IX

Commerce, Religion, Loyalty: Royalist Newcastle upon Tyne, 1642–1644

Jerome de Groot

SUMMARY

The close study of Newcastle during the Civil War highlights the fact that the town cannot be easily categorised as Puritan or Royalist; indeed, pigeonholing ignores the intricate subtleties of local relationships. Such consideration forces us to once more reassess our mode of discussing the history of the 1640s. To illustrate this I concentrate in particular on the figure of Lionel Maddison, in order to consider the economic imperative underpinning all civic and religious action in the city. Allegiance seems to be elastic, depending on issues of finance rather than religion or loyalty. I also consider the status and activities of the town during the siege, and the Parliamentarian propagandists' characterisation of the city. Lionel Maddison's motivations were a hybrid mixture of religion and financial necessity. Like the population of the city himself, he avoids easy characterisation: politically slippery, religiously ambiguous, highly independent.

> The Lords and Commons, in Parliament assembled, having received certain intelligence of God's gracious Providence, in delivering the Town of Newcastle into the Hands of our Brethren of Scotland, come in to our Assistance; do Order, That publick Thanks be given to God on our and their Behalf, by all the Ministers within the Cities of London and Westminster, on the Lord's Day next, for this great Blessing from the Lord of Hosts.[1]

The increasing importance of the North-east to the Civil War can be crudely illustrated by the growing number of Garrisons in the area: Alnwick, Warkworth, Morpeth, Newcastle, Tynemouth, Prudhoe, Hexham, Lumley and Durham all supported major Royalist military forces in 1644, whilst the camps around York grew from 3 in 1643 to 9 in 1644.[2] The strategic and symbolic import of Newcastle was such that the instructions for the Parliamentarian committee sent to Oxford to negotiate with the King in March 1643 specified that

> 12. You are to move his Majesty that all forces out of Newcastle and other towns wherein any have been placed since these troubles began may be removed, and fortifications that have been lately raised may be slighted.[3]

It is illustrative of the court-centric nature of Civil War Royalist propaganda and cultural production that the official newsletter *Mercurius Aulicus* takes little notice of Newcastle whereas in the imagination of the London journalists and pamphlet-writers it figures large. *Aulicus* barely mentions the city itself, discussing rather the actions of the Earl's army in the North-east, the arrival of the Queen, or using the siege to criticise the actions of the Scots. Newcastle was far more commonly to be discussed in broadsheets printed in London. Strategically and economically the status of Newcastle impacted on the struggling capital; the coal trade was far more important to London than to the Royal army.[4] The expansion of the mining industry in the North-east from the end of Elizabeth's reign meant that by 1681 Durham and Northumberland were responsible for nearly half the United Kingdom coal output.[5] Newcastle's industrial and economic importance meant that "it stood in a relation to London which no other provincial town could hope to emulate".[6] Pamphlets in London bemoaned the "great want of Fewell for fire" that "makes some thieves that never stole before".[7] The writer of this tract notices the

economic equity imposed by the lack of a stable coal supply, which yet comes at a high price: "Horse-dung in Balls with Saw-dust, or the dust of Smalcoale, or Charcoale dust [...] dryed, is good Fewell, but the smell is offensive".[8]

In late 1642 a letter purporting to be from Rotterdam describing the activities of Henrietta Maria in raising support for her husband's cause on the continent was published by the command of Parliament.[9] The letter warned of the treacherous activities of the Merchants of Newcastle whose ships were sent to Holland "for the service of the Queen: And there is continuall transportation of great store of Men, Money, and Ammunition, over in them".[10] The arms and horse imported through Newcastle are specifically for the "advancing of Her Majesty's Army in these part", and her own Standard is to follow later.[11] Newcastle is seen as enabling the influx of foreign mercenaries to fight for the Queen and all that she represents:

> It is very credibly reported here, that there is now sending away with all speed to *Newcastle* 160000 pound sterling, which I am very credibly informed by some Dutch-men, is by way of a loane raised by the Papists in these parts (which are not few) for the Queen.[12]

Combining such suggestions with accusations of Catholic influence in the army of William Cavendish, the Parliamentary pamphleteers were busy creating an alarmist image of the North-east as a hotbed of papist insurrection.[13] Cavendish's army was discussed as if separate from that of the King, a loose collection of Catholics wreaking havoc from their safe haven in the North-east.[14] Indeed, Cavendish's actions in Northumberland led to his being specifically exempted from pardon by Parliamentary Ordinance; he headed the list of those "that have been most active against the King in Co. Northumberland, and as such we conceive fit to be exempted from any favour or pardon of King and Parliament".[15] He had earlier been dismissed from his position as tutor to the Prince of Wales for his delinquency, in a public attempt to negate his influence over the King and his family.[16] Carefully eschewing any mention of the King's use for the Town, the Parliamentary Ordinances thus constructed an image of Newcastle as a rebellious conduit for the importation of continental papist influence.

In early 1643 Parliament, realising the importance of Newcastle both strategically and, most importantly, financially, took economic action.[17] Westminster decided to impose a trade embargo a full six months before military action was even considered.[18] The Commons Ordinance identified Newcastle as the "principall In-let of Forreine Ayde, Forces, and Ammunition, for the strengthening of that Force that intends Destruction to the Parliament, and thereby the Religion, Lawes, and Liberties of this Kingdome".[19] When they finally decided to raise a force of troops specifically to reduce the city, they emphasised the strategic value of the town to the Earl of Newcastle, "to the danger of the kingdome".[20] The economic and social effects of the embargo were blamed on the Earl and his rebellious actions:

> The City of *London* and all the greatest part of this Kingdome are like to suffer very deeply in the want of that Commodity so absolutely necessary to the maintenance and support of life; and which is like to be of very dangerous consequence in the influence it may have upon the necessities of the meaner sort. (1–2).

The Ordinance strives to unite the populace against Newcastle and so sweeten the unpopular nature of the subsidy by emphasising that it is the fault of the rebel army which is attempting to unsettle the established government. Cavendish's actions encourage poverty and crime; the Earl's forces are in some way an agent of evil, spreading popery and destitution.

In February of the same year Gellibrand and Bostock published a letter from the General of the Scottish Forces, Lesley, considering the status of Newcastle.[21] This piece performs several functions in the anti-Newcastle propaganda campaign. Basing his evidence on first-hand experience of the town and his

correspondence with the Council, Lesley highlights several important issues. The residents are very definitely part of the town, the civic government is merely an extension of their will: the reply to his demand for submission is signed "in the names of the Common Counsell and the rest of the inhabitants of the Towne of *Newcastle*" (11). They have allied themselves irrevocably with Cavendish, even in the face of the Scottish siege, and are proud, contemptuous of the Gospel, idle and greedy.[22] He vividly describes the attitude of the townspeople:

> They say they are better read in our proceedings then so, the fault is in our eyes if we be not well read in theirs, the letters are plaine and in blood, to this purpose, *Popery*, *Tyranny*, *Perjury*, *Cruelty*, and *deep dissimulation*, witnesse *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland* (5).

In the context of the rhetoric of early Civil War propaganda, Lesley highlights the sinful and debauched nature of those that rebel. Yet the blame is firmly laid at the feet of the residents of the city. They are not led to wrong, but fully implicated in the revolt.

Most discussions of Newcastle's role in the war have been informed by this parliamentary characterisation. Thus earlier historiographers such as Brand and Bourne emphasised the Laudian character of the clergy and the unified defiance of the council in the face of the Scottish siege.[23] More recently, however, Roger Howell's authoritative case-study *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution* has laid the modern basis for our understanding of the war in the North-east and emphasised the importance of economic concerns to the political and religious issues in the city. He also challenges the notion that the townspeople were unified in their support for the King, arguing that during the war the national conflict was to an extent superimposed on local squabbles. Yet even his analyses are often obscured by his increasing stress on reading religious issues as mainsprings for political motive. Loyalties in the city were far less black and white than Howell has suggested, and loyalty to cause or religion was more ambivalent than his work sometimes allows. There were far more subtle relationships between puritan and royalist, kingsman and parliamentarian. National concerns were refracted through local issues; whilst this is the model Howell offers, his polarised reading of religious leanings in particular still gives a skewed image of the town's loyalties and actions during the war years.[24]

An example of the ambiguous nature of the mercantile community can be seen in the only major piece of monumental architecture to survive from the 1630s, the Maddison memorial in the Cathedral of St Nicholas (*c.* 1635). This impressive piece of work testifies to a peculiarly Catholic or Arminian tendency in one of the major civic families of the city. The monument is made of brightly "painted and gilded marble", the panels are jewelled and the decorative carvings elaborate.[25] The family is seen in the process of worship: kneeling on cushions and facing each other across a prayer desk. The composition emphasises that the Maddisons wished to be seen as a practically religious family; the elders join their children in kneeling to God. By contrast, the relatively contemporaneous monument to the Raynton family in St Andrew's, Enfield, shows a distinct difference in iconographic monumental representation between London and the North.[26] Here the design and composition is extremely similar, a rejection of the idealisation of Nicholas Stone's influential designs, which favours a simple vernacular tradition. Sir Nicholas and Lady Raynton recline above the figures of their children, who kneel around a prayer desk. Sir Nicholas wears his ceremonial Lord Mayoral robes and armour, and Lady Raynton reads a small bible. However, their supine position is far more leisurely than the praying Maddisons, and their social position and dominance is emphasised less subtly. The Maddisons' prayers are practical rather than meditative, a rather catholic distinction; they feel the need to represent a physical communion with God rather than emphasise the personal meditative relationship evoked by Lady Raynton's consideration of the Bible. The dominance of the figure of Sir Nicholas

Raynton emphasises political and mercantile power tempered by the pious nature of his wife; the Maddisons conflate religious and civic duties, kneeling in familial equity.

Church monuments can re-establish social difference, and the Maddison monument does this in several ways: physical size and height, opulence of material, the robes of the two male Maddisons. At the top of the piece sit three figures:

> that on the West in a sitting Posture, with a Cross in the left Hand, and a Book in the Right, is the Representation of Faith; that on the East in a sitting, expecting Posture, with an Anchor at her Feet, is the Representation of Hope, and that in the standing Posture, with a Flaming Heart in her Hand, (the Emblems of Action, and Fervency and Love) is the Representation of Charity. Above the Statue on the East, is *Memorae Novissima*, and that above on the West, *Memoriae sacrum*.[27]

The flaming or sacred heart is generally regarded as a Catholic motif. Whilst 1635 is the high water-mark of Laudian architectural and monumental reform, this piece seems to be somewhat independent of his influence. Laud's interest in St Nicholas's was restricted to the removal of a gallery "which obscured the choir and actually extended over the top of the altar".[28] The monument suggests a more ambiguous religious allegiance than the High-Church rituals of Laudianism. The sacred heart signifies the difference between the puritan mercantile classes of London figured by Raynton's monument and those of the North-east. The Maddisons are generally thought of as conservatively puritan yet the religious ambivalence of their monument indicates that the family was anything but strictly doctrinaire. The monument was part of the general character of the church and congregation, a fact that comments on the uncertain religious tenor of the city. This strange collage of affinities led to the Scots ejecting several clergymen as malignants in 1641 whilst reports elsewhere discussed the anti-Laudian behaviour of the town:

> It seems the people of Newcastle have been somewhat bold to despise the service book and to cast it under their feet as a book full of popish errors and superstitions; because it is written from thence that his Majesty taking notice of that disorder, he has sent to that town to require them to conform to the orders of Parliament in that particular of the service book and ceremonies.[29]

There were several factions and disputes; politics and religion were split along personal and familial boundaries, tied up rather more with economic necessity than anything else. Durham and the North-east were hotbeds of Laudian experimentation, but Newcastle and the Tyne Valley were far more autonomous.[30] An influx of Scottish workers to the Coal industry, and the dearth of episcopal authority figures created a culture of religious independence in which allegiances were split along family and economic rather than party lines.[31] Architecturally the city was in thrall to its economic classes: little was built of a non-practical nature during the 1620s and 1630s. Goldsmiths, Musicians, Upholsterers and Scriveners were all considered inferior activities in comparison with the twelve central Mysteries and sundry by-trades. What the Maddison monument testifies to more than anything is the civic and mercantile pride of the city: Henry and his father Lionel wear the scarlet gown of Aldermen and had been mayors of Newcastle. Religious and civic concerns here merge.

That religious loyalties prior to the war were overshadowed or at least intertwined with economic and civic concerns explains somewhat the actions of those in the city during the conflict itself. The ambivalence and ambiguity of civic loyalties are figured in Lionel Maddison. He had been knighted by the King during the brief visitation of 1633, and was briefly a staunch defender of the city against the invasion of the Scots in 1640.[32] When they took the city the Earl of Lothian, appointed Governor, lodged at Maddison's house. Maddison then joined with John Marley in journeying to the King at York to petition for the relief of Newcastle from the Scottish occupation. When the town reverted to Royalist control in 1642, he

was active in the largely supportive Common Council. He is recorded as subscribing to the 1643 emergency ordinance of the Company of Merchant Adventurers to help the Mayor and the Town bear the cost of the Garrison.[33] At the fall of the city in 1644, he took no part in the parley between the loyal Council and the Scottish, and went to London to petition the House of Commons on his own behalf.[34] The fact that the Maddison monument escaped the violation exacted by the Scottish on the rest of the religious decoration of the city suggests that Maddison was well regarded by the invading forces.[35]

In a letter written shortly after the Scottish liberation of Newcastle in 1644, Maddison wrote to Sir Henry Vane (then Lord Commissioner of the Treasury), estimating the size of the Newcastle coal industry: "The vent ordinarily was about 18,000 tens, or 180,000 chaldrons – for we commonly account by tens, that is, so many ten chaldrons – in this port and about 4,000 tens, or 40,000 chaldrons, at Sunderland, so that the whole comes but to 220,000 chaldrons, or 22,000 tens".[36] Vane had led the Commons since the death of Pym in 1643 and created the Committee of the Two Kingdoms; he was hugely influential within the heart of Parliament. He was a staunch puritan, settling in New England for some years during the 1630s to worship unmolested. Maddison had been in contact with him in 1642 regarding the sale of forest land, and was obviously looking to renew this economic relationship.[37] The significance of the above letter lies in Maddison's reassertion of mercantile values in the city. Whilst expressing his happiness that Parliament "is in hand touching the pay of the army, which must needs be taken care for", his greater purpose is the reinvigoration of the coal trade in Newcastle and thence of the city's economic fortunes (98). His discussion is ostensibly about vents and taxes, but the underlying message is that the effects of the recent blockade need to be countered by a swift relaxation of controls. Maddison uses the rhetoric of the humble egalitarian Puritan, but his implicit motive is personal economic gain:

> In my poor opinion it deserves due consideration whether it be advisable to impose any great matter either on coals or salt, both being so necessary commodities, and thought of low and mean value, yet so useful for all, even the meanest people, that it may neither occasion an aversion of trade from these ports nor an overburden to the poor people that may use them. In cases of necessity few rules can be made or observed, otherwise imposition upon native commodities within the kingdom would trench much upon the subject's interest and liberty, which we are all bound to maintain (98).

Maddison was obviously very concerned about this matter; he wrote to Vane four more times in November, and the correspondence became increasingly agitated on Maddison's side.[38] The letters highlight his self-interest. He complains on 7 November that "I and others who conceive ourselves friends" are being stalled in the recovery of their collieries by the actions of Sir Nicholas Cole "who hath no continuing colliery, but a great stock upon his staith, which he got cheap when others had no means to do the like".[39] Cole had been a high profile member of the pro-Royalist City Council (and had gone into hiding when the city fell); Maddison paints himself as a loyal Parliamentarian economically disenfranchised both during the war and now by the manipulative Royalist faction. His tone attains a shrillness which indicates that Vane took little notice of his earlier letters:

> Those that are friends, to deal plainly with you, I find not well satisfied with what is concluded here, if things be not concluded with you and there were time, and I cannot perceive what great loss of time there can be, for the malignants' coals may be a-delivering, and will supply the ships a good while. It would not be amiss if some who understand the trade were summoned to attend the Committee there for the better understanding and settling of the coal business.[40]

There can be little doubt that Maddison is proposing himself for the job. His next letter to Vane concerns a Colliery in Sunderland he wishes to acquire. The former owner is

Thomas Wray, "a grand Papist and delinquent."[41] The loyal alderman also recommends that the state take over the running of those collieries formerly owned by delinquents, and it is obvious that he hopes Parliament will kick-start the sluggish local economy by stimulating supply. These letters indicate that Maddison saw the end of the siege as his chance of gaining a strong economic foothold and a position in the new government of the city. Parliament finally got around to deciding what to do with Newcastle, and Maddison did rather well out of the settlement. After the fall of the city, however, very little changed in civic government. Several of the major Royalist leaders were imprisoned, and the embargo was lifted, leading to an upturn in trade. The Parliamentary measures "for settling the government of Newcastle confirmed an existing situation rather than created a new one".[42] Stability, both political and economic, was emphasised. Indeed, the fact that Cole was allowed to use his supposedly ill-gotten gains indicates that his disenfranchisement in 1644 was merely a political gesture.[44]

In his statistical analysis of the geographical distribution of wealth in seventeenth-century Newcastle, John Langton concludes that the physical shaping of the city illustrates the "finely structured hierarchical society" that dominated civic and economic government.[44] His study pinpoints the unusual nature of the city when it is considered within the standard models of pre-industrial or proto-capitalist urban topographies. Due to the skewed economic makeup of the town, the social geography empowered a 'merchant clique' that 'was pre-eminent in wealth and municipal power. Its social dominance was expressed geographically by the existence of a mercantile quarter in that part of the city where its economic purposes were best served and where the institutions through which it dominated the city were located' (200). Langton's conclusions highlight two issues of importance for the study of Newcastle during the Civil War: the impact of economic factors on the town as a whole, and the excessive influence that the mercantile classes had on the civic government and thence political allegiance of the city. Through the Council they also affected the nature of religious leadership and education. Thus the majority of the Charity Schools were funded by Guild donation.[45] The Common Council, moreover, proved very supportive of Charles's campaign. In 1642 £700 was "lent out of the reveneues of this Towne" to the King, and this act of largesse was followed by a pledge of further financial and military support.[46] The Council conscientiously and proactively helped to protect the town and worked closely with the Royal Garrison. Citizens disarmed by the Scots were rearmed, money forwarded by Parliament was diverted to the Garrison and a greater tax was imposed on coal "for the defence of the said Towne and maintenance of the Garrison there".[47]

The mercantile classes were not quite as unified as it appears however, as is shown by the proposal to disenfranchise 35 freemen for

> refusing to hould with our Soveraigne Lord the King against all psons to liue and to die, according to the oath they tooke when they were seuerally made free Burgesses and haue been incendiaries and treate wth seuerall men of another nation to invade this kingdome and to possess themselves of this Towne.[48]

This was confirmed a month later, with several more names added as subsequent to the first order "more at large doth appear".[49] The discontent created by the increasing economic hardship led to such civic unrest, the malignants coming from several different social and political backgrounds, a number of the leading guilds and merchant families. The effects of Parliament's sanctions on trade with the city were manifold and immediate. In 1644 the Council budget ran over for the first time as payments outgrew received income.[50] This was due to both the straightened economic circumstance and the increased cost of keeping the city. Payments for the watching of the various gates and clearing of rubbish increased, and the mayor was allowed money 'for the poore and Souldiers'.[51]

The records of the Incorporated Guilds and

Merchant companies in the city illustrate the economic disruption of the war to the civic life of Newcastle. During the first Scottish occupation apprenticeships to the guilds suffered so much that they were "likely to haue great hinderance if some remedie be not prouided for them" and council measures were taken to speed up the apprenticeship process in order to prevent a shortage.[52] The economic confusion of the siege and the embargo is further reflected in the state of the accounts of the various guilds. Many societies seem to have stopped functioning for the years 1642-44, and what records there are appear fragmented and disjointed.[53] Income for the Fraternity of Masters and Seamen of Trinity House, the organisation that oversaw general harbouring issues and the duty at the port of Tynemouth, dropped sharply. Receipts had been fairly regular until the blockade.[54] The figures for the mid-year period in 1641 compare to the same period in 1643 as follows:

1641		1643	
June:	received 39 ii 00	**June:**	received 32 i9 02
July:	received 68 00 06	**July:**	received 06 i9 00
August:	received 39 0i 06	**August:**	received 03 ii ii[55]

Income tailed off until the lifting of the barricade (June 1644: received 08 05 00; June 1645: received 34 ii 05).

Whilst the coal industry was specifically targeted by the embargo, other trades also suffered. The Incorporated Company of Smiths, one of the 12 major Guilds, managed to elect or commission only 2 Freemen in 1642 and 1643, compared with 9 in 1645.[56] The Glovers (a secondary by-trade affected in consequence of the centralised economic downturn) experienced a serious budget deficit in 1644.[57] Newcastle's extensive life was also affected; controlled in the main by the Guilds, companies performed plays and processions, and funded the St George's festivities and other feast days.[58] However, the Chamberlain's Accounts for the war period show that it was clearly more expedient to have the gates secured or the rubbish collected than money to be expended in civic enjoyment. No references are made in the various surviving Company accounts to plays or general activities being prepared. Some accounts provide for money for liquid entertainment, but only one refers to any other kind: in both 1643 and 1644 the Barbers and Brewers paid for music, probably to accompany the meal after the annual meeting of the Company.[59]

Lionel Maddison may be untypical – many councillors, like Sir John Marley, were loyal to their death – but it seems that his agenda is reflected in the city in general. The mainspring of his actions is economic; the town (and he) only complained about the Scots because of the massive disruption in trade that their first arrival caused. Similarly, it was only when Parliament blockaded the Coal industry that the town and Maddison began to doubt their supposed loyalty to the King. This in turn suggests that loyalties at this time, at least in the towns, were fairly elastic. Lionel Maddison's motivations were a hybrid mixture of religion and financial necessity. Like the population of the city itself, he avoids easy characterisation: politically slippery, religiously ambiguous, highly independent. Maddison's case chimes with so many others and so many incidents of blurred loyalties that it is possible to extrapolate several versions of Civil War Newcastle from his example. The close study of Newcastle during the Civil War highlights the fact that the town cannot be easily categorised as Puritan or Royalist; indeed, such pigeonholing ignores the intricate subtleties of local relationships. Such consideration forces us once more to reassess the way we discuss the history of the 1640s.

NOTES

[1] 25 October 1644, *Commons Journals 1642–1644.*

[2] Peter Newman, *Atlas of the English Civil War* (London and Sydney, 1985), maps 14, 6, 16.

[3] March 20 1642[3], *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series 1641–1643*, 453. Additionally, in 1642 a special committee was set up by Parliament to consider the state of affairs in the North-east.

[4] See for instance Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Cambridge, 1993), 495, for the economic importance of Newcastle and the power of the mercantile classes in forming London's political views. See also J. U. Nef, *The Rise of the British Coal Industry* 2 vols (1932), I, 246–47.

[5] *Rise of the British Coal Industry*, I, 19 Table. 1 (and 23–109 *passim* for the expansion and importance of the Coal industry to the British economy).

[6] Roger Howell, jr., *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution: A Study of the Civil War in North England* (Oxford, 1967), 1.

[7] *Artificial Fire, or, Coale for Rich and Poore. This being the offer of an Excellent new Invention, by Mr. Richard Gesling Ingineer (late deceased) but now thought fit to be put in Practice* (Richard Cotes for Michael Spaek Senior, 1644), broadsheet.

[8] *Artificial Fire, or, Coale for Rich and Poore*, broadsheet.

[9] *A GREAT DISCOVERY OF THE QUEEN'S Preparation in Holland to assist the* King *in England. Also, how Her Majesty hath sent Her Standard, with the rest of her Regiments over to New castle. As it was sent in a Letter from Rotterdam, Dated Decemb. 16 Stilo nuovo, and directed to M. Iohn Blackston a Member of the House of Commons. Die Veneris 16 Decemb.* 1642. Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that this Letter shall be forthwith printed and published. *I. Brown Cler. Parliamentorum.* LONDON: Printed for *J. Wright* in the *Old-bayly*, Decemb 17. 1642.

[10] *A GREAT DISCOVERY*, 1.

[11] 'Upon Thursday last I was at the *Hague*, and there saw Her Majesty's Standard, which was just then going away, to be sent for *Newcastle*.', *A GREAT DISCOVERY*, 2–3.

[12] *A GREAT DISCOVERY*, 10.

[13] See for instance *A DECLARATION Made by the Earle of NEW-CASTLE, Governour of the Towne and Country of NEW-CASTLE And Generall of all His MAJESTIES Forces raised in the Northerne parts of this Kingdome, for the Defence of the same. For his Resolution of Marching into YORKSHIRE.* As also a Just Vindication of himselfe from that unjust aspersion laid upon him for entertaining some *Popish Recusants* in his *Forces. With other passages of consequence.* Printed for *W. Webb* M.DC.XCIII.

[14] "*The Protestant Informer* [...][claimed] the Papists 'swarme in that Army ... like Wasps around a hony pot" and estimates their number in the North at 8,000. *A Remonstrance of the Present State of Yorkshire* [...] says the Earl's army 'is now called the Catholic army', and that there were 6,000-7,000 known Papists and recusants serving in it.' *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, 150 n.5.

[15] *C. S. P. D. 1641–1643*, 516.

[16] 'They [Parliament] talk of the Earl of Newcastle to be therein a delinquent, and the Prince to be sequestred from his tuition.', Thomas Wiseman to Sir John Pennington, 18 June 1641, *C. S. P. D. 1641–1643*, 18; Cavendish was also publicly exempted by Parliament from the general Pardon of 1642, *C. S. P. D. 1641–1643*, 399.

[17] *A DECLARATION OF THE LORDS and Commons Assembled in PARLIAMENT: That no Ships, Barques, or other Vessels shal from henceforward make any Voyage to New-Castle, for the fetching of Coales, or any other Commodity, untill that Towne shall be reduced into such hands, as shall declare themselves for King and Parliament. Die Sabbathi, 14 Ian.* 1642. Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that this Declaration shall be forthwith printed and published *by John Browne, Cler. Parliament.* Ian. 16. Printed for *John Wright* in the *Old Bailey*. 1642.

[18] Parliament again stressed the economic importance of liberating Newcastle in the resolution calling for arms that was published in June 1643. *AN ORDINANCE with severall PROPOSITIONS Of the LORDS AND COMMONS Assembled in Parliament, For the speedy raising of Forces by Sea and Land, to reduce the Town of Newcastle to obedience to the King and Parliament. In the recovery of whereof all persons are so much interessed, that it is hoped none will be backward to contribute their best assistance towards the performance thereof, that so Coales may again be bought at an easie rate, to the great benefit of the poore aswell as rich, according to the true intent and meaning of this Ordinance. Die Lunae, 5 Jun. 1643.* Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that this Ordinance with the PROPOSITIONS shall be forthwith printed and published. J. Brown Cler Parliamentorum. LONDON: printed for *J.Wright* in the Old-baily, *IUNE* 8. 1643.

[19] *A DECLARATION Of the LORDS and COMMONS Assembled in PARLIAMENT: That no Ships, Barques, or other Vessels shal from henceforward make any Voyage to New-Castle*, 1–2.

[20] *AN ORDINANCE with severall PROPOSITIONS Of the LORDS and COMMONS Assembled in Parliament, For the Speedy raising of Forces by Sea and Land, to reduce the Town of Newcastle*, 2.

[21] *A True RELATION Of the late Proceedings of the Scottish Army, Sent from his Excellency the Lord General LESLEY's Quarters before NEWCASTLE the 8th of Febr 1643.* Together with *A LETTER from the Committees of both Kingdomes, to the Mayor, Aldermen, Common Councell, and other the Inhabitants of the Town of Newcastle; and their ANSWER. LONDON, Printed for* Robert Bostock *and* Samuel Gellibrand, *dwelling in Pauls Church-yard, 1643.*

[22] "the Towne of *Newcastle* have resigned themselves to my Lord of *Newcastle*, and extinguished their right to the Government, which will be a good president for us, if God see fit to deliver it into our hands", 4.

[23] Dr George Wishart, Lecturer of St Nicholas', "was by the House of Commons (*June* 18, 1642) resolved unfit to be Lecturer of St. *Nicholas*; and soon after, as I presume, turned out of that Place. He was plunder'd also, and suffer'd a long and tedious Imprisonment, in the nastiest Part of the *Tolbooth* at *Edinburgh*, called the *Thieves-hole*." Henry Bourne, *The Ancient and Present State of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1736), 76.

[24] Howell modifies his position somewhat in his later "Newcastle and the Nation: the Seventeenth-Century Experience", *AA*5, 7 (1985), whilst still emphasising the importance of religious affinities.

[25] Nikolaus Pevsner and Ian Richmond, *Northumberland* (Harmondsworth, 1992), 422 and plate 51.

[26] I would like to thank Mr. John Gerry for information regarding this monument.

[27] *The Ancient and Present State of Newcastle*, 66.

[28] H. L. Honeyman and Thomas Wake, *The Cathedral Church of St. Nicholas* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1932), 127.

[29] Newsletter dated 22 September 1641, *Historical Manuscripts Commission: Salisbury (Cecil) MSS* 1612–1668, 364. Yeldard Alvey, vicar of St. Nicholas', was forced out by the Scots in 1640, writing to Laud to complain of his usage at the hands of the Rebels, *The Ancient and Present State of Newcastle*, 74.

[30] See Mervyn James, *Family, Lineage, and Civil Society: A Study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500–1640* (Oxford, 1974), for a discussion of County Durham in this period. After the battle of Newburn in 1640 most of the clergy fled Durham (which had been a military camp), leaving the Scots to destroy the Cathedral's organ. See Henry Gee, "General History of the City", in the *Victoria History of the Counties of England: Durham* ed. by W. Page 3 vols (1968), II, 1–53. I have benefited from discussion with Dr. James Cannon on this issue and those pertaining to the Maddison monument in general.

[31] Newcastle is unusual amongst large cities in having so few parish churches at this time

[32] Most of this biographical information is from Richard Welford, *Men of Mark 'Twixt Tyne and Tweed* 3 vols (London and Newcastle upon Tyne, 1895), III, 124–30.

[33] *Extracts from the Records of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle upon Tyne* 2 vols, Surtees Society 93 (1895), I, 133–35.

[34] *Commons Journals 1642–1644*, 555.

[35] "they plundered the Churches, and these and many more were defaced; for they broke down the Carved Work thereof with Axes and Hammers", *The Ancient and Present State of Newcastle*, 63.

[36] Letter dated Newcastle, 6 November 1644, *C. S. P. D. 1644–1645*, 98.

[37] Letter from Maddison to Vane, 18 May 1642, *C. S. P. D. 1642–1643*, also further letters 327, 391.

[38] "If you above do not timely and speedily provide for the northern counties, especially Durham, expect the inevitable ruin thereof, and that suddenly.", 27 November 1644, *C. S. P. D. 1644–1645*, 163.

[39] *C. S. P. D. 1644–1645*, 103.

[40] 14 November 1644, *C. S. P. D. 1644–1645*, 122.

[41] February 1644[5], *C. S. P. D. 1644–1645*, 328–29.

[42] "Newcastle and the Nation: the Seventeenth-Century Experience", 24.

[43] For the list of those disabled and disenfranchised by Parliament, see the entry for 5 December 1644, *Commons Journals 1624–1644.*

[44] "Residential Patterns in Pre-industrial cities: Some Case Studies from seventeenth-century Britain" in *The Tudor and Stuart Town: A Reader in English Urban History 1530–1688* ed. Jonathan Barry (London and New York, 1990), 192.

[45] Chamberlain's Accounts (TWAS 543/27).

[46] "Order for £700 to be lent to his Matie. out of the Reuenewes of the Towne", 19 August 1642; "Petition of the Maior and Common Councell to the Kinges Matie.", Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–1656 (TWAS MD/NC/1/1), fols. 39, 40.

[47] "Order for deliuering 100. Muskitts to the fower Captaines of this Towne", 10 August 1642, Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–1656 (TWAS MD/NC/1/1), fol. 38. Further ordinances 8 September 1643 fols. 50, 51.

[48] 8 September 1642, Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–1656 (TWAS MD/NC/1/1), fol. 49.

[49] 2 October 1642, Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–1656 (TWAS MD/NC/1/1), fol. 52.

[50] Chamberlain's Accounts (TWAS 543/27), 97–99.

[51] Chamberlain's Accounts (TWAS 543/27), 98.

[52] October 1641, Newcastle Common Council Book 1636–1656 (TWAS MD/NC/1/1), fol. 28.

[53] For instance, the Minute Book of the Incorporated Company of Barber Surgeons and Chandlers lacks any entry for the years 1643–1654 (TWAS Gu/BS/2/1).

[54] The Fraternity of Masters and Seamen of Trinity House, Newcastle, Receipt Book 1622–1645 (TWAS Gu/TH/21/1).

[55] The Fraternity of Masters and Seamen of Trinity House, Newcastle, Receipt Book 1622–1645 (TWAS Gu/TH/21/1); only 188 ships of all types entered the Tyne in 1644 compared with 3,043 in 1641, C. S. Terry, "The Siege of Newcastle by the Scots in 1644" *AA*^{2}, 21 (1899), 242.

[56] MSS Notes on Newcastle Companies, Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne (NRO ZAN M12/A4).

[57] "Laid out more then rec.", Glover's Company, Newcastle upon Tyne, Minutes 1630–1677 (NRO ZAN M13/A4), fol. 14.

[58] See especially the introduction to *Records of Early English Drama: Newcastle upon Tyne* ed. J. J. Anderson (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1982) for a history of drama in the city up to 1642.

[59] 1643: 'Itm paid to the musick 00 10 00.' 1644: 'Paid to the Musick 00:10:00.' Bakers and Brewers Company of Newcastle upon Tyne, Accounts 1638–1696 (NRO ZAN M17/51), fols. 39, 42. Anderson does not make reference to these entries.