County history and Civil War: Sir Philip Mainwaring, William Dugdale, and the Attempt to Publish a History of Cheshire in the 1650s\*

**Abstract**

In 1659 Sir Philip Mainwaring, great-uncle to Thomas Mainwaring of Baddiley and Peover, proposed that the eminent antiquarian William Dugdale write a county history of Cheshire along the lines of his successful publication on Warwickshire. This article explores the ways in which this proposal reflected the interests and concerns of Mainwaring, his relatives and wider circle during the troubled 1640s and 1650s. Those who regarded themselves as the rightful governors of the county had been profoundly disturbed by a series of challenges to their status and authority during the Civil War and its aftermath. The projected county history, intended to be richly illustrated with engravings of coats of arms and funeral monuments, would have emphasised the elite families’ claim to be the county’s legitimate governors.

I

In 1669 William Dugdale compiled a history of the Mainwaring Family of Peover in Cheshire for the head of the family, Sir Thomas Mainwaring. A decade earlier, however, there had been an attempt by one of his relatives to launch a more ambitious project; a history of Cheshire, modelled on Dugdale’s *Antiquities of Warwickshire* which had been published in 1656. This attempt received some attention in the report on the manuscripts at Peover Hall by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 1885, although the examiner mistakenly attributed this endeavour to the wrong member of the family, Sir Thomas’s father Philip Mainwaring, a parliamentarian captain of horse who had died in 1647.[[1]](#footnote-1) The project was actually the idea of Sir Thomas’s great-uncle, Sir Philip Mainwaring, fourth surviving son of Sir Randall Mainwaring, who had achieved greater distinction in his earlier career than his nephew and namesake and had remained loyal to the king during the Civil War. It was proposed when Sir Philip held no office and was in his sixties, and could be considered a retirement project; something to interest him in his old age, and something to leave behind as a legacy – perhaps an important consideration for him as he had no children. This paper aims to argue that the proposed history was inspired at least in part by other concerns and that it should be read in the context of the challenges that faced the senior gentry families of Cheshire during the 1640s and 1650s, in particular the threat to their continued control of county government.

Jan Broadway’s recent work on gentry culture and the development of local history in Elizabethan and early Stuart England has noted that ‘The education that equipped them [the post-Reformation gentry] to act as local administrators and to pursue their lawsuits also enabled them to become historians.’ Her work has examined the ways in which history mattered to the gentry and the methods they used to research and disseminate it or, as in Mainwaring’s case, commission it to be written by others. The publication of a county history, or circulation of a manuscript work, could serve as a valuable opportunity to reaffirm a shared set of values relating to military deeds, good stewardship of land and care for both the church and the local population. It emphasised the claim to antiquity, and, therefore, legitimacy of a governing elite.[[2]](#footnote-2) The Mainwaring family belonged to the governing elite of Cheshire and Sir Philip’s proposed history of the county should be understood in this context. It can also be seen in the light of his experiences earlier in his career, serving two remarkable men who helped to shape his view of himself and his wider community.

II

As a younger son, Philip Mainwaring had to make his way in the world. Towards the end of his life, in 1660, he referred to 55 years’ service at court which would signify that he started his career at the age of 16 in around 1605. He was a student at Gray’s Inn in 1609 and matriculated from Brasenose College, Oxford, in August 1610, graduating BA in February 1613 at the mature age of 24. He seems to have begun his career before 1610 in the service of Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, through his mother’s family – the Fittons’ – connections to Cecil. He seems to have been an effective contact at court for his relatives, assisting the Newdigate family of Warwickshire with their successful bid for the wardship of the heir, John III, and sufficiently financially secure to lend them money. Before the end of 1610 he was described as ‘my Lord Chancellor’s man’, referring to Thomas Egerton, Lord Ellesmere, himself a Cheshire gentleman.[[3]](#footnote-3) During the latter part of that decade, probably after Ellesmere’s death in 1617, Mainwaring began working as an agent for Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel, at home and in the Netherlands, where he ran errands for the earl in Antwerp and Amsterdam. David Howarth has argued that it is quite possible that it was Mainwaring who, in 1617, secured for Arundel the work ‘Cardinal Carondolet and Attendants’ (c. 1511-12) by Sebastiano del Piombo, then reputed to be a Raphael, which might have influenced the later van Dyck double portrait in which he appeared with Strafford.[[4]](#footnote-4) Mainwaring owned a copy of the double portrait of Strafford and himself which eventually hung at Baddiley Court, one of the Mainwaring properties, presumably brought there by Sir Philip, and which became a family heirloom, together with one of his father, Sir Randle, also by Van Dyck.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Working for Arundel brought Mainwaring into close contact with a man who placed great emphasis on noble lineage and matters of honour and gentility. Arundel was appointed earl marshal in 1621 and allowed to preside over the newly-restored court of chivalry. During the 1630s he was eventually able to reform the court and encourage Charles to call a halt to the inflation of honours that had marked his father’s reign and the first few years of his own.[[6]](#footnote-6) Arundel had a strong sense of the importance of his status as the premier English non-royal peer and, in 1613, had asked the renowned antiquarian Sir Robert Cotton to begin work on the history of the Howard family. Those with whom he associated recognised his immense pride in his noble status and ancestry and enjoyed, as his biographer puts it, his ‘generosity towards people who shared his enthusiasms and won his trust.’[[7]](#footnote-7)

Mainwaring’s service to Arundel enabled his relatives to approach the earl marshal to appeal for justice in local disputes.[[8]](#footnote-8) He kept the earl informed of court news as in November 1618 when he reported from Newmarket on the celebrations to mark Prince Charles’s birthday.[[9]](#footnote-9) There were signs that the earl was high in James’s favour towards the end of the king’s reign: Arundel was one of the few privy councillors who strongly supported the ‘Spanish match’, the proposed marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta Maria, and it was reported that discussions had taken place at Arundel house in 1624 between James and the Spanish ambassador. The failure of the Spanish marriage plans and the accession of Charles I, however, brought a shift towards an anti-Spanish foreign policy and an immediate change for the worse in Arundel’s fortunes, and therefore in Mainwaring’s prospects. Charles snubbed the earl after his coronation by failing to attend the reception that Arundel had arranged in Sir Robert Cotton’s Thames-side garden. He was kept under house arrest in 1626 following his son’s elopement with the daughter of the duke of Lennox and prevented from sitting in the Lords, relying on his supporters, including Mainwaring, for news of developments during this difficult parliamentary session.[[10]](#footnote-10) In 1629 Arundel was once again in trouble through his association with Sir Robert Cotton, from whose private library had appeared a libellous tract which a number of peers and MPs had circulated.[[11]](#footnote-11) By the late 1620s Mainwaring had served a number of patrons, none of which had been able to advance him to office. Now aged forty, he must have been looking for a patron who might be better placed to further his career, and he had begun to communicate with Thomas, Viscount Wentworth, President of the Council of the North, shortly to be appointed to the Privy Council, informing him of foreign developments and court news.[[12]](#footnote-12) Wentworth appears to have taken particular note of Mainwaring’s careful monitoring of the activities at court of his Yorkshire rival, Thomas, Lord Savile, with whom he was engaged in a struggle to control the West Riding commission of the peace.[[13]](#footnote-13) Mainwaring’s services were finally rewarded in 1634 when the lord deputy secured his appointment as the Irish Secretary of State to replace the ageing Sir Dudley Norton. With this post came membership of the Irish privy council and a knighthood, and it was the highest administrative post held by a member of the Cheshire gentry at this time.[[14]](#footnote-14) Wentworth had also favoured Mainwaring’s older brother Edmund, a civil lawyer, appointing him in 1629 to the council of the north and the northern recusancy commission.[[15]](#footnote-15)

In favouring Philip Mainwaring, Wentworth went against the advice of his closest political allies, Archbishop Laud and Francis, Lord Cottington. Cottington reminded Wentworth that he had himself voiced criticisms of Mainwaring in the past. According to Laud, Cottington had warned that ‘if you meddled with making him Secretary you would burn your fingers, with some other expression, which I cannot think fit to write’. No specific incident or character flaw was stated, but Cottington was married to the daughter of a Cheshire gentleman, Sir William Meredith, and might have known Mainwaring well.[[16]](#footnote-16) The Mainwarings were counted among the leading puritan families of Cheshire, which, alongside his close connection with Arundel, would not have commended him to Laud.[[17]](#footnote-17) Either way, this indicates that Wentworth had strong reasons for making the appointment, possibly an acknowledgement of Arundel’s influence; possibly his own recognition of Mainwaring’s abilities or his family connections: Sir Philip’s maternal grandfather, Sir Edward Fitton, had served as President of Connacht during Elizabeth’s reign.[[18]](#footnote-18) Another possible reason was Mainwaring’s likely knowledge of the postal service gained through his service for Arundel, which would be of great value for the lord deputy of Ireland. Philip Mainwaring seems to have been responsible for securing Wentworth the services of his very able agent, William Raylton, whom Mainwaring described as his ‘antient’ friend and who also seems to have been employed in the posts.[[19]](#footnote-19) Whatever the reason, Sir Philip evidently served Wentworth well during the 1630s and he sat in the two Irish parliaments that met during Wentworth’s deputyship as part of a Dublin castle government ‘team’. Wentworth must have been satisfied with the choice he had made in 1634, as reflected in the Van Dyck portrait of 1639/40. For Mainwaring, this post brought prestige and the opportunity to purchase land in Ireland, and occasional access to the king, as he was one of three members of Wentworth’s circle whom the lord deputy sent to London to present his dispatches. It also meant that he worked closely with another man who was proud of his ancestry and his place at the head of the West Riding gentry.

During the Civil War Mainwaring joined the king at Oxford and served him as a receiver of revenue, but, according to his own account, took no military part in the conflict. He returned to Cheshire after the regicide, staying with his great-nephew Thomas Mainwaring at Baddiley from March to at least November of 1649. He was imprisoned from the spring of 1650 to February 1651, as he put it, ‘for being at Oxford with the late King’, returning to Baddiley for several weeks that spring and again from Christmas 1651 to May 1652.[[20]](#footnote-20) He then seems to have remained in London for the next few years.[[21]](#footnote-21) He was still connected to the Wentworth family long after Strafford’s execution, combining with his former master’s younger brother, Sir George Wentworth, to try to frustrate the Commons’ efforts to secure the return of disputed land in Ireland to Viscount Loftus, a former lord chancellor of Ireland whom Lord Deputy Wentworth had forced out of office. This was a complex case, valuable in this context for the light that it sheds on Mainwaring’s circumstances. Having refused to cooperate with the Commons’ orders in 1642, Mainwaring was troubled again by the case in the early 1650s.[[22]](#footnote-22) Loftus’s heir demanded his recall to prison unless he formally signed the required re-conveyance, which he appears never to have done, arguing by 1653 that he believed the other claimant was entitled to the land and ‘that he is bound in conscience to be faithful to his trust.’[[23]](#footnote-23) His refusal to sign caused him to be hounded for years, facing repeated threats of imprisonment as Lord Loftus claimed there was a danger that he would leave the country if he remained at liberty.[[24]](#footnote-24) Mainwaring appears to have had no material interest in the case, nothing to gain by refusing to sign; his decision was influenced either by his conscience or, possibly more likely, his loyalty to the memory of Strafford. He no longer held any land of his own, emphasising in his petition to parliament (1650) that ‘My whole estate was lost in Ireland by reason of the rebellion.’ Furthermore, ‘I have demeaned myself quietly ever since my removing from Oxford, and I have nothing for which I should compound.’[[25]](#footnote-25)

Sir Philip spent several weeks at Baddiley in the summer of 1657 and the diary entries of his great-nephew Thomas Mainwaring provide a glimpse of how he spent his time in Cheshire. Some days involved visits to Chester, but the purpose of these visits was not always stated and so it is not possible to know whether they were social or business visits. Other days saw, in Thomas’s words, ‘nothing remarkable’, but on half the days of his visit, Sir Philip enjoyed the company of the extended Mainwaring family and their relatives and associates among the leading families of the county, either at Baddiley or Peover or in other people’s houses. Thomas Mainwaring both entertained and dined out frequently but the time that Sir Philip spent with him seems to have been more than usually busy. Sir Philip was evidently a respected member of the family: Sir Thomas normally listed his name before any other member of the party, and his return to the county was recognised by prominent members of the gentry who sent invitations or came to dine at Baddiley. The final week of his stay was particularly busy: ‘21st [August] Sir George Booth dined at Baddeley & also Mr Grosvenour & Mr Henry Bridgeman.’ On the 24th the Mainwarings visited ‘cosen Crew at Mr Cobs’ where they also met Sir Arthur Gorges. On the 25th the Mainwarings dined at the home of Minshull family at Stoake before entertaining ‘Cosen Leycester of Tabley, cosen Robert & cosen Adam, & Mr Legh of Ridge’ at Baddiley in the evening. On the following day, a Wednesday, the Mainwarings went to hear Parson Mainwaring of Malpas preach at Nantwich exercises. They were entertained by the Wilbraham family at Woodhey on the 28th and returned their hospitality at Baddiley the following day.[[26]](#footnote-26) August 1657, then, enabled Mainwaring to re-acquaint himself with family and friends whom he had probably not seen for several years. He immersed himself fully in the social activities of a county gentleman and it is at least possible that his desire to commission a history of his home county might have sprung from conversations that took place during this visit, perhaps particularly on the 25th when the antiquary, Peter Leycester, came to dinner.

Mainwaring seems to have spent the last years of the Commonwealth in London, although it is unclear what he was actually doing during that time. He did not benefit materially from the Restoration: his bid for the mastership of the Charterhouse, which he hoped would provide him with a place of retirement, failed.[[27]](#footnote-27) Instead he went home to Cheshire, although we cannot trace his activities as his great-nephew’s diary for the years 1659-1673 is missing. In 1661, when Mainwaring served as MP for Newton Borough in Lancashire, he was described as living at Baddiley Court, indicating that he had no other home, although he died (intestate) in London in the August of that year following the parliamentary adjournment.[[28]](#footnote-28)

III

A couple of years before his death Sir Philip had contacted the acclaimed antiquarian William Dugdale with a proposal that he ‘write historically of the Antiquities of Cheshire, in such sort as I have done of Warwickshire.’[[29]](#footnote-29) Dugdale had also already published the first volume of his *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655) and his *History of St Paul’s Cathedral* (1658) and he had served the king as a herald, attending the raising of the royal standard at Nottingham on 22 August 1642. He was appointed Chester herald in April 1644 and, more than three decades later, promoted to Garter king of arms and knighted. From November 1642 to the surrender of the city in June 1646, Dugdale resided in Oxford where, according to his most recent biographer, Jan Broadway, ‘he acted as historiographer to the royalist war effort’, finding and transcribing documents that would later be used by Clarendon in his *History of the Rebellion*.[[30]](#footnote-30) It is possible that he spent some time with Mainwaring during the 1640s as both were at Oxford and they shared a connection with Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel, the Earl Marshal, who had given Dugdale his first appointment as a herald in 1638. In approaching Dugdale, therefore, Mainwaring was trying to secure the services of an established author with a proven track record in bringing a similar type of work successfully to print and a known interest in encouraging research on county history. Dugdale wrote in his dedication to *Antiquities:*

‘I could wish that there were more that would adventure in the like manner for the rest of the Counties of this Nation, considering how acceptable those are, which others have already performed.’[[31]](#footnote-31)

*Antiquities* was the result, as Dugdale put it, of ‘the chiefest of my time for much more than twenty years, diligently searching into the vast treasures of publique Records, besides a multitude of Manuscripts, Original Charters and Evidences in private hands’. The depth of this scholarship is evident in the careful and systematic use of evidence as witnessed by the extensive marginal notes. At its heart it is a history of the gentry families who had owned land, held office and patronised the churches in the county, emphasised by the genealogical tables, coats of arms and illustrations of tombs and other monuments that adorn the work. In ‘setting before you the noble and eminent Actions of your worthy Ancestors’, Dugdale hoped ‘to incite the present and future ages to a virtuous imitation of them.’[[32]](#footnote-32) The proposed history of Cheshire would presumably also have celebrated the lives and deeds of the county’s elite families. In doing so it would have created the *impression* of a community with shared values and a strong sense of attachment to the county, and a genuine interest in its history. It would have glossed over evidence of division and disharmony. Dugdale’s Warwickshire gentry were portrayed as good stewards of the county’s churches, or at least of their funerary monuments; they were not divided into different religious denominations. He did not dwell on the recent conflict, but referred to the ‘sad distractions’ which had forced the subject of the dedication, Lord Hatton, into exile, and he wrote little about Lord Brooke, one of Charles’s strongest critics, other than note the date of his creation.[[33]](#footnote-33) Ownership of this large and impressive volume might have given the impression of genuine interest in county history, but many purchasers probably read little more than the pages that referred to their own family.[[34]](#footnote-34)

The Historical Manuscripts Commission examiner, H. Barr Tomkins, considered Mainwaring’s proposal of sufficient interest to transcribe the relevant documents: Dugdale’s response, dated 3 March 1658 (presumably 1658/9) to Mainwaring’s proposals, setting out the terms on which he agreed to do the work, and an undated letter, also without the names of writer and recipient, asking Dugdale to clarify those terms, endorsed with Dugdale’s notes.[[35]](#footnote-35) These manuscripts were attached to the 1669 volume, together with correspondence from Charles I and Charles II, and were retained by the family in 1921 when Sir Henry Mainwaring deposited a large collection of estate and family papers in the John Rylands Library. In 1955 their owner, Mrs Harvey deposited them briefly, and the work is described in the Supplementary List as ‘leather bound, silver mounted, in case stamped ‘Chartularium Mainwaringianum’. The following March Mrs Harvey removed the work which has since remained with the family at Sennowe Park, Guist, Norfolk.[[36]](#footnote-36)

 The first document perhaps contains the explanation for the non-appearance of the work: Dugdale made it clear that he could not begin the task for at least two years due to his existing commitments, and within two and half years Sir Philip had died. During the following years his great-nephew preferred instead to commission a history of the Mainwaring family which remained in manuscript form. The following points referred to the nature of the research that Dugdale would need to undertake:

‘There must be treaty had with the Gentlemen of that County and their consents obtained, that I may have free access to view and take notes out of their antient writings and Evidences.

That I may have the like free accesse to all the Records in the Castle at Chester, without paying fees, and also to the Bishops Register.

That Mr Leycester of Tabley do communicate to me what he hath gathered or obtained in reference to such a worke, from private Evidences, or any publique Records.

Dugdale asked for the large sum of £150 per quarter until the work was to go to press, noting that he would need to pay an artist to accompany him on his visits to churches to draw arms and monuments. He promised to work as quickly as he could. Were he to die before completion of the work, his research would belong to the gentleman who had paid him his fee. Dugdale signed off by noting that he had been offered more than the aforesaid sum to write the history of a county nearer to London, presumably in an attempt to secure if not the desired £150 per quarter then at least a decent sum for his efforts.[[37]](#footnote-37)

The second document sought clarification of some of Dugdale’s terms, and referred to the original proposals having been made on 3 March 1658/9, indicating that they were made verbally in London. Dugdale was asked to confirm that he would bear the costs of preparing and printing the work, given that he would receive the profits. The writer was evidently unwilling to place his trust in Dugdale’s promise to work speedily and wanted him to set a specific deadline. The document also revealed that Mainwaring intended the project to be supported financially by what he referred to as ‘the Gentlemen of our Country’, whom he believed would each expect to receive a copy but would not wish to commit themselves to contributing for an indefinite period. Dugdale agreed to bear the bulk of the costs and present each contributor with ‘a Booke fairly bound’, but that those gentlemen whose ancestors’ monuments were drawn would be expected to meet those particular costs. This was a method that Dugdale himself had developed to pay for the publication of *Monasticon Anglicanum*: subscriptions covered the cost of an illustration which would then feature the donor’s name and arms. In response to Mainwaring’s query about timescale he promised, barring ‘death or sicknesse’, to deliver the work within five years – rather than the two decades it had taken him to bring his Warwickshire work to press.[[38]](#footnote-38) This helps to explain the importance he placed on gaining access to the work that Peter Leycester had already completed and raises the question whether Sir Philip had already discussed his plans to commission this work with his Cheshire acquaintances. Dugdale himself prepared notes on the families of Cheshire. Copies of his notes bound into a nineteenth-century volume contain a series of numbered paragraphs discussing marriages, office and landholding, and noteworthy deeds of a range of families. The latest date given is 1651 in reference to the earl of Derby’s execution, but it is not clear exactly when the notes were compiled or whether they related to Mainwaring’s proposal.[[39]](#footnote-39)

 This was not the first attempt to publish a history of Cheshire during the Interregnum. *The Vale-royall of England,* *or A Discription Historicall and Geographicall of the Countie Palatine of Chester* appeared in 1656, published under the name of Daniel King, a Chester man who had produced some of the engravings for Dugdale’s *Monasticon Anglicanum*. This was not an original work but comprised four older manuscripts, paginated separately: William Smith’s, *The Vale-Royall of England*; William Webb’s similarly-titled *The Vale Royall of England*; Samuel Lee’s *Chronicon Cestrense* and James Chaloner’s work, *A Short Treatise of the Isle of Man* *,* illustrated with several prospects of the island by King. It was compiled when Dugdale’s own project, the *Antiquities of Warwickshire* was attracting considerable interest and support from the Warwickshire gentry. Dugdale was made aware of the existence of Webb’s manuscript, written in the 1620s, by Sir Simon Archer who had worked with him on the research for *Antiquities*, and who offered him the manuscript if he wished to publish it. Dugdale responded by asking John Crew, one of the Mainwaring family’s circle, how the Cheshire antiquaries William Vernon and Peter Leycester might feel about this as they were already working on aspects of the county’s history. Dugdale’s own opinion was that Vernon’s work would be far superior to the older manuscripts but his advanced age brought into question whether he would complete it.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Leycester had known Dugdale at Oxford during the 1640s and gained his interest in antiquarian pursuits from Dugdale’s circle. His royalism excluded him from active involvement in county government and during the 1650s he turned instead to the study of county history. This eventually manifested itself in 1673 as *Historical antiquities in two books; the first treating in general of Great Brittain and Ireland; the second containing particular remarks concerning Cheshire, and chiefly of Bucklow hundred. Whereunto is annexed a transcript of Doomsday-Book so far as it concerneth Cheshire*. Despite encouragement from Dugdale and other antiquarian friends such as Crew and the Suffolk MP Sir Simonds D’Ewes, Leycester chose not to publish an actual history of his county. Dugdale was clearly interested in work on Cheshire, but his communication with Crew appears to have been the end of his involvement in the King project. He seems not to have wished to be associated with a work that did not pay much attention to documentary evidence and which was, by now, in need of updating.[[41]](#footnote-41)

King’s work failed to win much support from the Cheshire gentry. Only modest sponsorship was forthcoming to cover the expenses of new illustrations, notably from the royalist and former MP, Peter Venables, who paid for the eleven plates depicting the coats of arms of the county gentry. King was forced to make use of older engravings elsewhere in the work. As Jan Broadway notes, ‘It is likely that King was unable to replicate in Cheshire the success Dugdale had in Warwickshire because he was not a member of the community whose support he sought.’[[42]](#footnote-42)

King had certainly tried hard to present himself as worthy of respect from this community, through repeated references at the start of the work to the fact that he was born in Cheshire. In his dedication of the work to Sir Orlando Bridgeman, King spoke of his own ‘great Affection which I bear to my Native County’. For added emphasis he included a letter from his cousin John King who commended his ‘industrious enquiries into the Antiquities and Monuments of your Native Country Cheshire’. Finally, to drive the point home, he included a Latin poem and its English translation:

 Rise noble Cheshire, rise again from th’ dead,

 And from thine Urne, erect thy royall Head;

 Cheshire, Palatines most noble Pile,

Cheshire, the Glory of the British Isle!

What Guerdon shall thy studious Reader give

Thee, KING! By whom these Monuments do live?

For had they not been Thus preserv’d, we must

Have left those Trophies grovelling in the dust:

But Thou dispell’st those clouds, and do’st restore

That pristine Beauty which they had before;

And Herauld-like the Gentries Arms dost blaze,

And crown’st their Temples with victorious bayes.

Say you brave Cestrians, what reward can then

Be well proportion’d to th’elaborate Pen

Of Him, who for your Sole Affairs is known

These many years to intermit his Own?[[43]](#footnote-43)

These efforts might have been more convincing had King written the work himself, but despite the prominence of his own name he was little more than the compiler and illustrator. Dugdale had no qualms about considering Mainwaring’s proposal so soon after the appearance of *Vale-royall*: King had shown an interest in publishing an English translation of the first part of Dugdale’s *Monasticon Anglicanum*, which forced Dugdale to print his second volume of the Latin work more quickly than he had planned in order not to lose sales. King was, by 1658, no longer just a skilled engraver but a commercial competitor.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Dugdale’s *Antiquities of Warwickshire* demonstrated the potential profits to be made from a well-written and attractively-illustrated county history. In early 1659 Dugdale must have decided that Mainwaring’s approach merited a positive response. If Daniel King had struggled to attract the support of the Cheshire gentry because he was not one of them, this was not likely to be the case with Sir Philip Mainwaring, a member of one of the oldest and most prominent gentry families of Cheshire, one of five in the county that were named in the Domesday book.[[45]](#footnote-45) Mainwaring’s service in Ireland, and in the King’s cause during the 1640s, no doubt commended him to Dugdale and to the former royalists among the Cheshire gentry. His active social life at Baddiley, however, indicates a much broader respect for him that overrode differences of allegiance in the recent conflict.

As an individual Sir Philip cannot be described as active in the service of his county. During his adult life he spent little time in Cheshire and does not appear to have owned property in the county. He never represented the county or its boroughs in parliament, but was returned as MP for seats in Yorkshire (1624-6), Derbyshire (1628), Northumberland (1640), and, finally, Lancashire (1661). He never served as a JP or deputy lieutenant. Mainwaring’s confidence in his ability to secure the support of the county for the proposed history must have stemmed at least in part from the reputation enjoyed by his wider family, particularly his nephew Philip and great-nephew Thomas, both of whom had sided with parliament in the recent conflict. His interest in publishing the history of his county, which would – as we have seen – have emphasised the importance of the senior landowning families, must also have been influenced by the experience of his family and other senior gentry families during the Civil War. The recent conflict had, in a number of ways, threatened their role as county governors and their actual safety and security in their own properties, developments that formed an important background to Sir Philip’s proposal.

IV

Daniel King wrote of Cheshire in his preface to *Vale- royall* that ‘no County in this Nation doth exceed it for a succession of Ancient Gentry.’[[46]](#footnote-46) He was acknowledging the remarkable stability of the county’s senior gentry, which were mostly the same families from 1540, when John Leland listed them, to 1640.[[47]](#footnote-47) The Cheshire gentry had also intermarried, to a great extent, as is certainly testified by Thomas Mainwaring’s frequent use of the term ‘cosen’ to describe his guests.[[48]](#footnote-48) The gentry’s sense of its status and responsibility for the sound government of the county was perhaps also prompted by the absence of a great peer, as the earl of Derby seems to have shown little interest in Cheshire, and the ‘inactivity’, according to John Morrill, of the four resident peers: Earl Rivers, Viscount Cholmondely, Viscount Kilmorrey and Lord William Brereton of Brereton.[[49]](#footnote-49) Instead, the senior gentry dominated the commission of the peace, led by the *custos rotulorum*, Sir George Booth, and were broadly opposed to policies which they believed endangered the security of the county – for example, the king’s attempt to recruit forces from the county for his war effort against the Scottish Covenanters.[[50]](#footnote-50) Philip Mainwaring (Sir Philip’s nephew) formed part of what was an essentially moderate opposition, having served as sheriff in 1639 and been responsible for collecting Charles’s contested ship money levy.[[51]](#footnote-51) According to Morrill, most of the Cheshire gentry maintained their moderate opposition as the crisis developed in 1641-2, and many of those who could be described as royalist in 1642 caused no trouble for parliament once it had taken control of most of Cheshire in 1643.[[52]](#footnote-52) It is important to note, however, that this preference for moderation was inspired not by reluctance to engage with national developments but rather by important matters of principle. This can be seen in the decision of three of the county’s baronets, Sir George Booth, Sir Richard Grosvenor and Sir Richard Wilbraham, and their supporters, to sign Sir Thomas Aston’s second petition to parliament of December 1641, which reflected a more moderate focus on the *Book of Common Prayer*, but not his more strongly episcopal first petition of February 1641.[[53]](#footnote-53) Once the war was underway, tension developed between different groups of parliamentarians, between those who could be described as the ‘deputy lieutenants’ on the one hand – those from mostly prominent families who had long histories of service to the county, and the supporters of Sir William Brereton of Handforth, described by John Morrill as ‘a substantial, but not leading county landowner.’[[54]](#footnote-54)

Brereton had powerful support at Westminster from Lord Saye and Henry Vane, in particular, and he was granted command of the county’s forces by parliamentary ordinances of January and March 1643.[[55]](#footnote-55) This gave him authority over men regarded as his social superiors such as Philip Mainwaring, who had worked diligently to raise his own horse troop, and Booth, his former guardian and father-in-law. A later ordinance of March 1644 essentially removed power from a group of at least five deputy lieutenants and transferred it to Brereton plus two or more deputy lieutenants, thus enabling him to block measures with which he did not agree. Brereton made full use of these powers, ensuring that his supporters controlled committees that provided him with the means to achieve his military aims, perhaps most controversially the establishment of sequestration committees in each hundred, or administrative unit, of the county.[[56]](#footnote-56)

John Morrill has argued that sequestration was in Cheshire ‘the most significant single form of revenue’ and that it was operating in the county from the middle of 1644, soon after Brereton’s return. Exactly how the receipts should be collected and spent led to a disagreement in 1645 between Brereton and John Booth, commander of the garrison at Warrington, who refused to follow an order that all receipts be paid to the county treasurer, James Croxton, one of Brereton’s men. Clashes over recruitment of troops escalated this tension and armed violence broke out which was only halted by the threat of royalist attack. Philip Mainwaring was one of those who tried to combat Brereton’s power by taking control of the county’s sub-committee of accounts, which was one means open to Brereton’s rivals to challenge his hold on the county’s revenues. Thomas Mainwaring appears to have served on the sub-committee as well, after his father’s death in 1647. In May 1645 the deputy lieutenants proposed that sequestrations be handled only by the senior gentry and that the militia be managed by a committee made up of the ‘Cheefe Gent[tlemen] of the County’. This struggle reflected different priorities: Brereton aimed to use local resources in the furtherance of broader regional and national aims and was willing to challenge and override the authority of the established elite. As Malcolm Wanklyn has argued, he encouraged and promoted men who were willing to prosecute the war energetically so that by the end of the First Civil War in 1646 the county’s military command structure did not closely resemble its social hierarchy. The senior families’ administrative power was also starting to decline as committee seats were taken up by men who had earned them through service in the parliamentarian cause rather than their family’s pedigree and status. The Mainwaring family represented those, probably the majority of gentry families, who put what they saw as their counties’ interests first. It was desirable, as far as possible, that conventional forms of government be maintained, and that those families with long histories of service as JPs and/or deputy lieutenants, who had sided with parliament, continued to command authority over the county and were not subject to policy-making by their social inferiors.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Brereton was determined to use the resources of Cheshire to support a broader military strategy; to create a system that involved a group of counties raising and financing troops which could be deployed flexibly. In his efforts to do this he sought and achieved the backing of Westminster which intervened repeatedly to enforce new measures on the county. Both developments challenged the customary influence of the senior gentry families and, as Morrill emphasises, their understanding of what constituted right and proper approaches to county government.[[58]](#footnote-58) Wanklyn has noted the strong impression of senior gentry families, including the Booths and the Mainwarings, that Brereton was striving to secure complete control over Cheshire’s military power, and that they responded by plotting against him.[[59]](#footnote-59) There was also a personal element to this disagreement as it seems likely that Brereton’s determination in the early phase of the war to secure control of the various units recruited and organised by prominent Cheshire gentlemen, including Philip Mainwaring, had caused immediate friction.[[60]](#footnote-60) This worsened in September 1645 when Sir George Booth and the other deputy lieutenants responded assertively to Brereton’s supporters’ attempts to denigrate their efforts and marginalise them. According to Booth, the deputy lieutenants had found the county’s forces ‘in a mutinous condition, for want of pay, and the country quite exhausted … yet it hath pleased God so to render our endeavours prosperous that the country and forces are now reduced to a cheerful and obedient condition, ready and capable of any *proportionable* design that can be presented them for the service of the parliament… Nevertheless we are informed there are some factious petitions presented to you [the Speaker, William Lenthall], bearing the character of the whole county, but indeed being the act of a few … intimating a necessity of Sir William Brereton’s return and so insinuating an odium and scandal upon us and our actions to the disturbance of the present condition we are in and the hazard of the great attempts now in agitation’, referring to the siege of Chester.[[61]](#footnote-61) The impression that Brereton’s presence was vital to the success of parliamentarian actions did not just cause resentment among the Cheshire gentry. The able Scottish soldier, Sir John Meldrum, responded angrily to printed accounts in which ‘Sir Wm Brereton is highly extolled for the overthrow given [to the enemy] at Ormskirk, when he was at least 30 miles from the place, and where there were none of the Cheshire forces but such as came to Ormskirk by my order and against his will.’[[62]](#footnote-62)

The end of the first Civil War in 1646 did not bring about an immediate return to peace and stability. A shortage of money to pay soldiers’ wage arrears led to mutiny at Nantwich in July 1646 during which the sequestration committee was seized and imprisoned for two days. Almost a year later, in late June 1647, mutiny broke out again, with one party of soldiers seizing possibly as many as fifteen of the deputy lieutenants, including Philip Mainwaring, at Nantwich and taking them off to Chester where they were kept captive in poor conditions, possibly for several weeks, until the troops’ wage demands were met. The Mainwarings were also amongst those gentry who experienced attacks on their homes in July 1646 by horse troops demanding quarter. These experiences had a profound impact on those supposedly in charge of the county.[[63]](#footnote-63)

The ‘moderate’ gentry led by Booth did try to reassert their authority, with quarter sessions in 1646 and much of 1647 dominated by the long-established families, including the Mainwarings.[[64]](#footnote-64) They experienced some reverses, however, towards the end of the decade and the 1650s bench was made up mostly of men of notably lower social standing, with the significant addition of Thomas Mainwaring, at least in terms of activity: the Commission of the Peace listed many prominent names of men who seem to have chosen not to serve. In contrast, Mainwaring was one of the hardest workers in terms of the number of documents that he signed during the 1650s.[[65]](#footnote-65) His diary provides important insights into his approach to his duties as a JP during the Commonwealth. He was willing to serve under both the Rump and Protectorate, despite having described the regicide as ‘murther’ in his diary.[[66]](#footnote-66) He maintained and enjoyed relationships with a politically diverse group of men, in line with what Morrill has referred to as the tendency during the 1650s of the Cheshire gentry to come together to defend their interests, particularly with regard to the Decimation tax of 1656. Mainwaring sought to protect his cousin Peter Leycester, whom Worsley suspected of supporting Penruddock’s Rising in 1655, and he cannot have welcomed Worsley’s efforts to disarm former royalist gentry – some of whom were his dinner guests – or ban horse-racing which he enjoyed watching.[[67]](#footnote-67)

Mainwaring did not share the major-general’s view that former royalists posed a continuing danger to the Protectorate. Instead, he seems to have taken part in at least some meetings of the senior gentry before the 1656 and 1659 parliamentary selections trying to ensure that the county seats went to those who would act to reduce military power.[[68]](#footnote-68) He undoubtedly shared the younger Sir George Booth’s hostility to the continued presence of the army, but what is not clear is whether he was one of the parliamentary gentry who supported Booth’s rising of August 1659. He did live long enough (d. 1689) to see something like the pre-war county government re-established, however, with the return of the senior gentry families to the commission of the peace.[[69]](#footnote-69)

V

The Mainwarings were evidently a learned family. Sir Philip collected books from abroad,[[70]](#footnote-70) and he apparently knew Dugdale’s *Antiquities of Nottingham* well enough to know that he wanted something similar to be written on his own county. His work for Arundel and Strafford had ensured that his cultural horizons stretched far beyond the boundaries of Cheshire and his interest in county history did not indicate a narrow, insular approach to the subject. Thomas’s entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* notes that ‘like his father, Mainwaring loved books and cultivated learning.’[[71]](#footnote-71) It is reasonable to assume that dinner party conversations at Baddiley touched on matters of Cheshire history, informed by knowledge of historical and antiquarian work on other counties, and that there must have been some interest in Sir Philip’s ambitions. The proposal was influenced, therefore, by a number of factors: a growing interest in local history – a means by which the county could be ‘presented’ to the wider nation, and a desire to state unequivocally that its senior families were its legitimate governors.

In the event, Dugdale’s ‘History of Cheshire’ was never written. Sir Philip might have become distracted by political developments as he took up a seat in his last parliament and hoped for some mark of favour from the restored king. Perhaps it was more difficult than anticipated to secure the interest of the senior gentry in the proposed work. Alternatively, the explanation might lie in Thomas Mainwaring’s decision to ask Dugdale to write a manuscript history of the Mainwarings of Peover, exclusively celebrating the ancestry and achievements of his own family, prompted perhaps by his promotion to the rank of baronet in 1660. During the 1670s he became embroiled in a lengthy argument with his relative Peter - now Sir Peter - Leycester which focused on the alleged illegitimacy of one of their twelfth-century ancestors, and which generated a number of pamphlets from both parties.[[72]](#footnote-72) Whatever the reason, he did not take forward his great-uncle’s ambition to sponsor the publication of a county history. Plans by Foote Gower, an Anglican clergyman and antiquarian scholar born in Chester, to publish the history of his home county in the 1770s never came to fruition either.[[73]](#footnote-73) It was to be George Ormerod of Lancashire, one of the founding members of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, who published *The history of the county palatine and city of Chester* in the early nineteenth century. Its emphasis on the history of the senior gentry families would have undoubtedly met with Sir Philip Mainwaring’s approval.[[74]](#footnote-74)
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