquency being brought against them in August 1654 and a petition, probably organised by Pateshall, Rogers and other radicals, was sent to Cromwell from 'divers godly and well-affected persons in Hereford' against Hoskyns and Reed sitting in Parliament.¹⁹ The petition failed. Moreover, before March of the following year, Hoskyns was restored to the Commission of the Peace, along with Edward Harley and Richard Hopton. Another of the county gentry class, William Powell (1622-80) of Pengethley in Sellack, was added to the Commission also.²⁰ A younger son of Thomas Hinson of London, he was adopted as heir to his estate by Sir Edward Powell, Bart., of Pengethley. He qualified as a barrister around 1648 and took the surname 'Powell' about the time of his uncle's death in 1653. His first wife was a
daughter of Richard Zouch, an Admiralty judge; then in 1655 he married the widow of Sir John Brydges, Bart., of Wilton. Both marriages increased his wealth, while the second also extended his estate in Herefordshire, worth over £600 p.a. in 1663, and confirmed his place among the leading gentry of the shire. 21

Richard Hopton, who received the appointment as sheriff at the end of 1654, was a younger brother of Sir Edward Hopton of Canon Frome, a Royalist colonel knighted in 1645. Sir Edward surrendered at Oxford in 1646 and was then allowed to leave for the continent where he joined other Royalist exiles. Their father, Sir Richard Hopton, had been a lukewarm Parliamentarian, whose conforming temporarily to the Royalist administration in the Civil War led to his being under sequestration until a discharge restored his lands in 1647. 22 He was included in Commissions of the Peace under the Commonwealth until his death in 1653. Richard Hopton junior had trained for a career in law, entering the Inner Temple in 1634. In 1642, he was a steward of lands in the Wharton area belonging to the Aubrey family of Clehonger. During the war, he fought for Parliament, reaching the rank of colonel. After the disbandment of his regiment in 1647, he resumed his legal studies, qualifying as a barrister in 1648, and about this time he married Susanna Harvey, daughter of Sir William Harvey of Staffordshire. She had been converted to Catholicism and then back to Protestantism, later becoming an Anglican devotional writer. Her husband, meanwhile, was a Presbyterian. 23

Most of the Canon Frome inheritance passed to the elder brother, Sir Edward Hopton, although it was held by the widowed mother during her lifetime. Sir Edward also gained possessions in Surrey through marriage. Richard Hopton inherited part of the Herefordshire estate and also purchased confiscated episcopal property, which he lost at the Restoration. He resided at Gattertop in Wharton. 24

Hopton's Presbyterianism appears to have been more vital to him than the security of tenure of his episcopal land, because, while serving in county government in the 1650s, he also acted as a Royalist agent, making journeys to the continent and
helping to organise Presbyterian plots in favour of Charles Stuart. He was imprisoned in 1657 but soon released.\textsuperscript{25}

The return of these Presbyterian gentry, some of whom were tainted with Royalism, to Parliament and local government in late 1654 and part of 1655, formed a severe setback for the forces of religious radicalism. These gentry wished for a return to the old, established order, less centralisation of government, less taxation and a reduction in the Army. They were also hostile to the many sects that had flourished in recent years. Such were the views expressed in the Parliament of 1654. Cromwell's hopes for compromise were disillusioned and he dissolved the Parliament in January 1655. The radicals, in contrast, suddenly found their hopes raised again. With the dismissal of Parliament, the main forum for Presbyterian opinion had been removed. In the following March, a nationwide Royalist revolt was planned; it failed dismally, and only 'Penruddock's Rising' in Wiltshire caused serious concern. The importance of the rebellions, however, was in their persuading the government to adopt more repressive policies and to stop the concessions to the Presbyterians and Royalists, for the time being at least.\textsuperscript{26}

In Herefordshire, Colonel Rogers had raised extra troops to deal with any local risings. He also arrested John Birch. According to Rogers, at the recent assizes Birch had expressed an opinion that the troubles of the time were not caused by Royalists but were due to 'silly Quakers' and 'other discontented persons'. Apparently he also said to Rogers 'that the greatest matter was our own jealousies and fears'. These remarks and Birch's earlier actions, when the Scots were at Worcester in 1651, persuaded Rogers to imprison him at Hereford gaol. He also sent soldiers to occupy Birch's house at Whitbourne.\textsuperscript{27} Another report of activities in the area, from a Mr. Gunter at Brecon, who was less enthusiastic for the local radicals, revealed that 'Anabaptists do daily rendezvous and lift themselves in these parts, under pretence to act for the Lord Protector'. Gunter
also described the members of the garrison that Rogers had installed at Whitbourne as 'Anabaptists'. The term may be interpreted merely as an insult, but it does suggest that Rogers and his troops were linked with the Baptist cause. Shortly afterwards, he was ordered to disband the extra forces he had raised, including those at Whitbourne.²⁸

While in Herefordshire the Royalists had been relatively quiescent in 1655, the rebellion in Wiltshire led Cromwell to send one of his officers, John Desborough, to enforce order in the region. He was appointed 'Major-General of the West'. Later in the year, in September 1655, a plan for extending the rule of major-generals over England and Wales was detailed. The country was split into regions, each under a major-general, and Herefordshire was eventually combined with Shropshire, Worcestershire and all of Wales under the command of Major-General James Berry. This region was almost equivalent to that under the pre-war Lord Lieutenant and the Council of Wales, and there were some similarities between the functions of these institutions and the duties that Berry had to undertake, although he did not have the same judicial functions as the Council of Wales. His tasks included the prevention and suppression of disorders, inspection of the clergy, the running of the poor laws and other measures, and supervision of the local militias. This latter duty was the main purpose of his office. Cromwell hoped the system would provide an efficient military organisation at the lowest possible cost, and thus enable taxation to be reduced, while also being prepared for any further rebellions. Similar proposals had been put forward in the previous Parliament, by the gentry and central finance officials, including John Birch, for a reduction in the Army and taxation, while militia forces would be increased but placed under gentry control. The 'Major-General' system went part of the way to satisfy these demands but meanwhile ensured that the government maintained a control of the local forces. Army officers, appointed as major-generals, were placed in command of the militias and the part of the county gentry in the
organisation was minimal. A 'Decimation' tax was levied from Royalists to
finance the system.  

In Herefordshire, any forebodings that the new institution would take power
away from the radicals were soon dispelled. As Major-General Berry had to cover
such a large region, Colonel Rogers was often left alone in control at Hereford
and now, besides having his garrison force, he was also appointed colonel of the
new militia. Chosen to be lieutenant of the militia was Benjamin Mason, another
of the radical faction. Berry was at Hereford for a brief stay in November 1655,
when he decided that it was safe to release John Birch from the gaol there. He
warned the government, however, that Birch could be a threat in the future. In
December, he reported on William Powell, who had been nominated as sheriff, and
described him as 'an indifferent man'; Berry preferred John Flackett. The office
went eventually to Wroth Rogers, an important choice because a Parliament was due
in the following summer and sheriffs were able to influence county elections to
some extent.  

One of Berry's main problems was the opposition to the Protectorate from
some of the Puritans in Wales. Vavasor Powell, a preacher who influenced many
Welsh officials, particularly those in Radnorshire, had not abandoned his Fifth
Monarchy ideals although he was turning to the Baptist cause as well by late 1654.
He spoke against the ending of the 'rule of saints' in December 1653, leading to
his temporary imprisonment, and continued attacking the Protectorate in following
years. His opinions were forcibly expressed in A Word for God, a pamphlet issued
towards the end of 1655; John James, the Herefordshire 'custos', was among the
radicals who put their names to this document. Berry himself was a non-
Presbyterian Puritan and probably sympathised with some of Powell's views. On one
occasion, after summoning Powell because of his anti-government stance, he held an
amiable conversation with the Welsh radical and ended by only lightly reprimanding
him. Besides his Puritanism, Berry was also a man of obscure background. In
1642, he had been an ironworks clerk. With Colonel Rogers also a radical Puritan and formerly a tailor, it was apparent that the conservative trends, set in motion after the fall of the Barebones Parliament, were temporarily abated. The presence of Berry may partly have influenced Puritan leaders in Wales such as Walter Cradock and Morgan Llwyd, and other radicals including those in Herefordshire, to conform to the Protectorate. The government was continuing the policy of religious toleration, and the Independent congregations seemed to be secure. 31

Further indications of 'godly rule' and the influence of the radicals came in the summer of 1656 when additional commissioners were appointed for ejecting unsatisfactory ministers and schoolmasters. The new men chosen for Herefordshire were John Woodyate, Richard Nicholletts, Benjamin Mason, Robert Weaver and Francis Hall. All of these, apart from Hall, had earlier signed a radical petition. 32

Elections were held in August for the forthcoming Parliament, and the radicals attempted to exert a control over these as well. Colonel Rogers managed to have himself returned as M.P. for Hereford, and as sheriff he tried to sway the election of the county M.P.s in favour of the radical candidates, Colonel John James, Benjamin Mason and Major-General James Berry. Men from established gentry families, Edward Harley, Richard Reed, Bennett Hoskyns and John Scudamore of Kinetchurch, also came forward to contest the four shire seats available. The election was held in Lugg meadow, outside the city walls, and according to an account of the proceedings Rogers told the supporters of Harley and the 'conservative' candidates to separate themselves from the other voters and go some distance away so that it would be easier to count them. It was a trick, however, because with the Harley voters out of earshot the sheriff then held the hustings. The radicals had a clear majority of votes from those present. The defeated candidates protested over these proceedings, as did others, including Silas Taylor, John Birch, Thomas French (one of Birch's officers in 1646) and William Gregory (a local lawyer who acted as an agent for the Royalist Scudamore
family of Ballingham and for the Marchioness of Hertford). Eventually, after a petition from the county against Rogers, the issue was resolved with the election of Harley and Hoskyns, while of the radical candidates, Berry and Mason were returned. Berry was also elected for Worcestershire and chose to represent that county.33

John Birch was again elected for Leominster, but it was decided to continue to bar him from entry to the House of Commons. Of the five residents of the county returned from Herefordshire, three were from the Presbyterian faction, and had either been accused of delinquency or of supporting Charles Stuart in the 1650s, while only two (Rogers and Mason) were associated with the cause of religious radicalism and reform. It was apparent that although the radicals could maintain a grip on the administration they did not have widespread support in the county. Birch's influence at Leominster, for example, had probably been a reason for the Baptist elder there, John Pateshall, to send a petition to Cromwell, complaining of 'their being few well-affected' in the town.34

Leominster, later described by Defoe as 'a well built, well inhabited town' was Herefordshire's second most important urban centre, behind Hereford, but it did not have the administrative independence of the county town. The bailiff of Leominster, or one of the town's wealthiest inhabitants, was, however, often included on taxation commissions, and although no separate quarter sessions were held there for the town, there was a court leet of about twenty-four burgesses meeting twice a year to enact by-laws and make decisions on local commercial disputes. In the early years of the Civil War, the membership of the court leet had remained stable; of the twenty-three burgesses in the meeting of May 1641, twenty (including one as bailiff) were in the court leet of 1643, including Parliamentarians such as Miles Hill and John Pateshall. The administration was disrupted in 1643-6. Not until 1649 was there any substantial purge of Royalists from the court leet, and the number of burgesses in the 1650s fell below twenty.
with only fourteen in 1651. In his petition, Pateshall recommended an even greater reduction, to seven burgesses only, if possible; he probably hoped to concentrate local power in the hands of his Baptist congregation.35

Pateshall's attempts failed and Leominster continued to elect Presbyterians to the Parliaments of 1659 and 1660. In the Parliament of 1656-8 the fears of the radicals were justified when conservative trends of 1654 were resumed. The right to collect the Decimation tax was not confirmed by the M.P.s and without finance the 'Major-General' system, unpopular with the county gentry, was scrapped early in 1657. In May, a new constitution, 'The Humble Petition and Advice', was accepted by Cromwell. Future Parliaments were to be elected on the old franchise, an 'upper house' was to be established, there was to be a reduction in the Army, and a confession of faith was to be introduced in order to enforce religious uniformity. Cromwell did not carry out the latter provision, but the new constitution was enough to dismay many radicals. During the summer of 1657 a further restoration of county gentry families took place in local government with a new assessment commission that June. Among the appointments were Edward Harley, Bennett Hoskyns, John Birch, Richard Reed, William Powell (who was also appointed sheriff in 1657), Richard Hopton and Sir John Kyrle, Bart., of Much Marcle.36

The commission contained forty-seven Herefordshire men, more than on any of the earlier committees. The extra numbers were probably designed to make the levying of the tax more efficient, with more commissioners able to supervise the work of local constables and collectors. Earlier, in 1646, it was necessary at times, because of the other tasks of the committeemen, for the county committee to appoint further men to settle disputes over assessments in the parishes.37 The extra commissioners in 1657 also safeguarded against some of those appointed refusing to take part in the Protectorate administration. Owing to the large size of the assessment commission, compared to the more exclusive Commission of the Peace, even more people of lesser gentry or plebeian origins needed to be included.
Despite the return of the Presbyterian county gentry, still less than a quarter of the commissioners were from families known to have acted as taxation or loan commissioners, sheriffs or as J.P.s before the Civil War. Nearly half of those appointed owned estates worth only about £100 p.a. or less. Among this group were Thomas Alderne of Canon Frome, possibly a relation of the Aldernes of Hereford, John Barston, a local clergyman from a yeoman family of Colwall, Thomas Lane of Colwall, an excise collector also, Sampson Weaver of Elton, younger brother of the magistrate, Robert, and George Mason of Much Dewchurch, younger brother of Benjamin, the former sequestrator; he was accused of having fought for the King during the Civil War. 38

Samuel Davies, probably of Kington, was of obscure origins. He may have been at Gray's Inn in 1655, the son of a Shropshire family. 39 William Jones of Stapleton moved to the county from Radnorshire in the 1650s. He had earlier been fined for Royalism. 40 Also from another county was Samuel Tracy. His family were among the Gloucestershire gentry, but he moved to the parish of Clifford in west Herefordshire, bordering Hay in Radnorshire. He appears to have been a Baptist. 41 Another in this group owning small estates only, was John Edwards of Bodenham. In 1646 he was on the grand jury and he was possibly an attorney. Around 1653 he signed a religious radical petition. 42

Anthony Frere, probably from a medieval Worcestershire family that had a branch in Herefordshire by the late sixteenth century, had acted as a local tax collector in 1647. He also rented confiscated land in the Stoke Edith area from the county committee. 43 Also renting sequestrated property was John Wootton of Marden, possibly a brother of Richard, an accounts sub-committee member in 1646. His estate was worth under £100 p.a. in 1663. 44

Some of the new appointments were of greater wealth and status. Roger Hereford (1599-1659) of Sufton in Mordiford had medieval roots in the shire with ancestors including knights and men active in the local administration. His
father had paid the distraint of knighthood fine imposed by Charles I. Roger married a daughter of James Rodd, the merchant of Hereford who supported the King during the war, but he was also related to a J.P. of the 1650s, Bridstock Harford, who had married a sister of his. In the summer of 1645, he had joined the Scots at the siege of Hereford. 45

James Pytts (1632-1685) was the son of a wealthy Worcestershire family of Kyre, on the north Herefordshire border. He held the family estate at Ivington, near Leominster, during his father's lifetime and also occupied land at Kinnersley, gained by marriage around 1650. These possessions were worth over £400 p.a. in 1663. 46 Ralph Darnell came from a lesser gentry background in Hertfordshire, but he prospered in a legal and administrative career. Before the war, he was an attorney in the Court of Wards. In the 1640s and 1650s, he prospered further in various government departments, and acquired an estate at Birley in Herefordshire, and further land at Canon Frome in 1660, as well as land elsewhere. 47

Thornton Jones of Mainstone in Pixley owned an estate worth over £100 p.a. in 1663. He was the son of the committeeman Henry Jones who died in 1649. He had earlier served as an agent of the county committee. 48 John Nourse (1617-1670) of Llanwarne was a grandson of the Sir John Kyrle, Bart., who died in 1650. His family had been in Herefordshire since the mid-sixteenth century. Charged with being in arms for the King, his small landholding of around £25 p.a. was placed under sequestration for a time. In the 1650s his wealth increased following an inheritance from an uncle and Nourse's estate was worth around £150 p.a. in 1663. 49

The commission were evenly distributed over the shire, except for the Ewias Lacy hundred, and included over twenty men who can be specifically linked to the religious radical faction. These included (besides Tracy, Edwards, the Masons and the Weavers) Miles Hill, John Pateshall, Wroth Rogers, Richard Nicholetts, John Cholmley, John and Higgins James, John Wancklin and others, and probably some of the more obscure members of the commission were attached to this group. It is
likely that many of the new names appearing in the assessment commission of 1657 were appointed earlier in the 1653-6 period; from the thirty-five Herefordshire men in the commission of December 1652, only eighteen remained and twenty-nine had been added by 1657. This probably reflects the purges of 1653 as much as the changes under the Protectorate. 50

In the Commission of the Peace, meanwhile, the effects of appointments policies from 1655-7 can be seen more clearly. Radicals and lesser gentry excluded by July 1657 were Morgan Watkins, Howell Vaughan, Thomas Careless, Walter Merrick and Thomas Cooke. John Herring, John Flackett and Richard Walsham (all probably deceased) were omitted also. New appointments included two known to be from the radical faction, Robert Mynors and Thomas Seabourne, along with John Walsham (replacing Richard Walsham) on the Commission of the Peace by September 1656. Added by July 1657 were William Brydges, Thomas Delahay, Francis Pember junior and John Vaughan. 51

Mynors, Seabourne and Walsham were appointed at the time when Berry was still major-general of the region. Walsham was probably a nephew of the Richard Walsham who had signed a radical petition in 1653. He resided at Knill in the Wigmore hundred, close to the Radnorshire border, and had already been named a magistrate in that county as well as being included on other commissions there in the 1650s. He was sheriff of Radnorshire in 1654. The Knill estate was worth under £100 p.a., but Walsham also possessed some land in the neighbouring county. 52

The later appointments, Brydges, Delahay, Pember and Vaughan can not be linked to the radical faction; they were also from families of older ancestry in the shire than many of the J.P.s appointed at the time of the Barebones Parliament. The family of William Brydges (1601-1668) was from Bosbury. His father had married a daughter of the Vaughans of Courtfield in Welsh Bicknor (a Catholic family with lands in the south of the county and in Monmouthshire) and he purchased property at Tyberton in the late sixteenth century. William Brydges extended the estate
there with further acquisitions in 1652. His lands were worth over £200 p.a. in 1663. Part of his prosperity was due to his engaging in money-lending. In the Civil War, he conformed to the Royalist administration but was discharged from sequestration and took part in county government in the 1650s, becoming sheriff in 1653. He was an assessment commissioner as well as a J.P. in 1657. 53

Thomas Delahay (c.1620-1696) of Urish-Hay in Peterchurch was from a medieval Herefordshire family. His father had been appointed a J.P. in 1642 and died in 1643. The Urish-Hay estate was worth about £150 p.a. in 1663. 54 Francis Pember resided at Elsdon in Lyonshall while his father, already a J.P. at this time, held the Almeley property belonging to the family. As with Delahay and Brydges, Pember junior was on the assessment commission in June 1657. He was appointed sheriff in 1658. 55 John Vaughan (c.1625-c.1669) of Hergest in Kington was the grandson and heir of a pre-war Herefordshire magistrate. The family had been established in the county since the Middle Ages. As well as some land in Kent, Vaughan's property at Hergest was worth about £150 p.a. in 1663. 56

The gradual return of many county gentry families to the Commission of the Peace in 1654-7 led to an increase in the overall wealth and status of the magistrates by the summer of 1657. Whereas nobody on the Commission at the time of the Barebones Parliament owned an estate worth over £500 p.a., in 1657 there were 10% of the J.P.s possessing estates of this value. Families that had been on the Commission before the Civil War now made up 27% of the J.P.s, in contrast to only 4% in 1653. There was a similar increase in the proportion of magistrates with medieval or Tudor roots in the shire, and whereas in 1653 over half were of obscure origins, or from families established in Herefordshire after 1603, this group formed only a third of the Commission in 1657. The number with university backgrounds or training at the Inns of Court did not increase substantially, perhaps because of the Civil War having disrupted the education of many of the younger magistrates. Of the marriages of the J.P.s, 63% involved ties with local
families, while a further 17% of the marriages were to daughters of families in bordering counties. The trend of increasing localism in marriages had not been reversed. Before the war, half of the marriages of the J.P.s were to daughters of merchant families of London and the south-east or greater gentry families outside Herefordshire and the bordering counties. The lower wealth and position of the new men in county government in the 1650s meant they were unable to attract such lucrative and prestigious marriages. Interestingly, if the J.P.s of 1657 who were from families on the Commission before the war (eight out of thirty) are considered separately from the others, then the percentage figure doubles for those marriages outside Herefordshire and bordering counties. There was a paradox, therefore, in that these established gentry, often Presbyterians, who defended the county against increasing centralisation of government, were less parochial in their choice of brides than the radicals. 57

Cromwell's policy of compromise with the Presbyterian county gentry may have been the best hope for the survival of the Protectorate, but developments in 1658 were not wholly encouraging. Following a recess of Parliament, the M.P.s gathered again at Westminster in January 1658. There was now the 'Other House' as well, which could be used to limit the power of the House of Commons by keeping a check on any legislation promoted by the Presbyterian and Republican opponents of the government. Thus it was thought safe to allow excluded M.P.s, including John Birch, to take their seats. Cromwell aimed to unite the various factions behind the new constitution. Instead, constant attacks on the Protectorate from the Presbyterians and Republicans persuaded him to dissolve Parliament in February 1658. Besides these political problems, the Protector also faced financial difficulties. The cost of the Army and wars abroad resulted in annual deficits on the government's revenue. 58

This was despite the large sums raised by the assessment tax. In Herefordshire, the accounts of the receiver of assessment money in 1657-60 reveal that the
tax was collected efficiently with £3500 raised every half-year. Sequestration revenues, however, had declined since the 1640s. It was attempted to compensate for this by increasing the excise revenue. Parts of this tax were farmed to merchants in the hope of greater efficiency, but in Herefordshire there was opposition to the collectors in 1658 and the local magistrates were not convicting people who refused to pay. Wroth Rogers was ordered by the Council of State to help the excise collectors and to 'quicken the other Justices' in their proceedings.

Hostility to the excise tax was to emerge again in the 1660s when many more of the established county gentry families had returned to local government. In 1662, there were complaints over the excise commissioners in the county who were outsiders and of obscure origins. Local gentry were put forward to act as commissioners instead. Similarly, the opposition in 1658 was probably inspired partly by the localism of the county community.

The signs from Herefordshire, therefore, were not encouraging. The religious radicals were disappointed with the conservatism of the Protectorate, while the Presbyterian county gentry, gradually allowed to return to the administration since the purges of 1649 and 1653, were not fully satisfied with Cromwell's attempts at compromise and settlement. For them, taxation was still too high, the Army too powerful, and the freedom enjoyed by the religious sects too great for their Presbyterian orthodoxy. Cromwell's death in September 1658 left the country unprotected from the conflicts of these opposing factions.
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CHAPTER VIII

Radicals, Presbyterians and Royalists, 1658-1661

The new Lord Protector, Richard Cromwell, faced a difficult task in attempting to establish a stable government following his father's death. The Presbyterian gentry, who wished to suppress the radical sects, campaigned for a national, established Church to impose rigid uniformity. They also called for a reduction in the Army and less interference by the central authority in local government. Richard Cromwell continued the policy of conciliation with these county gentry even further, and with more success, than his father at the cost of antagonising other groups. A Parliament assembled at Westminster in January 1659, elected on the old franchise; it was dominated by conservatives, many of whom supported the Protectorate government as the nearest alternative to a return of monarchy. Republicans and religious radicals were in a minority at Westminster, but they did have strength in the Army and on the Council of State. Freed from the restraining hand of Oliver Cromwell, they opposed the pro-gentry policies of his son. They feared an end to religious toleration and soon began calling for a return to the 'good old cause' of 'godly' rule and social reform.¹

The M.P.s for Herefordshire in the Parliament of January-April 1659 were Wroth Rogers and Bennett Hoskyns as knights of the shire, Nathaniel Rogers and Roger Bosworth as M.P.s for Hereford, Edward Freeman and John Birch representing Leominster, and Herbert Perrot with Robert Andrews for Weobley. All of these, apart from Andrews, were residents of the county. The return of Wroth Rogers and his son Nathaniel, along with the absence of Edward Harley, the leading Presbyterian, may indicate that the radicals still had some control of the local administration.² Edward Freeman may also have been a Puritan, but in his office as state's attorney in south Wales earlier in the 1650s he had made investigations into the workings of the Propagation Commissioners in Wales and made complaints
about their corruption in 1652, thus probably alienating himself from the
radicals. Freeman also held the post of recorder of Leominster, and this may
account for his representing the borough in Parliament in 1659. There, he resumed
his attack on the Propagators and later, in April 1660, a commission was appointed
to investigate their activities. After the Restoration, Freeman received the
post of attorney-general for south Wales. 3

Bennett Hoskyns and John Birch had also prospered in government service,
the former as a circuit judge in Wales, the latter in the excise department in
London, where he received promotion in 1657. They also had in common their
having been accused of Royalism at times in the 1650s and both supported the
return of monarchy in 1660. 4 Herbert Perrot was another M.P. with a history of
Royalism, having conformed to the King's administration when residing on his
Pembrokeshire estate during the early years of the Civil War. He inherited his
father's land at Moreton-upon-Lugg about 1657, and acquired further property at
Wellington before 1663. He was appointed a J.P. in Herefordshire in 1658.
Perrot's election as M.P. for Weobley probably owed something to his being a
cousin of Thomas Tomkins of Monnington. Tomkins, a Royalist, owned Weobley manor;
an aunt of his had married Perrot's father. Both Tomkins and Perrot received
knighthoods shortly after the Restoration. 5 Roger Bosworth (c.1609-1660) was from
a lesser gentry family of Woolhope. He qualified as a doctor of medicine and
practised at Hereford. He was reputed to have been knighted on the return of
Charles II. 6

Apart from Wroth Rogers, his son Nathaniel, and the Northamptonshire man,
Robert Andrews, the Herefordshire M.P.s were of the Presbyterian/conservative
faction. Birch was Presbyterian in religion and the same religious designation
may be given to Perrot and Hoskyns, and perhaps Bosworth also. Freeman was a
'political' Presbyterian at the least. There were two further Herefordshire men
in the House of Commons at this time; Job Charlton of Ludford was a burgess for
Ludlow, while Robert Weaver of Aymestrey represented the borough of Radnor. Weaver was of the radical faction. Job Charlton (1614-1697), however, was a Presbyterian. The Charlton family had been in Shropshire from medieval times. His father was a goldsmith who established himself in London and supported Parliament in the Civil War, representing Bridgnorth at Westminster until the purge of 1648. Job trained in law, becoming a barrister in 1644, and a serjeant-at-law in 1660. Although having strong ties with Shropshire and London, he resided at Ludford in north Herefordshire, very near Ludlow. He had been appointed on commissions in the county from 1649 onwards until the 1653 purge of conservatives from the local administration. After the Restoration, he returned to county government and prospered further in his legal career, becoming chief justice of Chester in 1662. He was knighted in the same year.

The Presbyterian gentry may have dominated Parliament but they lacked military force. The Army leaders, including General Charles Fleetwood and Major-General John Lambert, distrusted the Protector's alliance with the gentry and they were wary of efforts made by the M.P.s to control the soldiery. The Army had the additional grievance of arrears in pay; in July 1659, arrears of the Hereford garrison were put at well over £2000. In April 1659, the Army leaders forced Cromwell to dissolve Parliament. He resigned from his position as Lord Protector shortly afterwards. With the fall of the Protectorate, a Republican government was established, similar to that of the Commonwealth of 1649-53. The Rump Parliament of that period was restored, and again the House of Commons was deprived of any Herefordshire representatives, apart from Robert Andrews.

There were tensions within the new regime between the Army and Republican politicians. The Army leaders, with Fleetwood as commander-in-chief, and the radical sects found that their views were not wholly represented in Parliament. The Rump politicians, meanwhile, tried to assert their authority over the Army by maintaining their right to control the appointment of officers. Thus, with
these divisions and the additional threat from Royalists and Presbyterians, the government could not feel secure. Military commanders in the counties, including Colonel Rogers at Hereford, were warned by the Council of State in July 1659 to be on the alert for local plots and rebellions. Rogers had served under Lambert in the Civil War and was a protégé of his in 1659. That month, Rogers was confirmed as governor of Hereford while Hugh Jenkins, one of the radical faction, was appointed as lieutenant and deputy governor. Nathaniel Rogers was made ensign of the garrison force. 10

Also in July 1659, measures were taken to ensure that the trained bands were controlled by supporters of the government and a new Militia Act was passed. The commission for Herefordshire included twenty-six names, of which nineteen were residents of the county. 11 Apart from Edmund Heath and James Siddall, these Herefordshire residents had all been named on earlier commissions. Heath was perhaps from a Leintwardine family, hardly of gentry status, that had a marriage connection with John Edwards, an assessment commissioner of 1657 who had earlier signed a religious radical petition. 12 Siddall can be more positively identified, although his background was also obscure. He may have been the son of a Cheshire man who became vicar of Kingstone in Herefordshire in 1616. Siddall was Clerk of the Peace in 1653–8 and in 1657 he acquired a small estate at Allensmore, near Kingstone. 13

Few of these militia commissioners possessed estates worth over £100 p.a., apart from Arthur Cockerham, Bridstock Harford, Thomas Delahay, Thomas Cooke, Herbert Perrot, Robert Weaver and John James. James's son, Higgins James, was also on the commission. None of this group owned land in the county worth over £250 p.a., although Perrot had a large estate in Pembrokeshire as well. Delahay was the only member from a family of the pre-war Commission of the Peace, and most of the commissioners, with Perrot a notable exception, were in the radical faction. These included Wroth Rogers, John James and his son, Samuel Tracy, Hugh
Jenkins, Miles Hill, Thomas Seabourne, John Woodyate, John Walsham, John Wancklin and Robert Weaver, who had all either signed radical petitions, or had been named on commissions by the Barebones Parliament, or were members of Independent congregations. The militia commission bears a similarity to the list of J.P.s of 1657, except that a number of the Presbyterian faction were excluded. Edward Harley, in particular, was missing. His younger brother, Robert, was imprisoned by the Council of State because of involvement in Presbyterian plots. Other wealthy members of the county gentry omitted were Bennett Hoskyns, William Powell and Richard Hopton. Compared to the earlier militia commission issued by Parliament, before Pride's Purge in December 1648, there was only one survivor, John James, from that Presbyterian-dominated body. In conclusion, it may be said that the militia in July 1659 was controlled by religious radicals and men who supported the Republic.

The importance of safeguarding the militia was emphasised by the Royalist rebellions during the summer of 1659. The most serious was that led by Sir Charles Booth in Cheshire. This was suppressed by Major-General Lambert. In Herefordshire, Royalist gatherings were taking place late in July and there was a plan to capture Hereford, with Sir Henry Lingen as the leader of these operations. The local troops were able to deal with any trouble, however, and a number of prisoners were taken. Some estates suffered sequestration as well. Among the Herefordshire Royalists implicated in risings that summer, apart from Lingen, were Sir Edward Hopton of Canon Frome and a son of Fitzwilliam Coningsby. There was also an order for the arrest of John Birch in August, while Sir Walter Pye had been imprisoned in the previous year. The militia commissioners were active throughout August, but in the following month the forces they had raised were ordered by the Council of State to be paid and dismissed, while a cavalry troop was left with Rogers's garrison at Hereford.

Despite the order for the arrest of John Birch, a Presbyterian, the risings
in 1659 were mainly carried out by the Royalists of the Civil War years rather than the 'Presbyterian-Royalists', who had turned to supporting the Stuarts from the late 1640s onwards. Perhaps many in the latter group realised in 1659 that the Rump politicians and the Army, although successfully dealing with rebellions, would be unable to establish a lasting government. The Presbyterians might have hoped to return to power once the rivalries between the Rump and the Army caused a collapse of the Republican regime. The first part of this process took place in October 1659. Parliament dismissed Fleetwood, Lambert and other officers, to which the Army replied by forcibly ending the session at Westminster and seized control of the government. From October to December, the Army leaders ruled the country ineffectively. They had no constitutional backing and no authority to raise new taxes. Support for the recall of Parliament came from General George Monck, commander of the occupying forces in Scotland. Under pressure from Monck, who marched his troops to the Scottish border, and facing a hostile soldiery whose pay was in arrears, Fleetwood decided to call the Rump back to Westminster. This Parliament of December 1659-February 1660 also contained some of the M.P.s excluded or voluntarily absenting themselves in 1648. From Herefordshire, John Birch and Edmund Weaver joined Robert Andrews in the House of Commons, an indication that the ascendancy of the radicals was coming to a close. Following Monck’s march south and his appointment as commander of the Army, he called for the return in February of all the surviving M.P.s who had been excluded in 1648. Two further Herefordshire M.P.s, Edward Harley and Bennett Hoskyns, were thus able to come to Westminster. Robert Harley, also, could sit for Radnor. Walter Kyrle, William Crowther and Sir Robert Harley had died in the 1650s.19

New assessment commissions had been named in January 1660. The Herefordshire commission saw the return of the county gentry and Presbyterians, including the Harleys, the Kyrles, John Birch, Ambrose Elton, Job Charlton, William Powell, Richard Reed and John Scudamore of Kentchurch. Silas Taylor was named as well.
Few of the radicals of the previous assessment commission of 1657, or from the militia commission of 1659 were present. Of the forty-seven in the June 1657 commission only fifteen (mostly pre-war county gentry and Presbyterians) survived in the list of thirty-three in January 1660, and only four were included from the nineteen of July 1659. Wroth Rogers was among the many Independents removed. Miles Hill retained his place, possibly because of his earlier support of John Birch.

Newcomers to the administration in the assessment commission were John Brydges, Thomas Geeres, Thomas Good, Thomas Cornwall, Thomas Carpenter, Simon Seward and William Gregory. John Brydges (c.1603-1669) of Priors Court in Dormington held an estate worth near £200 p.a. in 1663. He was a younger brother of William Brydges, another committeeman of this time. Thomas Geeres (c.1613-1675) of Bridge Sollers owned lands of around £200 p.a. His family came from Shropshire to settle in Herefordshire in the early seventeenth century, and their estate was built up through useful marriages. Geeres also inherited much from an uncle who had prospered as a proctor in London and had invested in Herefordshire land. Brydges and Geeres were of the lesser gentry. Thomas Good, meanwhile, came from a yeoman family of Peterchurch. He eventually acquired gentry status after purchasing lands in the area around Willox Bridge in Didley in the late 1640s. The estate was worth over £200 p.a. in 1663 and his sons went to Oxford University.

Thomas Cornwall, although owning an estate of under £100 p.a. at this time, came from a much more prestigious family than that of Thomas Good and the others. The Cornwalls could trace their ancestry back to Richard, Earl of Cornwall, the brother of Henry III. In the seventeenth century, Sir Gilbert Cornwall of Burford belonged to the Shropshire county gentry while his son and heir, Thomas, resided on the family's property in north-west Herefordshire, at Stapleton. Also owning estates of around £100 p.a. or less were Carpenter, Seward and Gregory. Thomas
Carpenter of Chilston in Madley trained as a lawyer at Lincoln's Inn. He married a daughter of John Brydges of Priors Court, while his sister married Robert Simonds, also named as an assessment commissioner in January 1660, for the city of Hereford. Simon Seward was the son and heir of the pro-Harley sheriff of 1641, Isaac Seward of Leominster. Another son, Henry, signed a radical petition about the time of the Barebones Parliament. William Gregory (c.1624–1696) of Woolhope was from a family that came to the county from Warwickshire early in the seventeenth century. He was the son of a clergyman. After studying law, he became a barrister in 1650 and worked on the Oxford circuit, as well as being an agent for the Marchioness of Hertford and the Scudamores of Ballingham. In 1660, he purchased further property at Fownhope.

Whereas in 1657 over three-quarters of the assessment commissioners were lesser gentry or from plebeian origins, almost half of the commission in 1660 was made up of men from families of county gentry status before the Civil War. This restoration of the squirearchy continued with the new Militia Act passed by Parliament in March 1660. Of the twenty-three Herefordshire men on the commission, which again was dominated by the Presbyterian faction, eleven came from pre-war county gentry families, compared to only one (Thomas Delahay) in the 1659 militia commission. Only three (Perrot, Darnell and James) of those from 1659 survived in the new commission. Over half of those named in March 1660 had been in the Presbyterian-dominated militia commission of December 1648, before Pride's Purge.

Also on the militia commission of 1660 was John Greene (c.1620–1665) of Allensmore, a Parliamentarian soldier in the Civil War who had been governor of Canon Frome in 1646. In 1660, he was sent by General Monck to take over command of the Hereford garrison from Wroth Rogers. The removal of Rogers confirmed the fall from power of the radicals in Herefordshire. They had gained control of the local administration because of events at the centre of government, and now they were ejected following the Presbyterian takeover in 1660. On 16 March, the
Long Parliament dismissed itself so that elections could be held for a new assembly, the 'Convention'. This Parliament turned out to be dominated by Presbyterians and Royalists, with most of the former group also supporting monarchy at this time. The most prominent Presbyterians in Herefordshire, John Birch and Edward Harley, were both supporters of General Monck and the return of the Stuarts. They were also appointed to the Council of State. 31

The Convention Parliament, meeting in April 1660, included a restored House of Lords, although Royalist peers were not allowed to attend at first. The Herefordshire M.P.s were mainly of the Presbyterian county gentry faction. Edward Harley and William Powell were returned as knights of the shire. John Birch was elected for Leominster again, along with Edward Pytts of Kyre, a Worcestershire man who had earlier been reported as an opponent of the Protectorate. 32 His son, James Pytts of Kinnersley was returned with Richard Weston, a lawyer from London, to represent Weobley, while the vote at Hereford saw Roger Bosworth again sent to Westminster, along with Herbert Westfaling (1630-1705) of Mansell Gamage, the grandson and heir of a Royalist J.P.; he owned an estate worth over £100 p.a. and was due to inherit further lands at Rudhall from his grandmother. 33 Other Herefordshire men in the Convention were Job Charlton, a Presbyterian who was an M.P. for Ludlow, and Robert Harley (the younger brother of Edward) who was M.P. for Radnor. 34

With the Harleys having been associated with plots in favour of Charles Stuart during the 1650s, and John Birch having offered allegiance to him at Worcester in 1651, it can be seen that even though only one of the M.P.s, Herbert Westfaling, came from a family that had supported Charles I, there was a certain sympathy for the cause of Restoration among the Herefordshire men in the Convention Parliament. These Presbyterian county gentry aimed to re-establish the old hierarchy in central and local government, hoping that the restoration of the monarchy would confirm the restoration of a county community in control of the local administration, excluding men from the lower orders who had won their
way into county government in the 1640s and 1650s. They also wanted a
Presbyterian religious settlement, with their rigid orthodoxy introduced into
the established Church. Some Independent ministers were already being removed.
In April 1660, Robert Harley wrote with pleasure about the expulsion of the
'mechanics' that had earlier been appointed to benefices by Colonel Rogers. 35

The Convention began negotiating with the exiled Charles Stuart, and in
May they accepted his 'Declaration of Breda', a compromise that promised
Parliament a part in decisions over settlement of religion and over the problem
of confiscated lands. Thus Charles was able to return to England, as King, on
25 May 1660, brought back by the Presbyterians rather than the old Royalists, who
were in a minority in the Convention. In Herefordshire, the Restoration appears
to have been welcomed by most of the people, although Thomas Baskerville of
Eardisley was reported to have made a list of those who made bonfires on news of
the arrival of Charles II, threatening them with punishment in the future. 36

The year or so after the Restoration witnessed a defeat for the
Presbyterians in the Herefordshire administration. A county community of
established gentry families was restored, but by 1661 the majority were Anglicans
and old Royalists. This administration engineered the return of M.P.s in 1661
who were to support an Anglican religious settlement, thus thwarting any lingering
hopes for a Presbyterian national church. This resurgency of Royalist influence
in the body politic had already been indicated in Herefordshire at the time of the
elections to the Convention Parliament. In April 1660, Robert Breton, the Puritan
minister at Pembridge, wrote to Edward Harley about the activities of old Royalist
families in the county. It appears there was a plan to prevent Harley's election
as a knight of the shire and to have returned instead a 'Mr. Price', probably the
Thomas Price of Marden who was elected for the Cavalier Parliament in 1661. The
design was led by Sir Henry Lingen, his brother Thomas, Michael Moore of Burghope
and William Moore of Chilston in Madley. Breton claimed this group was motivated
by 'popery', but while this may have been true for the Lingens and Moores it could not apply to another of the supporters of Price, Major Richard Hopton, who was of Presbyterian hue. Hopton's involvement can be explained as a continuation of his father's rivalry with the Harleys. Hopton had already been excluded from the assessment and militia commissions of earlier in the year. The Prices, Lingens and Moores had all supported Charles I during the Civil War and they reflected the majority opinion in the shire. Also in April 1660, a friend of Harley's, Sir Philip Warwick, wrote on his behalf to the leading Royalist in the county, Lord Scudamore. Warwick asked the viscount to use his influence in Herefordshire to overcome the opinion in the county that Harley's election as M.P. 'may be disagreeable to his majesty' because of his having fought against Charles I in the Civil War.

Clearly the Presbyterian control of the local administration was tenuous. In the months following the Restoration, many J.P.s from old Royalist families were appointed. A new Commission of the Peace in July 1660 contained thirty-seven of the Herefordshire gentry, and of these eighteen had fought for the King during the Civil War or were heirs of Royalist families. Only five (John Birch, Edward Harley, Thomas Blayney, Richard Hopton and Sir John Kyrle, Bart.) had fought against Charles I. The others had been involved in the Interregnum government, or were the sons of Parliamentarians. This return of Royalists and established county gentry families can be further illustrated by comparisons with the various commissions of the last few years of the Interregnum. From the Commission of the Peace of 1657, only seven of the thirty J.P.s survived in that of July 1660. From the radical militia commission of 1659, not one member qualified for the Restoration Commission of the Peace; the Restoration had completed the purge of radicals from county government. From the Presbyterian-dominated militia commission of March 1660, eleven of the twenty-three members survived; those omitted were mostly radicals or Presbyterians of low wealth and status. The
eleven who were included on the Commission of the Peace were mainly from the
pre-war county gentry, such as John Scudamore of Kentchurch, Richard Reed, William
Powell, Bennett Hoskyns and Edward Harley. 39

Well over half of the magistrates in July 1660 were from the pre-war county
gentry class, and of the twenty-seven families present on the Commission of the
Peace in 1642, fourteen were represented on the new Commission. 40 Absent were a
number of families who had fought against Charles I or taken part in the
Parliamentarian administration, with the Eltons of Ledbury and the Kyrles of
Walford as the most notable exclusions; seven Royalist families on the 1642
Commission were absent also: the Rudhalls, Smallmans, Pyes, Wigmores, Eures,
Crofts and the Scudamores of Ballingham. Sir John Scudamore, Bart., of Ballingham
was named a J.P. later in 1660, while the heir of Croft Castle, Herbert Croft, was
a clergyman who became Bishop of Hereford in 1662. 41 The Rudhall and Smallman
families had died out, while the Wigmore, Pye and Eure families had declined
financially since the Civil War. 42

Despite the absence of these families, the Royalist contingent on the
Commission was strengthened by the inclusion of some rising lesser gentry families
who were being rewarded for their loyalty to the crown in the 1640s and 1650s by
promotion to the county's ruling élite. John Booth, a Royalist cavalry captain in
northern England during the First Civil War, had settled in Herefordshire by 1646.
He married the widow of a local Royalist, William Smallman, and thereby gained an
estate worth almost £300 p.a. in the Letton area. Booth was sometimes designated
'of Hereford' as well as Letton. 43 John Skippe of Ledbury, appointed a J.P. by
the Royalist administration in 1643, had fought for the Stuarts in the First and
Second Civil Wars and now gained a place on the peace-time Commission. 44

John Barneby (c.1611-1684) of Brockhampton was descended from a medieval
Worcestershire family that had acquired an estate in Herefordshire, by marriage,
in the sixteenth century. The family suffered sequestration and fines after the
Civil War and John Barneby, with an estate of only about £150 p.a., was rewarded with a place on the Commission in 1660.\textsuperscript{45} Also on the Commission was another John Barneby, from a younger branch that had remained in Worcestershire, at 'The Hill' in Bockleton, a parish near the Herefordshire border. His grandfather, William, had been sheriff of Worcestershire in 1605. John Barneby (1621-1701) was possibly pro-Catholic; his wife was a Catholic heiress of an estate at Canon Pyon in Herefordshire, which Barneby inherited. His Herefordshire lands were worth near £200 p.a. in 1663, and he was knighted by 1673 when he was included in a list of the principal gentry of the county.\textsuperscript{46}

Humphrey Baskerville of Pontrilas in Kentchurch came from a cadet branch of the Baskervilles of Eardisley, a medieval Herefordshire family. His grandfather, James Baskerville, had been a J.P., but the family's place on the Commission of the Peace was lost in the reign of James I, possibly because of its Catholic sympathies. Humphrey Baskerville was included among the knights of the royal oak at the Restoration, a list of loyal crown supporters. With an estate of around £350 p.a., he was aptly qualified for his appointment as J.P. in 1660.\textsuperscript{47} Similarly, the Unetts of Castle Frome, a family established in the county from medieval times, had lost their place among the magistracy earlier in the seventeenth century, probably because of Catholicism, and regained it in 1660 following services for the crown during the Civil War; Francis Unett, who conformed to the Protestant Church, was made a J.P. in 1660 and he owned lands worth around £300 p.a. in 1663.\textsuperscript{48}

The Cocks family of Castleditch in Eastnor, meanwhile, only settled in the county in the seventeenth century. Richard Cocks senior had prospered in London and purchased a Herefordshire estate, establishing himself among the county gentry. Both his sons, Thomas and Richard, married daughters of the Elton family of Ledbury. Richard Cocks junior (c.1602-1684) engaged in commerce, travelling as far as Muscovy, but he returned and inherited lands at Ledbury along with the
family's merchant interests in London. Although supporting the King during the First Civil War, he gained a place on the Commission of the Peace in 1646 because of his connection with the Eltons, a Parliamentarian family, but he was removed before the end of the year. In 1654, he inherited an estate from an uncle at Dumbleton in Gloucestershire and was resident there, rather than Herefordshire, from this time onwards. He was created a baronet in 1662. Thomas Cocks, the elder brother, had inherited the Eastnor lands. He fought for Charles I in Herefordshire and his estate suffered from the campaigns in the Ledbury region in 1644. He regained the family's place on the Commission of the Peace in 1660.49

The Cornwalls of Berrington in Eye were another Royalist family. They were descended from a branch of the Cornwalls of Burford in Shropshire. Humphrey Cornwall (1551-1633) had been on the Stuart Commission of the Peace, but the family lost this position on his death. His grandson, another Humphrey (whose mother was from the Barneby family of Bockleton), had supported the King in the Civil War. Humphrey Cornwall (1616-1688) was also suspected of being involved in a rising for Charles Stuart in 1659. His estate was worth about £200 p.a. in 1663.50 His younger brother, Edward Cornwall (1620-1708), another Royalist, had married an heiress and thus acquired an estate at Moccas. This was worth under £100 p.a. only, but his family's loyalty to the crown saw him included with his brother as a magistrate in 1660.51

Other Royalists on the Commission in July 1660 were Viscount Scudamore, Sir Henry Lingen, Sir Edward Hopton, Wallop Brabazon, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, Thomas Tomkins and John Price. These were among the most wealthy and prestigious families in the shire. The smallest estate was that of the Price family of Marden, worth around £350 p.a., but they also owned property in the Brecon area. John Price (c.1600-1669) was the son of a pre-war J.P. who had supported the crown and was fined over £1300 for his delinquency. John was sequestrated and fined as well. Thomas Price (1633-1683), his son, was also included on the Commission of 1660.52
Another son of a Royalist on the Commission was Herbert Westfaling of Mansell Gamage, one of the M.P.s for Hereford in the Convention Parliament. Westfaling was among those named as a knight of the royal oak at the Restoration. 53

The remaining nineteen J.P.s, who can be described as Parliamentarians, had either fought against the King in the Civil War or had been involved in the post-war administration, or were sons of those involved on Parliament's side. This would therefore include Sir James Brydges, Bart. (1642-1714) of Wilton Castle in Bridstow, the son of Colonel Birch's ally in the capture of Hereford in December 1645. Brydges can perhaps be placed with the Presbyterian faction; he married a niece of Job Charlton of Ludford. 54 Roger Vaughan (c.1635-c.1673) was the son of Henry Vaughan of Bredwardine, who had been named on Parliamentarian committees for Herefordshire. Roger, however, had Royalist connections. His mother, a daughter of the Pye family, had married the Royalist, Edward Cornwall (another of the J.P.s of 1660) following her husband's death. Roger married a daughter of the Royalist, Thomas Tomkins, in 1657. 55

As with Brydges and Vaughan, most of the Parliamentarian J.P.s of July 1660 were from pre-war county gentry families. They included Edward Harley, his youngest brother Thomas, Richard Hopton, Bennett Hoskyns, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., William Powell, Richard Reed, John Scudamore of Kentchurch and John Vaughan of Hergest in Kington. Many of the lesser gentry and plebeian families raised by the war, and the land spoils in following years, were missing from the Restoration county government. Part of the Restoration settlement was that sequestrated lands should be returned to the pre-war owners and, although this did not help all the Royalists who suffered from the war (particularly those who had sold lands in order to pay their composition fines), it did mean that Parliamentarians who had purchased confiscated lands now found it difficult to retain these properties. Richard Hopton, for example, lost his purchases from the confiscated episcopal lands, but he still had a substantial estate in the county. Silas Taylor,
meanwhile, only held church property in the shire and in 1660, wrote Aubrey, 'the times turning, he was faine to disgorge all he had gott, and was ruined'. Taylor left Herefordshire after this, gaining a position as commissary at Dunkirk through Edward Harley's influence, and then later receiving an appointment as keeper of naval stores at Harwich. He died in debt in 1678. Taylor's old adversary, Benjamin Mason, held on to the lands he had purchased in the Pixley area and shortly afterwards he was added to the Commission of the Peace, possibly because of his Royalist marriage connections; but he was removed from the Commission around 1662.

Others not of the pre-war Herefordshire county gentry, but who were included in the Commission of July 1660, were Roger Bosworth, Job Charlton, James Pytts, Thomas Cornwall, William Gregory, Rudhall Gwillym, Thomas Blayney and John Birch. Bosworth died in 1660 and the family disappeared from the Commission of the Peace. Charlton, Pytts and Cornwall were from the county gentry of bordering shires. Gregory's family was already prospering before the Civil War, and they had purchased an estate at Woolhope. In the 1640s and 1650s, he rose through law and not merely through profiteering in confiscated lands. His legal fees enabled Gregory to purchase further property at Fownhope in 1660 and at How Caple about 1670. Rudhall Gwillym, who served in the Interregnum county government, had nevertheless been accused of Royalism and he had links with the Vaughans of Ruardean in Gloucestershire, a wealthy Catholic family. Probably Thomas Blayney's inclusion on the Commission was because of his association with the Harleys. His Kinsham estate was worth well under £100 p.a. in 1663.

The case of John Birch is the outstanding example of a man new to the county, and of lesser gentry origins, establishing himself in the ruling hierarchy in Herefordshire. Following his arrival in the county in December 1645 he had built up a large estate while also making a career for himself in central government, in the excise department. Much of his land in 1660 had been acquired from the
property of the Bishop of Hereford, but around 1661 he purchased additional
lands at Garnstone in Weobley. Owing to his usefulness in the excise department,
Charles II persuaded the Bishop of Hereford to allow Birch to retain much of the
episcopal property that he had acquired at Whitbourne. Birch's income in this
period, including his fee as auditor of the excise, was near £1000 p.a. 61

The majority of the magistrates of July 1660 were nevertheless from the
pre-war county gentry; 68% were from families on the Commission of the Peace in
Herefordshire before 1642, compared to only 27% in the previous Commission of
1657. Those of gentry origins in the county before 1603 formed 81% of the
magistrates, compared to only 67% in 1657. The figure was still lower than that
of the last full Commission named before the Civil War (95% in 1636) and there
was a shift in the balance of 'medieval' and 'Tudor', with only 38% of the J.P.s
in 1660 having medieval origins in Herefordshire, compared to 74% in 1636. There
were fewer men of title in 1660, compared to 1636, but after the Restoration
there was a spate of knighthoods and creation of new baronetcies to alter this
situation; John Barneby of Canon Pyon, Robert Harley, Thomas Tomkins, Job
Charlton and William Gregory received knighthoods. Charlton later became a
baronet, along with William Powell. Edward Harley, meanwhile, was knighted in
1660 and made a K.B. in 1661. 62

Despite the disruption of the Civil War, 59% of the J.P.s of 1660 had been
educated at the universities or the Inns of Court, a higher figure than at any
stage during the 1650s and less than 10% fewer than in 1636. There was an
increased proportion, however, with educations solely at the Inns rather than at
university. The percentage for J.P.s possessing estates worth over £500 p.a. was
again higher than for the Commissions of the 1650s, but still 84% were below
£500 p.a., compared to 47% in 1636, although this figure may be mitigated by
noting that almost a third of the J.P.s in 1660 were holding estates of around
£400 p.a. Probably the effects of the Civil War, with resulting land sales and
reduced revenues, contributed to the reduction in incomes. Only one of the
magistrates, Viscount Scudamore, possessed land in Herefordshire bringing an
income of over £750 p.a., compared to four (Scudamore, Sir Henry Lingen, Sir
Walter Pye and Sir Robert Harley) in 1636. One trend throughout the Interregnum
was that as men of lower wealth and status came on the Commission, the percentage
of magistrates' marriages to Herefordshire families increased. In 1660, this
figure fell sharply from the 63% of 1657 to 35% and it was less than 10% higher
than the 1636 percentage, confirming the conclusion that the county gentry were
more likely to seek their brides from other regions. 63

Thus it can be seen that the pre-war squirearchy had been established on
the Commission of the Peace again in 1660, with the old Royalist families joining
the high-ranking members of the Presbyterian faction that had already been
returning to the administration in the period after the Barebones Parliament.
Throughout 1660-1, these Presbyterians found power in the shire drifting towards
the Anglican-Royalist gentry. This latter group dominated appointments to the
Commission after July 1660. Before the end of the year, added to the Commission
were Edward Alderne, Thomas Baskerville of Collington, John Nourse, Herbert Perrot
and Sir John Scudamore, Bart. (1630-1684) of Ballingham. 64 Scudamore's father had
been rewarded with a knighthood and then a baronetcy for his military service for
Charles I during the Civil War, before he was killed in a duel in 1645.
Scudamore junior was in France for part of the 1650s and he corresponded with Sir
Richard Browne, the King's ambassador to the French court at the start of the
Civil War, who had remained in Paris. Scudamore, with an estate of over £500 p.a.,
was made sheriff in 1660, despite an appeal to Browne to use his influence to
prevent this. In 1661 he also received the title of K.B., something he had asked
Browne to procure for him, to add to his baronetcy. 65

Edward Alderne (c.1612-1671) of Hereford was the son and heir of the sheriff
of 1639. He qualified as a doctor of civil law before the war and like most civil
lawyers he supported episcopacy and monarchy. His estate suffered from
sequestration as well as plundering in the war. The charge of delinquency was, however, lifted from him because of the part his brother, Daniel, had played in aiding Colonel Birch in the capture of Hereford. After the Restoration, Edward received an appointment as chancellor of the diocese of Rochester. Thomas Baskerville of Collington had also suffered confiscation of his estate because of Royalism. His family were descended from the Baskervilles of Eardisley. Although his lands were worth under £100 p.a., his loyalty to the crown saw him appointed as a magistrate. Herbert Perrot had conformed to the Royalist administration for part of the Civil War while John Nourse, although receiving an appointment in the Interregnum county government, had fought for Charles I and suffered sequestration of his estate at Llanwarne. Also named a J.P. before the end of 1660 was John Scudamore junior (1624-1704) of Kentchurch, in place of his father, although Scudamore senior was still alive. The family estate was shared between the father and son around this time.

Further additions to the magistracy came in 1661 with Edward Freeman (the lawyer from Norton who had campaigned against the Propagators in Wales) and James Scudamore (1624-1668), the son of Viscount Scudamore. He was sometimes designated an esquire but was also assumed to have already inherited the title of baronet from his father as well as holding a large part of the family's Herefordshire estate. He had been an M.P. for Hereford at the age of sixteen but was expelled from Parliament, because of his Royalism, by 1643. In 1647 he went to the continent, 'for his better education', remaining there in following years, and he also was acquainted with Sir Richard Browne in the 1650s. Also added to the Commission in 1661 were Humphrey Howorth and Timothy Colles. The Howorths had moved to Herefordshire from Lancashire around 1500 and they featured in the visitation of the county in 1569. Humphrey Howorth (c.1605-1679) had a grandfather who had practised as an attorney for the Council of Wales, while his father, Epiphan Howorth, had Catholic sympathies. As a younger son, Humphrey inherited
only part of the family estate, at Vowchurch, worth under £100 p.a., but he trained in law, qualifying as a barrister, and made a lucrative marriage in 1647 with a portion of £800. In 1642, he was acting as a legal adviser to the councillors of the city of Hereford, when he recommended they agreed to the 'Nine Worthies Resolution' that had been put forward by the Royalist J.P.s of the county. 71 Timothy Colles (c.1618-c.1670) of Hatfield was the grandson of the county sheriff of 1613, John Colles. The family had moved into Herefordshire from neighbouring Worcestershire towards the end of the Tudor period. Timothy's property was sequestrated at the end of the Civil War and consisted of land in Herefordshire worth around £100 p.a., along with tithes valued at £400 p.a. at Tewkesbury in Gloucestershire. 72

The addition of these families, who had supported Charles I during the Civil War, to the Commission of the Peace after July 1660 reflected the increasing control of the 'Royalists' over the county administration. The deputy lieutenants appointed in 1660 were, apart from Edward Harley, all of the Royalist group: Sir Henry Lingen, Sir Edward Hopton, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, Thomas Tomkins and Thomas Price. 73 John Greene, meanwhile, was replaced as governor of Hereford by a Royalist military commander, Captain Henry Leicester. In December 1660, Leicester reported opposition to the Restoration government from Greene, who had refused to hand over the magazine at Hereford, and from Robert Harley, who opposed the disbanding of local troops. 74 These Presbyterian 'Royalists' were perhaps concerned over the Anglican Royalists' predominance in local government. Edward Harley had been removed from the county by his being appointed as governor of Dunkirk (captured by Cromwell's troops in 1658), a post he held for over a year, and he was joined by Robert, his younger brother, who was made colonel of the regiment there. 75

The strength of the old Royalist families in the administration was further revealed in elections to Parliament after the Restoration. The Convention
continued until the end of 1660. In August, a new election was ordered for the
borough of Weobley after Thomas Tomkins had petitioned Parliament over
irregularities in the return of M.P.s, James Pytts and Richard Weston. The new
vote saw Tomkins returned along with his cousin, Herbert Perrot. Perrot was
knighted in 1660, Tomkins in 1662. Both had been on the King's side at some
stage during the Civil War, Tomkins having to compound for his estate while
Perrot switched allegiance by 1644. In November 1660, the county's most loyal
Royalist, Sir Henry Lingen, was elected as an M.P. for Hereford in place of Roger
Bosworth, who had died that year. In April 1661, the M.P.s elected from
Herefordshire for the 'Cavalier' Parliament were all from families that had
supported Charles I in the Civil War. The leading Presbyterians, Edward Harley
and John Birch, needed to seek constituencies outside the shire. Harley was
returned for Radnor while Birch was an M.P. for Penryn, in Cornwall, a seat gained
through his connections in central government. Job Charlton was also returned
again as an M.P. for Ludlow. Returned as M.P.s for Herefordshire were Thomas
Price of Marden and James Scudamore, the son of the viscount. There was a move
for Lord Scudamore to be elected for Hereford, but he declined the nomination.
Two other Royalists were chosen instead, Sir Henry Lingen and Sir Edward Hopton.
The remaining constituencies, Leominster and Weobley, saw the return of others
from the Royalist group, Humphrey Cornwall of Berrington, Thomas Tomkins and John
Barneby of Canon Pyon, with Ranald Graham, not of Herefordshire, also elected.
Besides their loss of predominance in the local government and elections to
the Anglican Royalists, the Presbyterians also suffered in the Restoration
religious settlement. Clergymen that had been ejected by Parliament, and were
still alive, were returned to their benefices, and in 1662 ministers refusing to
conform to the pre-war prayer-book were removed to be replaced by Anglicans. In
Herefordshire during 1660-2, seventeen Puritan ministers were removed, most of
these having been appointed by the Presbyterians shortly after the First Civil
War. 80 The return to the old prayer-book gave the Church of England an Anglican uniformity, while laws were passed in the Cavalier Parliament against those people refusing to conform. This 'Clarendon Code' of 1662 covered all the sects, as well as Presbyterians, and Catholics also, but its enforcement always depended on the determination of the government along with the co-operation and efficiency of the magistrates. Edward Harley conformed to the established Church, attending Anglican services, but he also spoke in Parliament on the behalf of dissenters, patroned Puritan preachers and went to nonconformist meetings. At the start of the reign of James II, he was imprisoned because it was feared he might support the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion. 81

John Birch also conformed outwardly. 82 With other moderate Presbyterians, he may have been satisfied with the religious settlement. The excesses of the pre-war Arminianism had been moderated and Laud's campaign against lay control of church livings was not resumed. Harley's deeply felt Calvinism was not appeased by this compromise, but for Birch it was perhaps enough. Nevertheless, Birch revealed no great respect for the Anglican Church when, in 1676, he decided to marry a local woman, with whom it was said he had been living for the past fifteen years. Birch appeared at a church service and there asked the minister to carry out the wedding immediately, a request which at such short notice was denied. He then stood before the congregation with his bride and performed the ceremony without the sanction of the minister. It was reported that the parishioners laughed heartily at these proceedings. 83 Birch was a member of the 'country' party that had formed during the reign of Charles II. His outspoken opposition to the Catholic succession caused his removal from the Commission of the Peace in 1679. His land and influence at Garnstone in Weobley, however, ensured he was able to represent that borough in Parliament from 1679 until his death in 1691. As with Harley, he opposed James II and supported the accession of William of Orange. Adherents of the country party in Herefordshire were not only old Parliamentarians
and Presbyterians, but included also the lawyer, Sir William Gregory, and the old Royalists, Sir Thomas Tomkins and John Booth, all M.P.s for Weobley at times after the Restoration. 84

In conclusion, it may be said that the Presbyterians, the mainstay of the Parliamentarian cause in Herefordshire during the 1640s, after being purged from local government in 1649 and 1653, and making their way back into the administration from 1654 onwards, were finally defeated in 1660-1, with the Anglican Royalists becoming predominant in the county. The religious radicals, meanwhile, who assumed power after Pride's Purge, were removed from the administration in 1660 and the trend of lesser gentry, and men of plebeian origins, infiltrating the county government was reversed. In the 1660s, as in the rest of England and Wales, the 'county community' of established gentry families was restored while the Presbyterian gentry, so long the defenders of localism and hierarchy against the Independents, were reduced to a minority within an administration that contained Anglicans, and men of Catholic sympathies, in addition to the Puritans. Despite religious differences there was some cooperation within this ruling class. In 1668, there was a vacant position as knight of the shire following the death of the M.P., James Scudamore of Holm Lacy. Candidates were put forward from the Whitney and Kyrle families, Royalists and Puritans during the Civil War, and a contested election seemed likely. As it turned out, Sir John Kyrle, Bart., of Much Marcle was elected (despite his record of having fought against Charles I), probably as a result of Sir Edward Harley having written on his behalf to Lord Scudamore. Writing from Brampton Bryan, he asked Scudamore to use his influence to persuade Whitney to stand down, thus allowing Kyrle to be returned unopposed. In such a manner the 'inconveniences' of a contest would be avoided. 85

Yet while old wounds were healing among the members of the squirearchy, one of these county administrators, Fitzwilliam Coningsby, was less accommodating to
someone outside the ruling class. In 1665, an old soldier, William Millington, sought permission to retire to the Coningsby Hospital at Hereford. He was refused, however, by order of Fitzwilliam Coningsby, because he had fought in the Civil War 'in opposition of our late kinge of Blessed memory and likewise of his majesty that now is'. The 'good old cause' had been defeated and men such as Millington found no charity from the re-established gentry rulers. 86
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79. See Appendix II.


82. Birch is described as a 'moderate Anglican' in *ibid.*, p. 380.


86. H.R.O., A. 63/VIII/89. Coningsby was bound by the foundation charter of the hospital to expel anyone who had served as soldiers 'against the crown of England'. See *ibid.*, VIII/1.
Appendix I: J.P.s, Sheriffs and Committeemen, 1625-1661

The following list includes Herefordshire magistrates, sheriffs and members of the committees for the militia, assessment and sequestration. After each name any relationship to the preceding official is indicated: S = son, B = younger brother, U = uncle, G = grandson, N = nephew, H = adopted heir.

Next is given the parish and hundred of residence; the hundreds are abbreviated: B = Broxash, E = Ewias Lacy, Ge = Greytree, Gm = Grimsworth, H = Huntington, R = Radlow, S = Stretford, We = Webtree, Wi = Wigmore, Wp = Wolphy, Wm = Wormilow. For a map of the hundreds and parishes of Herefordshire, see Faraday, Assessment, p. xiv.

These are followed by the official's dates of birth and death, and then by the highest rank or title he attained while in office before 1661: G = gentleman, E = esquire, K = knight, B = baronet, K.B. = knight of the Bath, V = viscount.

After this is an indication of the family's antiquity in Herefordshire: M = medieval origins in the county, T = Tudor, S = Stuart.

The official's educational background is then noted: O = registered at Oxford University, C = Cambridge, O/C = Oxford and Cambridge, G = Gray's Inn, I = Inner Temple, L = Lincoln's Inn, M = Middle Temple, G/M = Gray's Inn and Middle Temple.

The subsequent entry refers to the highest value of the official's land in Herefordshire before 1661: A = less than £100 p.a., B = £100-£250 p.a., C = £250-£500 p.a., D = £500-£750 p.a., E = £750-£1000 p.a., F = £1000-£1500 p.a., G = £1500 or more.

The last reference is to the number of the page in the thesis where the official is first described at length. Sources are given in the notes to the text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish and Hundred</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Antiquity</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Inn</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Abrahall</td>
<td>Foy (Wm)</td>
<td>c.1570</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Alderne</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>c.1590</td>
<td>c.1646</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Alderne (S)</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>c.1612</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Alderne</td>
<td>Canon Frome (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barneby</td>
<td>Brockhampton (B)</td>
<td>c.1611</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barneby</td>
<td>Canon Pyon (Om)</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrow</td>
<td>Collington (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1663</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barston</td>
<td>Colwall (R)</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Baskerville</td>
<td>Eardisley (H)</td>
<td>c.1586</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Baskerville (S)</td>
<td>Eardisley (H)</td>
<td>c.1620</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Baskerville</td>
<td>Kentchurch (We)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Baskerville</td>
<td>Collington (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>Weoley (S)</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blayney</td>
<td>Kinsham (Wi)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1666</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Booth</td>
<td>Letton (S)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Bosworth</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>c.1608</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallow Brabazon</td>
<td>Eaton (Wp)</td>
<td>c.1585</td>
<td>c.1675</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Broughton</td>
<td>Kingston (H)</td>
<td>c.1566</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Brydges</td>
<td>Bridstow (Wm)</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brydges (S)</td>
<td>Bridstow (Wm)</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brydges (S)</td>
<td>Bridstow (Wm)</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brydges</td>
<td>Tyberton (We)</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brydges (B)</td>
<td>Dormington (B)</td>
<td>c.1603</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Careless</td>
<td>Preston Wynne (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carpenter</td>
<td>Madley (We)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Charlton</td>
<td>Ludford (Wp)</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cholmley</td>
<td>Credenhill (Om)</td>
<td>c.1603</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cockerham</td>
<td>Atfordon (Wi)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cocks</td>
<td>Eastnor (R)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cocks (B)</td>
<td>Ledbury (R)</td>
<td>c.1602</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish and Hundred</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Colles</td>
<td>Hatfield (Wp)</td>
<td>c.1618</td>
<td>c.1670</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Coningsby</td>
<td>Hope (Wp)</td>
<td>c.1595</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooke</td>
<td>Stretton Grandison (R)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>c.1665</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cornwall</td>
<td>Stapleton (Wl)</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1686</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Cornwall</td>
<td>Eye (Wp)</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Cornwall (G)</td>
<td>Eye (Wp)</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Cornwall (B)</td>
<td>Moccas (We)</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Croft</td>
<td>Croft (Wl)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crowther</td>
<td>Wormsley (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1598</td>
<td>c.1653</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dannett</td>
<td>Bosbury (R)</td>
<td>c.1595</td>
<td>c.1677</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Dansey</td>
<td>Brinsop (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1585</td>
<td>c.1658</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darley</td>
<td>Ross (Ge)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1658</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Darnell</td>
<td>Birley (S)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G/H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primus Davies</td>
<td>Buckton (Wl)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Davies</td>
<td>Kington (H)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G?</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Delahay</td>
<td>Peterchurch (We)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Delahay (S)</td>
<td>Peterchurch (We)</td>
<td>c.1620</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eaton</td>
<td>Pencombe (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1660</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton</td>
<td>Ledbury (R)</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton (S)</td>
<td>Ledbury (R)</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson Eure</td>
<td>Leinthall Earls (Wl)</td>
<td>c.1595</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett</td>
<td>Norton (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1648</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett (S)</td>
<td>Norton (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1657</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Freeman</td>
<td>Norton (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas French</td>
<td>Kingsland (S)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Freer</td>
<td>Stoke Edith (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Geeres</td>
<td>Bridge Sollers (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1613</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish and Hundred</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Good</td>
<td>Didley (We)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Greene</td>
<td>Allensmore (We)</td>
<td>c.1596</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Greene (S)</td>
<td>Allensmore (We)</td>
<td>c.1620</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T?</td>
<td>0?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gregory</td>
<td>Woolhope (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1624</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudhall Gwillym</td>
<td>Whitchurch (Wm)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>Ledbury (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1668</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridstock Harford</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>c.1607</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harley</td>
<td>Brampton Bryan (Wi)</td>
<td>c.1548</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harley (S)</td>
<td>Brampton Bryan (Wi)</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>K.B.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harley (S)</td>
<td>Brampton Bryan (Wi)</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harley (B)</td>
<td>Kingsland (S)</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harley (B)</td>
<td>Kingsland (S)</td>
<td>c.1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O/C</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hereford</td>
<td>Mordiford (Ge)</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herring</td>
<td>Holmer (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1605</td>
<td>c.1657</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Higgins</td>
<td>Eastnor (R)</td>
<td>c.1603</td>
<td>c.1678</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hill</td>
<td>Leominster (Wp)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Holmes</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hopton</td>
<td>Canon Frome (R)</td>
<td>c.1580</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hopton (S)</td>
<td>Canon Frome (R)</td>
<td>c.1603</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hopton (B)</td>
<td>Wharton (Wp)</td>
<td>c.1610</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hoskyns</td>
<td>Dore (We)</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns (S)</td>
<td>Harewood (Wm)</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Howorth</td>
<td>Vowchurch (We)</td>
<td>c.1605</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Husbands</td>
<td>Wormbridge (We)</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>Witton (Wi)</td>
<td>c.1609</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins James (S)</td>
<td>Witton (Wi)</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jones</td>
<td>Pixley (R)</td>
<td>c.1580</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Jones (S)</td>
<td>Pixley (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish and Hundred</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>Llanwarne (Wm)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1626</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>Stapleton (Wl)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kyre</td>
<td>Walford (Ge)</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kyre (S)</td>
<td>Walford (Ge)</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Kyre (U)</td>
<td>Ross (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1599</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kyre</td>
<td>Much Marcle (Ge)</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Kyre (S)</td>
<td>Much Marcle (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kyre (S)</td>
<td>Much Marcle (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1617</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lane</td>
<td>Colwall (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Lechmore</td>
<td>Fownhope (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1610</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lingen</td>
<td>Sutton (B)</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Littleton</td>
<td>Richards Castle (Wp)</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td>Pixley (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason (B)</td>
<td>Much Dewchurch (Wm)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hilborne</td>
<td>Llanrothall (Wm)</td>
<td>c.1609</td>
<td>c.1661</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mynors</td>
<td>Saint Leonards (Wm)</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nichollett</td>
<td>Stanford Bishop (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1660</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Nichollett</td>
<td>Hopton Sollers (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1643</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nourse</td>
<td>Llanwarne (Wm)</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
<td>Leominster (Wp)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember</td>
<td>Almeley (S)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1590</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember (S)</td>
<td>Lyonshall (S)</td>
<td>c.1620</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Perrot</td>
<td>Wellington (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1616</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Powell</td>
<td>Sellack (Wm)</td>
<td>c.1578</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Powell (H)</td>
<td>Sellack (Wm)</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Price</td>
<td>Marden (B)</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Price (S)</td>
<td>Marden (B)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Price (S)</td>
<td>Marden (B)</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Pye</td>
<td>Much Dewchurch (Wm)</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish and Hundred</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Pye (S)</td>
<td>Much Dewchurch (Wm)</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pytts</td>
<td>Kinnersley (S)</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rawlins</td>
<td>Llangarren (Wm)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1660</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rawlins</td>
<td>Llangarren (Wm)</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reed</td>
<td>Lugwardine (R)</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Reed (S)</td>
<td>Lugwardine (R)</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0/C</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rodd</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rodd (N)</td>
<td>Rodd (W)</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rudhall</td>
<td>Weston under Penyard (Ge)</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rudhall (B)</td>
<td>Weston under Penyard (Ge)</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore</td>
<td>Holm Lacy (We)</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Scudamore (S)</td>
<td>Holm Lacy (We)</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnaby Scudamore (U)</td>
<td>Holm Lacy (We)</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore</td>
<td>Kentchurch (We)</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore (S)</td>
<td>Kentchurch (We)</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scudamore</td>
<td>Ballingham (Wm)</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore (S)</td>
<td>Ballingham (Wm)</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore (S)</td>
<td>Ballingham (Wm)</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Seabourne</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Seward</td>
<td>Leominster (Wp)</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Seward (S)</td>
<td>Leominster (Wp)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Siddall</td>
<td>Allensmore (We)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Skippe</td>
<td>Ledbury (R)</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Smallman</td>
<td>Kinnersley (S)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smallman (S)</td>
<td>Kinnersley (S)</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Taylor</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Tomkins</td>
<td>Monnington (Gm)</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish and Hundred</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tomkins (S)</td>
<td>Monnington (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins (B)</td>
<td>Monnington (Gm)</td>
<td>c.1605</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Tracy</td>
<td>Clifford (Hu)</td>
<td>c.1584</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Trotman</td>
<td>Saint Weonards (Wm)</td>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Unett</td>
<td>Castle Frome (R)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Vaughan</td>
<td>Bredwardine (We)</td>
<td>c.1555</td>
<td>c.1626</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Vaughan (S)</td>
<td>Bredwardine (We)</td>
<td>c.1588</td>
<td>c.1643</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Vaughan (S)</td>
<td>Bredwardine (We)</td>
<td>c.1620</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Vaughan (S)</td>
<td>Bredwardine (We)</td>
<td>c.1638</td>
<td>c.1673</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Kington (Hu)</td>
<td>c.1568</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan (G)</td>
<td>Kington (Hu)</td>
<td>c.1625</td>
<td>c.1669</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walsham</td>
<td>Knill (Wi)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Walsham</td>
<td>Knill (Wi)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1655</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulke Walwyn</td>
<td>Much Marcle (Ge)</td>
<td>c.1603</td>
<td>c.1661</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
<td>Aymestrey (Wi)</td>
<td>c.1630</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0?</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson Weaver (B)</td>
<td>Elton (Wi)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Westfaling</td>
<td>Mansell Gamage (Gm)</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Westfaling (C)</td>
<td>Mansell Gamage (Gm)</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Whitney</td>
<td>Whitney (Hu)</td>
<td>c.1592</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Whitney (S)</td>
<td>Whitney (Hu)</td>
<td>c.1614</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wigmore</td>
<td>Shobdon (S)</td>
<td>c.1605</td>
<td>c.1653</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Woodyate</td>
<td>Hatfield (Wp)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1668</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wootton</td>
<td>Marden (B)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Wright</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>c.1618</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II: M.P.s, 1625-1661

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Hereford</th>
<th>Leominster</th>
<th>Weobley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>John Rudhall</td>
<td>Sir John Scudamore, Bart. ¹</td>
<td>James Tomkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giles Brydges</td>
<td>Richard Weaver ²</td>
<td>Edward Littleton ³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Sir Robert Harley</td>
<td>James Clarke ⁴</td>
<td>James Tomkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Walter Pye</td>
<td>Richard Weaver</td>
<td>Edward Littleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Sir Walter Pye</td>
<td>John Scudamore, Viscount</td>
<td>James Tomkins</td>
<td>William Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Giles Brydges, Bart. ⁵</td>
<td>John Hoskyns</td>
<td>Thomas Littleton ⁶</td>
<td>William Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Sir Robert Harley</td>
<td>Richard Weaver</td>
<td>William Smallman</td>
<td>William Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April)</td>
<td>Sir Walter Pye</td>
<td>Richard Seabourne</td>
<td>Walter Kyrle</td>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Sir Robert Harley</td>
<td>Richard Weaver</td>
<td>Sampson Eure</td>
<td>William Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(November)</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Coningsby</td>
<td>Richard Seabourne</td>
<td>Walter Kyrle</td>
<td>Arthur Jones ⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td>Edmund Weaver</td>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>Weobley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>John Flackett</td>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td>Nathaniel Rogers</td>
<td>Edward Freeman</td>
<td>Herbert Perrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td>Roger Bosworth</td>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>Robert Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td>Herbert Westfaling</td>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>Herbert Perrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April)</td>
<td>William Powell</td>
<td>Roger Bosworth</td>
<td>Edward Pytts</td>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Sir James Scudamore, Bart.</td>
<td>Sir Henry Lingen</td>
<td>Humphrey Cornwall</td>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Price</td>
<td>Herbert Westfaling</td>
<td>Ranald Graham</td>
<td>John Barneby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1. A viscount in 1628.

2. See supra, p. 53.

3. See supra, p. 22.

4. James Clarke (c.1583-1640) was from the urban gentry of Hereford. He went to Oxford University and the Inner Temple, qualifying as a barrister. See Weaver, Visitation of Herefordshire, pp. 85-6; Robinson, Mansions, p. 195; Al. Oxon., I, 280; H.R.O., City records, IV, passim.

5. The same Brydges who was an M.P. in 1625.


7. For Jones, see supra, p. 56. A number of changes took place during the Long Parliament. Only Harley and Kyrle continued to represent the county at Westminster during the Civil War. Thomas Tomkins had been elected for Weobley in place of his deceased brother in 1641. Fitzwilliam Coningsby was expelled for his part in monopolies and replaced in November 1641 by his son Humphrey. Richard Weaver died in 1642 and James Scudamore was elected in his place. These along with the other M.P.s were Royalists and were replaced in the 'Recruiter' elections of 1646, when Edward Harley was elected as a knight of the shire, along with his father, and John Birch joined Walter Kyrle as an M.P. for Leominster. Elected for Hereford were Bennett Hoskyns and Edmund Weaver (son of Richard) while the M.P.s for Weobley were William Crowther and Robert Andrews, a Northamptonshire man. Andrews was the only one of these M.P.s to remain at Westminster after the Revolution of 1648-9.

8. Only four representatives from the county sat in the Barebones Parliament.

9. Birch was not allowed to take his seat in the House of Commons.

10. Again Birch was not allowed into the House and with Major-General James Berry being elected for Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and choosing to represent the latter county, Herefordshire had only four M.P.s. Weobley had lost its franchise, while that of Hereford and Leominster had been reduced to one M.P. each. In January 1658, Birch was at last allowed to take his seat in this Parliament.

11. Son of Wroth Rogers. See supra, p. 204.

12. From May-October 1659, the Rump Parliament (including the M.P.s who sat after the purge of 1648) was recalled, and also sat again in December 1659. In February 1660, the purged M.P.s were allowed back so that representing Herefordshire in this final session of the Long Parliament were Edward
Harley, Bennett Hoskyns, Edmund Weaver, John Birch and Robert Andrews. The three other M.P.s were dead by 1660. The assembly was swiftly dissolved and replaced by the Convention Parliament in April 1660.

13. Bosworth died and Sir Henry Lingen was elected in November 1660.

14. Pytts was from Kyre in Worcestershire, near the border with Herefordshire. His son, James, resided at Kinnersley in Herefordshire. See Amphlett, Kyre Park Charters, passim.; Williams, Parliamentary History of Worcestershire, p. 47; Nash, Worcestershire, II, 71.

15. Richard Weston, a London lawyer, and James Pytts were elected at first for Weobley but a petition from Tomkins citing irregularities in the proceedings, led to the order for a new election, in which Tomkins and Perrott were returned.

16. The same Scudamore who was elected for Hereford in 1642. See supra, note 7.

17. Westfaling replaced Sir Edward Hopton after an investigation of the first election and an order for a new one in July 1661.


19. Of Canon Pyon.

Main Sources:

Members of Parliament: A Return of the Name of Every Member, part 1, 1213-1702 (1878).

Williams, Parliamentary History of Herefordshire.

C.J.


Brunton and Pennington, Long Parliament.

Underdown, Pride's Purge.
Appendix III: Sheriffs, 1625-1661

Sheriffs were usually appointed in November to act for one year, although in some instances in the 1640s and 1650s they remained in office for two years. The following list is based mainly on that contained in P.R.O. List of Sheriffs (Lists and Indexes, IX).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Giles Brydges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Coningsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>William Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Sir John Kyrle, Bart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>James Kyrle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Wallop Brabazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Roger Dansey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Philip Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>John Abrahall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>William Scudamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>John Rudhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Roger Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Henry Lingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Sir Robert Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Thomas Alderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>William Nicholetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Isaac Seward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Coningsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Henry Lingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Barnaby Scudamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Ambrose Elton junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Francis Kyrle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>John James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Charles Milborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>William Brydges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Richard Hopton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>William Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Francis Pember junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Sir John Scudamore, Bart., of Ballingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Sir Herbert Perrot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

1. The Danseys were a county gentry family, established in Herefordshire since the Middle Ages, but absent from the Commission of the Peace in the reign of Charles I. Roger Dansey (c.1585-c.1658) of Brinsop and Little Hereford was a Royalist during the Civil War. See Robinson, Mansions, pp. 45-6; Duncumb, Collections, IV, 34; Al. Oxon., I, 371; P.R.O., E. 407/35, f. 85; B.M., Add. MS. 11051, f. 141; C.C.C., I, 52. See further Faraday, Assessment, pp. 73,
74, 116, 125, 161, for lands held by Roger's sons, John and William, in 1663. The backgrounds of all the sheriffs in the above list, apart from those described in these notes, are detailed in the text as well as in Appendix I.

2. Philip Holman owned an estate in the Huntington area of Herefordshire, but he was of the Northamptonshire gentry, besides having interests in London also. See Cokayne, Baronetage, III, 227; Robinson, Mansions, p. 161; Duncumb, Collections, V, part 1, p. 103; Al. Cant., II, 397; P.C.R., VII, 623; A. D. Powell, 'Some Lawsuits about Brilley and Huntington in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', T.R.S., XXIX (1959), pp. 31-44; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 83, 85, 86, 88.


4. Coningsby was appointed by the Royalist administration. The Royalist sheriffs, 1642-5, are not included in the P.R.O. list.

5. Lingen replaced Coningsby in the summer of 1643. See P.R.O., C. 231/3/22.

6. Scudamore replaced Lingen in 1645 but the fall of Hereford to Parliament in December 1645 led to the appointment of a new sheriff, Ambrose Elton junior.

7. Elton, the first Parliamentarian sheriff, remained in office for two years.

8. John Skinner of Ledbury was appointed at first, but he does not appear to have acted and John James replaced him before the end of 1649. Skinner was a clothier, from a family established in the shire around 1500. He had married a daughter of Ambrose Elton senior in 1627. See C.J., VI, 319, 324; Mayo, Mayo and Elton Families, p. 16; Robinson, Mansions, pp. 169, 235; Burke's Gentry (1833-8), IV, 750. For land worth around £100 p.a. held by his son and heir, William, in 1663, see Faraday, Assessment, pp. 96, 98, 99, 103. See further H.R.O., A. 79/16.

9. Thomas Coke of Stretton Grandison was appointed in November, then replaced by Charles Milborne in December. Milborne (c.1609-c.1661) was a younger son from a wealthy Monmouthshire family that had moved into that county from Somerset in the early seventeenth century. He inherited land in south Herefordshire and in the 1650s purchased sequestrated property to extend his estate. See N.L.W., Milborne MSS. 1993 and passim.; Bradney, Monmouthshire, II, 125; Robinson, Mansions, p. 184; Duncumb, Collections, VII, part 1, p. 15; Brasenose College Reg., I, 154; P.R.O., E. 179/119/471-2.
Appendix IV:  J.P.s, 1625-1642

John Abrahall  c.1626-40  (d.)
Sir Humphrey Baskerville  1625-26  (d. 1648)
Wallop Brabazon  1632-42
Sir Giles Brydges, Bart.  1625-c.1634  (d. 1637)
Fitzwilliam Coningsby  1625-42
Humphrey Cornwall  1625-33  (d.)
Sir William Croft  c.1626-42
Ambrose Elton senior  1625-42
Thomas Harley  1625-31  (d.)
Sir Robert Harley  1625-42
Sir Richard Hopton  1625-42
John Hoskyns  1625-38  (d.)
Bennett Hoskyns  1641-42
Thomas Jones  1625-26  (d.)
James Kyrle  1637-42
Sir John Kyrle, Bart.  1625-42
Walter Kyrle  1641-42
Henry Lingen  1635-42
Sir Edward Powell, Bart.  1625-42
Thomas Price  1641-42
Sir Walter Pye senior  1625-35  (d.)
Sir Walter Pye junior  1631-42
William Reed  1632-34  (d.)
John Rudhall  1625-c.1635  (d. 1636)
William Rudhall  1638-42
John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo  1625-42
John Scudamore of Kentchurch  c.1637-42
William Scudamore  1626-42
John Scudamore of Ballingham  1640-42
Richard Seabourne  1629 ?
Isaac Seward  1641-42
Francis Smallman  1625-33  (d.)
William Smallman  c.1637-42
James Tomkins  1625-36  (d.)
William Tomkins  1635-40  (d.)
Thomas Tomkins  1641-42
Henry Vaughan 1625-26 (d.)
Roger Vaughan 1625-42
John Vaughan c.1632-41 (d.)
Herbert Westfaling 1641-42
Thomas Wigmore c.1632-42

Notes

The first date given after the name of each J.P. is the year of appointment, except for those on the Commission before the reign of Charles I; the date given in this instance is 1625. The second date, when not 1642, indicates the year the J.P. was removed from the Commission; the abbreviation 'd.' indicates that death led to his removal, while if the J.P. died after he was dismissed then the year of his death is given. There was no extensive purge of the Commission in the 1620s and 1630s, although around 1625 a number of gentry from bordering counties previously included on the Commission, but probably not active in Herefordshire, were removed.

Only resident gentry are listed in the above table. Honorary figures, assize judges, representatives of the clergy and gentry of other shires are excluded. Sir George Chute of Kent, for example, was placed on the Commission for Herefordshire, probably because he owned some land in the county. Similarly, the Child family of Blockley in Worcestershire was represented on the Commission in the 1620s and 1630s probably because of land held in the Broxash hundred of Herefordshire. William Child died in 1633 and was succeeded by his son, another William. Both were J.P.s in Worcestershire, acting there rather than in Herefordshire. See Butler, Visitation of Worcestershire, 1634, p. 21; Nash, Worcestershire, I, 99; Faraday, Assessment, pp. 40, 47.

Of the Herefordshire gentry excluded from the Commission before their death, reasons for Sir Humphrey Baskerville's absence are suggested supra, p. 111. Sir Giles Brydges, Bart., may have been suffering from his old age and illness. John
Rudhall was appointed sheriff in 1635 and died in the following year. For Richard Seabourne, see supra, p. 53.

A Commission of the Peace issued in 1634 (see P.R.O., C. 193/13/2) contains many alterations, recording removals and appointments up to about 1638. The list includes new J.P.s in James Kyrle, William Rudhall, William Smallman and John Scudamore (probably of Kentchurch) who were not in the Commission of 1636. See P.R.O., S.P. 16/405. It is found that Kyrle was appointed in 1637 and Rudhall in 1638 (see P.R.O., C. 231/5/230, 293) and probably Smallman and Scudamore were also placed on the Commission at this time. Scudamore of Kentchurch signed a petition from the Herefordshire J.P.s in 1641. See B.M., Add. MS. 11052, f. 107.

Sources

P.R.O., C. 193/13/1; C. 193/13/2; C. 231/5; E. 163/18/12; S.P. 16/212; S.P. 16/405.

B.M., Add. MS. 11052, f. 107; Harl. MS. 1622.

H.M.C., Portland, III, 89.
Appendix V: J.P.s, 1636 (from P.R.O., S.P. 16/405)

John Abrahall
Wallop Brabazon
Fitzwilliam Coningsby
Sir William Croft
Ambrose Elton senior
Sir Robert Harley
Sir Richard Hopton
John Hoskyns
Sir John Kyrle, Bart.
Henry Lingen

Sir Edward Powell, Bart.
Sir Walter Pye
John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo
William Scudamore
James Tomkins
William Tomkins
John Vaughan
Roger Vaughan
Thomas Wigmore
Appendix VI: J.P.s, 1642 (see supra, p. 64)

Wallop Brabazon  
Fitzwilliam Coningsby  
Sir William Croft  
Paul Delahay  
Ambrose Elton senior  
Sir Sampson Eure  
Sir Robert Harley  
Sir Richard Hopton  
Bennett Hoskyns  
John Greene  
James Kyrle  
Sir John Kyrle, Bart.  
Walter Kyrle  
Henry Lingen  
Sir Edward Powell, Bart.  
Thomas Price  
Sir Walter Pye  
William Rudhall  
Isaac Seward  
John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo  
John Scudamore of Ballingham  
John Scudamore of Kentchurch  
William Scudamore  
William Smallman  
Thomas Tomkins  
Roger Vaughan  
Herbert Westfaling  
Thomas Wigmore
Appendix VII: Royalist J.P.s, 1643 (see supra, pp. 81-2)

Wallop Brabazon
Fitzwilliam Coningsby
Sir William Croft
Sir Sampson Eure
Henry Lingen
Thomas Price
Sir Walter Pye
James Rodd
Richard Rodd
William Rudhall
John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo
John Scudamore of Ballingham
William Scudamore
John Skippe
William Smallman
Thomas Tomkins
Fulke Walwyn
Herbert Westfaling
Robert Whitney
Thomas Wigmore
# Appendix VIII: J.P.s, 1646-1660

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1646</th>
<th>1647-48</th>
<th>1649-57</th>
<th>1658-60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Baskerville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Brydges, Bart. (d. 1652)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1649-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brydges</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Careless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1654-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Charlton</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cholmley</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cockerham</td>
<td>1650-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cocks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1650-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darley (d. c.1658)</td>
<td>1650-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priamus Davies</td>
<td>1652-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Delahay</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dolphin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1650-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton senior (d. 1659)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton junior</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1649-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett senior (d. c.1648)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett junior (d. c.1657)</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1649-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudhall Gwillym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1650-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>1652-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridstock Harford</td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Harley (d. 1656)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1655-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herring (d. c.1657)</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1650-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Hopton (d. 1653)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hopton junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1650-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins James</td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kyrle (d. 1646)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kyrle</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kyrle, Bart. (d. 1650)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Kyrle (d. 1650)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Lechmere</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Littleton (d. 1653)</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>c.1649-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1647-48</td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>1658-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Merrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mynors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1655-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nicholetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Perrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward Powell, Bart. (d. 1653)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rawlins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rawlins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scudamore (d. 1649)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Seabourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1655-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Seward (d. 1653)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1649-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Steward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell Vaughan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walsham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1656-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Walsham (d. c.1655)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Watkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Woodyate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653-57</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Commissions of the Peace were issued for Herefordshire by Parliament's administration in August 1644 and July 1646 (see P.R.O., C. 231/6/5, 50) but the magistrates' names are not given. From elsewhere (B.M., Loan 29/175, Petition of Herefordshire quarter sessions, 6 October 1646; H.M.C., Portland, III, 146), it is possible to find the names of some of the J.P.s of 1646 and assuming
Parliamentarians on the Commission before the war were returned, there would have been at least sixteen J.P.s in 1646.

Further Commissions were issued in January 1648 and the February and April of the following year (see P.R.O., C. 231/6/105, 142, 149) but again the names are not given. Eleven of the J.P.s appointed in July 1649 are given while a full list survives for the Commission in early 1650. See P.R.O., C. 193/13/3; C. 231/6/157. Thus the J.P.s of 1647-8 can only be conjectured, but probably many of the committesemen were appointed to the Commission. (Such was the case in the 1650s when the Commission of the Peace bore a close relationship to the assessment and militia committees, and the situation was similar to before the war when J.P.s were appointed, with other gentry close to squirearchical status, to be commissioners for subsidies or loans).

The Commission of 1650 was made up of those added in July 1649 and those who had probably been appointed in January 1648-April 1649. It is likely, however, that as with the committees named before and after the Revolution of 1648-9 a number of J.P.s appointed before 1649 were removed. A few of those appointed in July 1649 had probably been temporarily excluded earlier that year because of their association with the Presbyterian faction before 1649.

During the Interregnum, the Commissions are well-documented until 1657. Most likely a number of changes took place in 1657-60 corresponding with the alterations to the committees in this period. See Appendix XVII.

In the above table, 'X' indicates the J.P. was on the Commission for part of the period at least while 'X?' means he may have been a J.P. but it is not certain. The dates of J.P.s dying before 1660 are given. For the 1649-57 period the dates of the magistrate's inclusion on the Commission are noted; Cooke, Darley, Davies, Gwillym and Harford were omitted for brief periods in the 1650s, either by policy or error.
Sources

P.R.O., C. 193/13/3-6; C. 231/6; S.P. 18/95/72 I.

B.M., Loan 29/175; Stowe MS. 577; L. 1238 (4): The Names of Justices of the Peace, November 1650.

N.L.W., Milborne MS. 1993.

H.R.O., City records, V, 5; Gatley MSS., F. 76/III/101.
Appendix IX: J.P.s, c.February 1650 (from P.R.O., C. 193/13/3)

Thomas Baskerville
Sir John Brydges, Bart.
Job Charlton
Job Cholmley
Thomas Cooke
Richard Dolphin
Ambrose Elton senior
Ambrose Elton junior
John Flackett
Rudhall Gwillym
Bridstock Harford
John Herring
Sir Richard Hopton
Richard Hopton junior
Bennett Hoskyns
John James
Sir John Kyrle, Bart.
Robert Kyrle
Walter Kyrle
William Littleton
John Pateshall
Francis Pember senior
Thomas Rawlins
Richard Reed
John Scudamore of Kentchurch
Isaac Seward
Appendix X: J.P.s, c.October 1653

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Cholmley</th>
<th>Walter Merrick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cockerham</td>
<td>Richard Nicholetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooke</td>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darley</td>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priamus Davies</td>
<td>Edward Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett</td>
<td>Thomas Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudhall Gwillym</td>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herring</td>
<td>Richard Walsham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins James</td>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>John Woodyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td>Morgan Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howell Vaughan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

The Commission containing twenty-six resident J.P.s around February 1650 (see Appendix IX) was extended with the addition of Cockerham, Darley, Merrick, Rogers and John Steward in March 1650. See P.R.O., C. 231/6/177; B.M., E. 1238 (4): The Names of the Justices of the Peace, November 1650. Sir John Kyrle, Bart. and Walter Kyrle died in 1650 and Davies was added to the Commission in March 1652, making the number of magistrates thirty in all. See P.R.O., C. 231/6/233; C. 193/13/4; B.M., Stowe MS. 577.

The P.R.O. list of J.P.s for around May 1652 (C. 193/13/4) contains many alterations relating to changes over the following year or so. From the alterations to this list and the P.R.O. additions book for this period (C. 231/6/253, 270) the J.P.s of around October 1653 can be deduced. Thomas Baskerville
was omitted and replaced as 'custos' by John James. Others omitted were Charlton, Dolphin, Harford, Hoskyns, Reed, Steward, Robert Kyrie, the Eltons, and Richard Hopton junior, while Brydges died in 1652 and Littleton, Seward and Sir Richard Hopton died in 1653. Darley was removed in July 1652, then restored the following October. In all, only half of the J.P.s of 1652 survived through to October 1653 and to fill the Commission eleven further magistrates were appointed in 1653, although one of these, Roger Lechmere, was removed before the end of the year, to make a total of twenty-five J.P.s.
Appendix XI: J.P.s, c. July 1657

William Brydges
John Cholmley
Arthur Cockerham
Charles Darley
Priamus Davies
Thomas Delahay
Rudhall Gwillym
Francis Hall
Bridstock Harford
Edward Harley
Richard Hopton
Bennett Hoskyns
Higgins James
John James
Benjamin Mason

Robert Mynors
Richard Nicholetts
John Pateshall
Francis Pember senior
Francis Pember junior
William Powell
Edward Rawlins
Thomas Rawlins
Wroth Rogers
John Scudamore of Kentchurch
Thomas Seabourne
John Vaughan
John Walsham
Robert Weaver
John Woodyate

Notes

Only resident gentry are included. Of the 25 J.P.s in October 1653 (see Appendix X), Cooke and Davies were omitted and Harley, Hopton, Hoskyns and Powell added to the Commission by March 1655. Gwillym was also left out but restored by this date. See P.R.O., S.P. 18/95/72 I; C. 231/6/305.

The numbers of magistrates were further increased to 29 by September 1656 with the addition of Mynors and Seabourne. In the meantime John Walsham replaced Richard Walsham, while Cooke, Davies and Harford, and Thomas Careless, were added then swiftly omitted.

Following this, Davies and Harford were appointed again and the total of
J.P.s by July 1657 was 30 following the addition of Brydges, Delahay, Pember of Lyonshall and John Vaughan while Flackett, Herring, Merrick, Watkins and Howell Vaughan were left out. See P.R.O., C. 193/13/5, 6; C. 231/6/315, 318, 322, 371.
Appendix XII: J.P.s, July 1660

John Barneby of Brockhampton       Sir Edward Hopton
John Barneby of Canon Pyon          Richard Hopton
Humphrey Baskerville                Bennett Hoskyns
John Birch                          Sir John Kyrle, Bart.
Thomas Blayney                      Sir Henry Lingen
John Booth                          James Pytts
Roger Bosworth                     William Powell
Wallop Brabazon                     John Price
Sir James Brydges, Bart.            Thomas Price
Job Charlton                        Richard Reed
Thomas Cocks                        John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo
Fitzwilliam Coningsby               John Scudamore of Kentchurch
Humphrey Cornwall                  John Skippe
Edward Cornwall                    Thomas Tomkins
Thomas Cornwall                    Francis Unett
William Gregory                    John Vaughan
Rudhall Gwillym                     Roger Vaughan
Edward Harley                       Herbert Westfaling
Thomas Harley

Notes

Only resident gentry are included. By about October 1660, Sir John Scudamore, Bart., of Ballingham, Edward Alderne, Herbert Perrot and John Nourse had been added to the Commission, while John Scudamore of Kentchurch, though still alive, was replaced by his son, John Scudamore junior. One list of J.P.s of the time has Robert Harley instead of his younger brother Thomas, but this
may be an error as Robert does not appear in subsequent lists while Thomas is named in earlier and later Commissions.

In December 1660, Thomas Baskerville of Collington was added, followed by Edward Freeman, Timothy Colles and Humphrey Howorth of Vowchurch in February 1661. James Scudamore, son of the viscount, was appointed a J.P. in August 1661.

Thomas Whitney, son of Sir Robert, is included in one list of 1660, but his name has been inserted following his appointment in 1662. Benjamin Mason was added in 1661 or 1662 but was removed shortly afterwards along with Thomas Blayney.

Sources

P.R.O., C. 220/9/4; C. 231/7/31, 58, 81, 127, 165.

H.R.O., R. 93/8357.

Appendix XIII: Comparisons of J.P.s, 1636-1660

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titled (Peers, knights of Bath, baronets and knights)</th>
<th>1636</th>
<th>1650</th>
<th>1653</th>
<th>1657</th>
<th>1660</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, or origins obscure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family on the Commission of the Peace before the war</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education                                              |      |      |      |      |      |
| University                                             | 58   | 38   | 20   | 20   | 32   |
| Inns of Court                                          | 58   | 38   | 20   | 23   | 49   |
| Neither at University nor the Inns                     | 32   | 42   | 72   | 63   | 41   |

| Wealth                                                 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Herefordshire land under £500 p.a.                     | 47   | 96   | 100  | 90   | 84   |
| Herefordshire land over £500 p.a.                      | 53   | 4    | 0    | 10   | 16   |

| Marriages                                              |      |      |      |      |      |
| Wife from Herefordshire                                | 27   | 44   | 58   | 63   | 35   |
| Bordering counties                                     | 23   | 39   | 25   | 17   | 37   |
| Other regions                                          | 50   | 17   | 17   | 20   | 28   |

Notes

The figures are percentages rounded to the nearest whole number, and they are based on a study of the J.P.s in Appendices V, IX, X, XI and XII. In the section on wealth, those J.P.s who were heirs but had not yet inherited the family estate, as with William Tomkins for example in 1636, are categorised as having already inherited. In the marriages section, the figures for the J.P.s of 1653 are not too conclusive because less than half of the marriages can be traced.
Appendix XIV: Commissioners of Array, 1642-1645

Wallop Brabazon
Fitzwilliam Coningsby
Sir William Croft
Sir Sampson Eure
Henry Lingen (knighted 1645)
Thomas Price
Sir Walter Pye

James Rodd
William Rudhall
John Scudamore, Viscount of Sligo
Thomas Tomkins
Sir Robert Whitney
Thomas Wigmore

Sources

C.J., II, 775.

H.M.C., Portland, III, 90-1.

H.M.C., Rye, Hereford and Dovaston, p. 341.

Webb, Civil War, I, 96, 348, 353.


C.S.P.D., 1654, p. 311.

P.R.O., C. 231/3/4, 56, 85.

B.M., Add. MS. 11051, f. 57.

Appendix XV: Parliamentarian Deputy Lieutenants, September 1642
(from H.M.C., Portland, III, 100)

Edward Broughton
Ambrose Elton senior
John Flackett senior
Edward Harley
Sir Robert Harley
Sir Richard Hopton
Bennett Hoskyns

Francis Kyrle
James Kyrle
Sir John Kyrle, Bart.
Walter Kyrle
Thomas Rawlins
John Scudamore of Kentchurch
Henry Vaughan
## Appendix XVI: Committeemen, 1646-1648

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>June 1646(13)</th>
<th>February 1647(25)</th>
<th>March 1648(24)</th>
<th>December 1648(31)</th>
<th>December 1648(23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Baskerville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blayney</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Broughton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cholmley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crowther</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praimus Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dannett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton senior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett senior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett junior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Harley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harley junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Husbands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jones</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kyrle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kyrle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kyrle, Bart.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Kyrle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Kyrle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Littleton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Pherrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sir Edward Powell, Bart.  
Thomas Rawlins  
John Scudamore of Kentchurch  
Isaac Seward  
Samuel Trottman  
Nathaniel Wright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Only residents of Herefordshire are included. For the committee in 1646, see supra, pp. 105-8. A number of those on the committee in 1646 continued to act as sequestrators although not named on other committees in 1647-8. The committees appointed in 1647 and the February and March of 1648 were for raising assessments. That of December 1648 was for militia organisation. A militia commission was issued earlier in 1648 also. See A. & O., I, 966-7, 1084, 1112, 1237; L.J., X, 276-7.

Commissioners appointed for Hereford and Leominster only are not included in the above table. In March 1648, additions were made to the assessment committee, but some were probably meant to act for the city of Hereford and not the county. Dannett, Freeman, Hall, Herring, Hoskyns and Seward were most likely appointed for the county and they were named on county committees before and after 1648 while others added in March were only named on city commissions at other times. See A. & O., I, 1112.

Robert Harley junior was added to the assessment committee named in March 1648, and in April 1648 he was also appointed as a sequestrator along with Robert Kyrle. See C.J., V, 533, 536.
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**Appendix XVII: Assessment and Militia Committees, 1649-1660**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April-May</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649(26)</td>
<td>1649(31)</td>
<td>1650(29)</td>
<td>1652(35)</td>
<td>1657(47)</td>
<td>1659(19)</td>
<td>1660(33)</td>
<td>1660(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Alderne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Baskerville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blayney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Bosworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Brydges, Bart.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brydges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brydges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Careless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Charlton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cholmley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cockerham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dannett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649(26)</td>
<td>1649(31)</td>
<td>1650(29)</td>
<td>1652(35)</td>
<td>1657(47)</td>
<td>1659(19)</td>
<td>1660(33)</td>
<td>1660(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Darnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priamus Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Delahay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dolphin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Elton junior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett junior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Frere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Geeres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudhall Gwillym</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridstock Harford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harley junior</td>
<td>1649(26)</td>
<td>1649(31)</td>
<td>1650(29)</td>
<td>1652(35)</td>
<td>1657(47)</td>
<td>1659(19)</td>
<td>1660(33)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hereford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Higgins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Hopton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hopton junior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Hoskyns</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Jenkins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kyrle, Bart.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Kyrle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kyrle, 2nd Bart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kyrle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649(26)</td>
<td>1649(31)</td>
<td>1650(29)</td>
<td>1652(35)</td>
<td>1657(47)</td>
<td>1659(19)</td>
<td>1660(33)</td>
<td>1660(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Lechmere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Littleton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Merrick</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mynors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nichtelets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pember junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Perrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pytts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rawlins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Reed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scudamore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Seabourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649(26)</td>
<td>1649(31)</td>
<td>1650(29)</td>
<td>1652(35)</td>
<td>1657(47)</td>
<td>1659(19)</td>
<td>1660(33)</td>
<td>1660(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Seward</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Seward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Siddall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Tracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walsham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wancklin</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Woodyate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wootton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

The committees of July 1659 and March 1660 were for the militia while the others were for the assessment. See A. & O., II, 35, 119, 299, 467-8, 664-5, 1246, 1369; C.J., VII, 727. Militia committee members appointed after 1649, but not by Parliament, are not in the above table. See supra, p. 155. Assessment committees were also appointed in 1653-5 (see A. & O., II, 904, 1031; C.J., VII, 355-6) but the only names available are those of John Pateshall and Thomas Holmes who were added to the committee in November 1653. See ibid. Some commissioners such as Bridstock Harford (in 1649, 1650 and 1652) and Thomas Holmes, Roger Bosworth and Silas Taylor (all in 1652) were appointed at times for Hereford only, or Leominster, as opposed to others, in the above table, who were named to act for the county.

Honorary figures, gentry from bordering shires and military officers who only spent a short time in the county are not included in the table. In all, about 70% of the commissioners named during 1649-60 were residents of the shire, along with about 14% appointed for Hereford or Leominster only. Gentry of bordering areas formed 11%, and 5% were military officers temporarily active in the region.

Note that the Sir John Kyrle, Bart., named in the assessment committee of November 1650 may be the one who died that year or his grandson who inherited the title.
### Appendix XVIII: Commissioners for Ejecting Ministers and Schoolmasters

**August 1654** (from A. & O., II, 971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Aston</td>
<td>William Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Blayney</td>
<td>John Pateshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Boterell</td>
<td>Francis Pember senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cholmley</td>
<td>Thomas Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priamus Davies</td>
<td>Richard Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eaton</td>
<td>Wroth Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flackett</td>
<td>John Scudamore of Kentchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harley</td>
<td>Thomas Seabourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Harley</td>
<td>Silvanus Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additions, August 1656** (from C.S.P.D., 1656-7, p. 72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mason</td>
<td>John Woodyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nicholetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

Of these 'ejectors' only the backgrounds of Aston, Boterell, Lane and Taylor are not given in Appendix I. Aston and Boterell were residents of Ludlow in Shropshire. Aston was a bailiff for Ludlow in 1652 and an M.P. for the town in 1654, while Boterell was governor of Ludlow in 1649, a bailiff in 1648, 1651 and 1659, and an M.P. for Shropshire in 1653. Both were appointed to commissions in 1657. See Thomas Wright, *The History of Ludlow* (Ludlow, 1841), p. 497; A. & O., II, passim.; Al. Oxon., I, 39; Grazebrook and Rylands, *Visitation of*
Shropshire, I, 61-3.

William Lane was a citizen of Hereford, named as an assessment commissioner for the city in 1657 and 1660. In 1658 he was mayor. Lane died in 1661. See A. & O., II, 1070, 1370; R. Rawlinson, The History and Antiquities of the City and Cathedral Church of Hereford (1717), p. 109; Will proved 1661 (P.C.C.).

Silvanus Taylor came from Shropshire and prospered as a financier in London. A Presbyterian, he was active in central government in the 1640s and 1650s. He purchased confiscated lands in Wales and the border shires and was named on commissions in these areas, including Herefordshire. His eldest son, Silas, was a Herefordshire sequestrator in the 1650s. See Dodd, Stuart Wales, p. 142; D.N.B., Silas Taylor.
I. PRIMARY SOURCES

a) Manuscripts

P.R.O.

Assi 2, 4, 5  Assize records, Oxford circuit
C. 115/M. 12, 21, 24 Including letters of Scudamore family of Holm Lacy
C. 115/R. 1 Records of loan to King in 1631
C. 181/3-7 Entry books of commission for sewers
C. 193/12/2, 3 Commissions of the Peace
C. 193/13/1-6
C. 212/20 Records of enclosure fines
C. 220/9/4 Commission of the Peace, 1660
C. 231/1-7 Records of changes in the Commission of the Peace
E. 163/18/12 Commission of the Peace, 1626
E. 179 Various taxation and loan records including:
E. 179/119/459, 469-76, 478-9, 481 Herefordshire lay subsidy rolls, 1641
E. 179/237/44-5
E. 198/4/32 Knighthood compositions, 1630-2
E. 403/3041-2 Records of enclosure fines, 1634-41
E. 407/35 Knighthood compositions, 1630-2
S.P. 16 State Papers, Charles I, including:
S.P. 16/212 Commission of the Peace, 1632
S.P. 16/405 Commission of the Peace, 1636
S.P. 18 Interregnum state papers, including:
S.P. 18/95/72 I Commission of the Peace, 1655
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.P. 23</th>
<th>Records of compounding procedures and fines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 24</td>
<td>Records of Committee for Indemnity, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 24/1, 4, 54, 71</td>
<td>Records of some cases relating to Herefordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28</td>
<td>Commonwealth Exchequer papers, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/129</td>
<td>Army accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/154</td>
<td>Accounts of Nathaniel Coggan, Nathaniel Wright and Samuel Shilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/209 B</td>
<td>Accounts of Robert Delahay, Thomas Blayney and Thomas Rawlins and orders of Herefordshire committeemen, 1648-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/228/1-4</td>
<td>Records of Thomas Blayney and the committee at Gloucester, 1643-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/228/5</td>
<td>Records of the Herefordshire county committee, 1646-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/229</td>
<td>Records of the Herefordshire county committee, 1646-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/249</td>
<td>Including petition of Thomas Blayney (f. 261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/252 (i)</td>
<td>Records of the Committee for Taking the Accounts of the Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/252 (ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/253 (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/253 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/255-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/298-309</td>
<td>Various financial records relating to troops and county committees, 1642-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/232</td>
<td>Records of county committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 28/339</td>
<td>Assessment accounts, including those of Nathaniel Coggan, receiver of assessments for Herefordshire, 1657-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 29</td>
<td>State Papers, Charles II, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P. 29/11</td>
<td>Herefordshire deputy lieutenants (f. 162) in 1660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Nalson papers
B.M.

Add. MS. 5494  Herefordshire sequestration records (ff. 118-35)
Add. MSS. 11041-59  Scudamore papers, relating to concerns of the
                    Scudamores of Holm Lacy
Add. MS. 15858  Letters of Scudamores of Holm Lacy and Ballingham to
                Sir Richard Browne (ff. 135-44)
Add. MS. 16178  Order book of the Herefordshire county committee,
                1646-7
Add. MS. 19678  Records of confiscated estates, including Herefordshire
                (f. 34)
Add. MS. 36452  Herefordshire Catholic delinquents (f. 191)
Harl. MS. 1622  Commission of the Peace, 1626
Harl. MSS. 4046, 6726, 6766, 6802, 6868  Including material collected by Silas Taylor on the
                                          history of Herefordshire and various taxation records
Harl. MS. 7189  'Certain observations of certain persons ... in city
                and county of Hereford' (ff. 241-49v)
Loan 29        Harley MSS.
Stowe MS. 577  Commission of the Peace, 1652

H.R.O.

A. 28            Miscellaneous deeds
A. 29            Miscellaneous deeds
A. 63            Arkwright MSS.
A. 77            Miscellaneous deeds and letters
A. 79            Miscellaneous deeds
A. 93            Miscellaneous deeds
A. 95            Pateshall MSS.
A. 100           Tedstone MSS.
A.C. 83          Miscellaneous deeds
A.D. 2           Bodenham MSS.
A.E. 37          Miscellaneous deeds
B. 16  Eardisland MSS.
B. 38  Ledbury MSS.
B. 47  Foxley MSS.
B. 56  Robert Biddulph Phillips MSS.
C. 67  Miscellaneous deeds
C. 94  Miscellaneous deeds
Downton  MSS. relating to the Downton area
D. 4  Miscellaneous deeds
D. 86  Miscellaneous deeds
E. 3  Rochester Bridge MSS.
E. 31  Papers of the Brydges of Tyberton
E. 60  Miscellaneous deeds
E. 92  Miscellaneous deeds
E. 95  Miscellaneous deeds
F. 35  Hellens MSS.
F. 37  Whitehouse MSS.
F. 49  Miscellaneous deeds
F. 76  Gatley MSS.
F. 78  MSS. relating to the Dilwyn area
F. 94  Snodhill MSS.
G. 37  Papers of the Walwyns of Hellens
G.H. 2  Guildhall collection
Hereford law day files  1617-40, 1655-71
City records  MSS. bound in nine volumes
J. 93  Miscellaneous deeds
K. 2  Langstone MSS.
K. 12  Miscellaneous deeds
K. 55  Miscellaneous deeds
K. 61  Pengethley MSS.
L. 48          Miscellaneous deeds
L. 57          Garnstone MSS.
M. 8           Miscellaneous deeds
M. 25          Miscellaneous deeds
M. 46          Brockhampton MSS.
M. 72          Including letter of Henry Lingen and Barnaby Scudamore, 16 October 1644
N. 61          Miscellaneous deeds
O. 57          Papers of John Birch
O. 58          Miscellaneous deeds
O. 68          Goodrich MSS.
P. 71          Papers of the Walwyns of Hellens
P. 73          Accounts relating to Hereford Castle, 1660
P. 74          Miscellaneous deeds
R. 93          Hopton MSS.
S. 33          Papers of the Crofts of Croft Castle
S. 67          Leominster court leet records and other records of the borough
W. 85          Papers of the Delahays of Urish-Hay

N.L.W.

Aston Hall deeds
Belmont MSS.
Courtfield MSS.
Kentchurch MSS.
Milborne MSS.
Mynde Park MSS.
Ottley MSS.
Powis Castle MSS.
b) **Primary Printed Sources**

i) **Tracts and Other Contemporary Publications**

Richard Blome, *Britannia* (1673)

William Camden, *Britain, or a Chorographicall Description* (1610)

A Copy of a Letter Writ from Serjeant-Major Kirle (1643), B.M., E. 246 (35)


The Declaration of the Gentlemen and others now in Armes in the County of Hereford (1648), B.M., 669, f. 13 (4)

Michael Drayton, *Poly-Olbion, or a Chorographicall Description of Great Britain* (1613)

Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662)

Miles Hill, *A true and impartiall account of the plunderings* (1650), B.M., E. 607 (3)

*Impostor Magnus, or the Legerdemain of Richard Delamaine* (1654), B.M., 698. h. 2, 1417. b. 1

A New Tricke to take Townes (1645), B.M., E. 314 (12)

The Names of the Justices of the Peace, November 1650 (1650), B.M., E. 1238 (4)

Severall Letters from Colonell Morgan and Colonell Birch (1645), B.M., E. 313 (17)

The Strong Castle of Gothridge taken by Colonell Birch (1646), B.M., E. 349 (2)

Two Letters sent to the Speaker of the House of Commons concerning the taking of Hereford (1645), B.M., E. 313 (11)

A. Yarranton, *England's Improvement by Sea and Land* (1677)

ii) **Official Records**

**Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series**

**Calendar of State Papers, Ireland**

**Calendar of State Papers, Venetian Series**

**Calendar of Treasury Books**

J. R. Dasent and others (eds.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1600-1631* (1906-64)

M. A. E. Green (ed.), Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, 1642-1656 (1888)

Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, 1643-1660 (1889-92)

H. M. C., Appendix to Seventh Report, Webb MSS. etc.

H. M. C., Bath

H. M. C., Cowper

H. M. C., De L'Isle and Dudley

H. M. C., Egmont

H. M. C., Letter Book of Sir Samuel Luke

H. M. C., Portland

H. M. C., Rutland

H. M. C., Rye, Hereford and Dovaston

H. M. C., Salisbury

H. M. C., Westmorland, Powis and Salway

Journals of the House of Commons

Journals of the House of Lords

Members of Parliament: A Return of the Name of Every Member, part 1, 1213-1702 (1878)

Privy Council Registers, 1637-1645 (P.R.O., 1967-8)

II. SECONDARY SOURCES RELATING TO HEREFORDSHIRE

a) Books

A. T. Bannister, Diocese of Hereford: Institutions, 1539-1900 (Hereford, 1923)

Herefordshire and its Place in English History (Hereford, 1912)

The History of Ewias Harold (Hereford, 1902)

John Beale, Herefordshire Orchards, A Pattern for all England (1724)

B. G. Charles and H. D. Emanuel (eds.), *A Calendar of the Hereford Cathedral Muniments* (N.L.W., 1955)

O. G. S. Croft, *The House of Croft of Croft Castle* (Hereford, 1949)


J. Duncumb, *General View of the Agriculture of the County of Hereford* (1805)

M. A. Faraday (ed.), *Herefordshire Militia Assessment of 1663* (Camden Society, 1972)


J. Hillaby (ed.), *Bromyard: A Local History* (Bromyard, 1970)

H. H. Hudson (ed.), *Directions for Speech and Style by John Hoskins* (Princeton, 1935)

*An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Herefordshire, Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England* (H.M.S.O., 1931)

Joseph Jones, *Hereford, Cathedral and City* (Hereford, 1858)

T. T. Lewis (ed.), *Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley* (Camden Society, 1854)

Nehemiah Lyde, *A Narrative of the Life of Mr. Richard Lyde of Hereford* (1731)

J. H. Matthews, *The Vaughans of Courtfield* (1912)


Richard Parry, *The History of Kington* (Kington, 1845)

H. W. Phillott, *Diocesan History of Hereford* (1888)

John Price, *An Account of Leominster* (Ludlow, 1795)

*An Historical Account of the City of Hereford* (Hereford, 1796)
R. Rawlinson, *The History and Antiquities of the City and Cathedral Church of Hereford* (1717)


Lord Rennell of Rodd, *Valley on the March: A History of a Group of Manors on the Herefordshire March of Wales* (1958)


G. Strong, *The Heraldry of Herefordshire* (1848)

G. F. Townshend, *The Town and Borough of Leominster* (Leominster, 1863)

V.C.H., Herefordshire

F. W. Weaver (ed.), *The Visitation of Herefordshire in 1569* (Exeter, 1886)

J. and T. W. Webb, *Memorials of the Civil War as it Affected Herefordshire* (1879)


W. R. Williams, *The Parliamentary History of the County of Hereford* (Brecknock, 1896)


E. B. Wood (ed.), *Rowland Vaughan: His Booke* (1897)

b) Articles and Theses


'Ship Money in Herefordshire', T.W.C., XLI (1973-5), pp. 219-29

R. S. Gavin Robinson, 'Rowland Vaughan and his Waterworks', T.W.C. (1936-8), pp. 35-8

A. Harford, 'The Harfords of Bosbury', Archaeologia Cambrensis, 6th series, IX (1909), pp. 283-301


J. N. Jackson, 'Some Observations upon the Herefordshire Environment of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', T.W.C., XXXVI (1958-60), pp. 28-41


T. W. M. Johnson, 'The Diary of George Skippe of Ledbury', T.W.C., XXIV (1952-4), pp. 54-62


'Hereford Presentments, 1611-1659', T.W.C. (1939-41), pp. 79-89


'Trade in Hereford in the Sixteenth Century', T.W.C. (1936-8), pp. 1-20


H. W. Phillott, 'Notes on Weobley, Herefordshire', Archaeologia Cambrensis, 3rd series, XV (1869), pp. 39-55, 265-76

G. Piper, 'Bronsil Castle, Eastnor', T.W.C. (1887-80), pp. 228-31

A. D. Powell, 'Some Lawsuits about Brilley and Huntington in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', T.R.S., XXIX (1959), pp. 31-44

'Two Eustace Whitneys', T.R.S., XX (1950), pp. 31-8

H. Reade, 'Hall Court and Sir John Coke, Knight', T.W.C. (1921-3), pp. 127-41

A. L. Rowse, 'Alltyrynys and the Cecils', E.H.R., LXXV (1960), pp. 54-76


T. S. Smith, 'Herefordshire Catholics and the Rites of Passage, 1540-1640', T.W.C., XLII (1978), pp. 235-43


III. SECONDARY SOURCES, GENERAL

a) Books


J. Amphlett, The Kyre Park Charters (Worcestershire Historical Society, 1905)

E. Andriette, Devon and Exeter in the Civil War (Newton Abbot, 1972)

M. Ashley, Cromwell's Generals (1954)

General Monck (1977)

John Wildman (1947)

R. Ashton, The English Civil War (1978)

T. Aston (ed.), Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660 (1965)

G. E. Aylmer (ed.), The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660 (1972)

The King's Servants (1961)

The State's Servants (1973)
W. B. Baildon (ed.), The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, Admissions (1896)

T. G. Barnes, Somerset, 1625-1640: A County's Government during the 'Personal Rule' (Oxford, 1961)

E. L. Barnwell, Perrot Notes, Or Some Account of the Various Branches of the Perrot Family (1867)

J. Barrell, The Dark Side of the Landscape (Cambridge, 1980)

H. E. Bell, An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards and Liveries (Cambridge, 1953)


Thomas Birch (ed.), A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe (1742)

B. G. Blackwood, The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660 (Manchester, 1978)

Philip Bliss (ed.), Athenae Oxonienses by Anthony Wood (1813-20)


L. Boynton, The Elizabethan Militia, 1558-1638 (1967)

J. A. Bradney (ed.), The Diary of Walter Powell, 1603-1654 (1907)

A History of Monmouthshire (1904-32)


Brasenose College Registers, 1509-1909 (Oxford Historical Society, 1909)

W. Brigg, Genealogical Abstracts of Wills Proved in the P.C.C.: Register Wooton, 1658 (Leeds, 1894-1914)


J. Buchanan-Brown (ed.), Three Prose Works by John Aubrey (1972)

Burke's Gentry (1st edn., 1833-8)

(2nd edn., 1852)

E. H. Burton (ed.), The Douay College Diaries, 1598-1654 (Catholic Record Society, X, XI, 1911)

A. T. Butler (ed.), The Visitation of Worcestershire, 1634 (1938)

I. M. Calder, Activities of the Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-1633 (1957)

B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (1972)

T. Carte, *Original Letters and Papers* (1739)


Peter Clark and Paul Slack (eds.), *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500–1700* (1972)

*English Towns in Transition, 1500–1700* (1976)


G. E. Cokayne (ed.), *The Complete Baronetage* (Exeter, 1900–9)

*The Complete Peerage* (1910–59)


*Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* (1834–43)


W. H. Cooke (ed.), *Students Admitted to the Inner Temple, 1547–1660* (1878)


J. A. Corbett (ed.), *John Leland's Itinerary* (1887)


H. C. Darby (ed.), *The Historical Geography of England before 1800* (Cambridge, 1951)

*A New Historical Geography of England* (Cambridge, 1973)


Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1962)

O. L. Dick (ed.), *Aubrey's Brief Lives* (1962)

*Dictionary of American Biography* (1964)

*Dictionary of National Biography*

*Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940* (1959)


A. M. Everitt, *Changes in the Provinces* (Leicester, 1969)

The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660 (Leicester, 1966)

The Local Community and the Great Rebellion (1969)

Suffolk and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660 (Suffolk Record Society, 1960)

W. J. Farrow, *The Great Civil War in Shropshire, 1642-1649* (Shrewsbury, 1926)


C. H. Firth (ed.), *The Clarke Papers* (Camden Society, 1891-1901)

The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656-1658 (1909)

(ed.), *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (Oxford, 1894)


Joseph Foster (ed.), *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714* (Oxford, 1891-2)
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