

Charles I. and the distribution of  
political patronage.

Thesis submitted in accordance with  
the requirements of the University of  
Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in  
Philosophy by Mark Duncan Shepherd.

September 1999.

# Contents.

List of abbreviations. i

Introduction. 1

## Section I. Charles and Patronage.

1. Charles and his chaplains: his ecclesiastical patronage as prince and king. 11

2. The King's Household. 54

3. The Queen's Household. 82

4. Charles's role in the selection of ministers. 120

## Section II. Patronage and Politics.

5. Buckingham: the transformation of a favourite. 171

6. The War Years, 1625-1629. 220

7. A settled Court: The objectives of Charles's patronage during the 1630s. 263

8. Lost opportunities. The impact of Charles's patronage during the 1630s. 301

Conclusion. 351

Bibliography. 355

## List of Abbreviations.

APC.	Acts of the Privy Council.
BCL.	Birmingham Central Library.
BL.	British Library.
BIHR.	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research.
CSPD.	Calendar of State Papers Domestic.
CSPV.	Calendar of State Papers Venetian.
DNB.	Dictionary of National Biography.
EHR.	English Historical Review.
HMC.	Historical Manuscripts Commission.
HJ.	Historical Journal.
JBS.	Journal of British Studies.
JMH.	Journal of Modern History.
MSS.	Manuscript Source.
NLW.	National Library of Wales.
PRO.	Public Record Office.
SO.	Signet Office.
SP.	State Papers.
SRO.	Somerset Record Office.
TRHS.	Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.
Vol.	Volume.

### Notes on Sources.

The Signet Office docket books (PRO. SO3 6-12) are unpaginated and unfoliated but are invariably arranged by date. Thus in references to them within each individual book only the date is given. The Lord Chamberlain's warrant books 1628-1641 (PRO. LC5/132 and PRO. LC5/134) are also arranged by date. As there are a number of different and confusing series of page numbers within them it is again simplest to trace references by date. So except where no clear date is provided to a reference within the manuscript they are listed according to date rather than page number. I am extremely grateful to Dr. B.W. Quintrell and Mrs Eve Webster for showing me photocopies of important documents from the Wynn Papers in the National Library of

Wales. For ease of reference these are referred to by the calendar number ascribed to them in J. Ballinger, ed., *The Calendar of Wynn (of Gwydir) Papers*.

## Introduction.

Due to the unusual manner in which it ended in Civil War and Regicide there was always going to be a tendency for investigations of the reign of Charles I. to be arranged teleologically. With this in itself largely a structural matter of approach rather than one of interpretation it need not have posed too great a hindrance to our understanding. However, it was assumed that momentous events must also have had profound causes. This made Charles's reign a convenient vehicle for the testing or confirming of wider political theories. The conviction of the Whigs in the perfection of the liberal constitution of the late-nineteenth and twentieth century, for example, led their historians to perceive the Civil War and the political activity which preceded it as part of an inevitable struggle between "authoritarian, arbitrary monarchy and the...property rights and liberties of individuals", and to place too great an emphasis upon political disputes and occasional meetings of parliament.<sup>1</sup> While rather than challenging these assertions, in being "dominated by various forms of modernisation theory" the work of Marxist orientated historians produced during the post-war period merely accepted the political narratives of the Whigs as read and looked at other areas in the hope of penetrating "beneath the surface of political history to the real causal motors of historical change and conflict in the society and economy of the day".<sup>2</sup> In prompting research into areas never previously examined this historiographical trend led to a broadening of the discipline of history and produced many revealing insights. But resting upon the false assumption that all political questions had already been adequately settled by the Whigs this was at the expense of a more thorough understanding of the politics of the reign. As long as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Cust and Anne Hughes, 'Introduction: after Revisionism', pp. 1-46, in R. Cust and A. Hughes, eds., Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642, (London, 1989). pp. 1-2, 26-27.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Lake, 'Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective', pp. 252-283, in J.F. Meritt (ed.), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth. (Cambridge, 1996). pp. 253-257.

assumptions of continual progress which underpinned these works remained there was little prospect of any change. But " under the impact of seemingly intractable national decline and economic crisis... " by the nineteen seventies confidence in the notion of continual progress was beginning to decline. <sup>3</sup> As a consequence of this there was a re-opening of " the realm of the political as a fit subject for historical study ". <sup>4</sup> The conclusions of the Whigs now became subject to the scrutiny of revisionist historians who, in taking account of the inherent danger of imposing arbitrary motives or focusing too greatly upon one event posed by the English Civil War, endeavoured to allow the politics of the seventeenth century to set its own agenda through " investigating the actions of individuals in their immediate political context ". <sup>5</sup> The importance of these early revisionist works lay in their demonstration of the fact that the events which had been described by the Whigs and accepted by the Marxists were the consequence of " disfunctions in the political system or body politic " rather than an inevitable consequence of some wider, predestined plan. <sup>6</sup> But in doing so they never completely freed themselves from the political agenda which had been set by the Whigs. <sup>7</sup> They had, however, established the need for a wider re-interpretation of seventeenth century politics; and this task was taken up by a second wave of revisionist (or post-revisionist) historians who in an attempt to get behind the rhetoric and ideological polarities of contemporary politics and discover their true meaning focused upon a specific event or policy and broadened the scope of

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 257.; Cust and Hughes, ' Introduction: after Revisionism ', in Conflict in Early Stuart England. p. 11,

<sup>6</sup> Lake, ' Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective ', in The Political World of Thomas Wentworth. pp. 261-2, 264 66.

<sup>7</sup> Cust and Hughes, ' Introduction: after Revisionism ', in Conflict in Early Stuart England. pp. 14-5.

their research to include the more permanent aspects of early-modern government such as the Court and the Privy Council.<sup>8</sup>

No longer being driven by Whig or Marxist determinism in these works long-term social, political and economic trends are seen as independent factors rather than an integrated set of causes all leading to some inevitable end. No single cause as to why these should have come together under Charles is advanced or always sought, but a significant factor which appears to lie behind many of these works is the disruptive influence of the king himself. In these Charles's distinctive religious and political opinions when combined with his personal emphasis upon order and obedience has ascribed him a significant role in events as diverse as the breakdown of the relationship between Crown and parliament, the decision to proceed with ship money and the forced loan and enter into two unsuccessful wars, and the alteration in the culture of the Court and the balance of the English and Scottish Churches.<sup>9</sup> With the

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 26-27.; Lake, ' Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective ', in The Political World of Thomas Wentworth. pp. 269-278.

<sup>9</sup> C. Thompson, ' Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625 ', pp. 168-192, in R. Cust and A. Hughes, eds., Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642.; K.R. Andrews, Ships, Money and Politics. (Cambridge,1991). Chapter 6.; B.W. Quintrell, ' Charles I. and his navy in the 1630s. ', pp. 159-179. The Seventeenth Century.; R. Cust, The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626-1628.; M.B. Young, ' Buckingham, War and Parliament. Revisionism Gone too far ', in Parliamentary History. Vol. 4. 1985.; T. Cogswell, The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624. Young and Cogswell see the wars against Spain then France in terms of Charles's wish to avenge personal honour.; R.M. Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England. (Pennsylvania,1987).; R. Strong, ' Not in front of the citizens ', in Country Life. October, 1990.; Tyacke, Fincham and Lake note a change in 1625 which Davies clearly links to Charles and they attribute to both him and Laud. Nicholas Tyacke, ' Puritanism, Arminianism and counter-revolution ', pp. 136-159, in R. Cust and A. Hughes, eds., The English Civil War. (London,1987). p. 147.; J. Fincham and P. Lake, ' The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I. and Charles I. ', pp. 23-49, in K.

problems associated with Charles's propensity to carry his personal preferences and weaknesses onto a wider plane through his emphasis upon his authority being such an important element in the revisionist interpretation of his reign in other areas it is a matter of some importance to discover whether he had a similar impact in relation to his patronage. For this was both a central pillar of the monarchy and the oil through which the political machine was made to function.<sup>10</sup> There had certainly been some alteration. As while the patronage system established under James certainly had its problems, most visibly in the discontent which surrounded the actions of his favourites, as a means of allowing a wide range of views to be expressed within the orbit of the Court it appears to have functioned fairly well. This, however, was not repeated under Charles, whose Court progressively became "less accessible to the political nation...".<sup>11</sup>

The Whigs and their twentieth century successors tended to view the Court of Charles I. in terms of fixed "rival factions identified with particular political views".<sup>12</sup> As a consequence of this they saw patronage very much in terms of Charles's ministers, whom they felt were using it to advance their own political objectives. The narrowing of the Court was therefore seen as a result of Charles's tendency to take bad advice from a select number of ministers rather than a consequence of his own actions or intentions. The Whigs had not deliberately falsified the evidence on which their accounts were based, but their political views had led them to mis-interpret the information which they provided. This was a tendency to which evidence produced around the Court of Charles I. was particularly prone. As with the newsletters which

---

Fincham, ed., The Early Stuart Church. 1603-1642. (London,1993).; J. Davies, The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I. and the Remoulding of Anglicanism. (Oxford,1992).; A. Macinnes, Charles I. and the Making of the Covenanting Movement. 1625-1641. (London,1991).

<sup>10</sup> Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict. England 1603-1658. (London,1986). p. 31.

<sup>11</sup> R. Cust and A. Hughes, 'Introduction: after Revisionism ', in Conflict in Early Stuart England. p. 27.

<sup>12</sup> Fiona Pogson, ' Making and Maintaining Political Alliances during the Personal Rule of Charles I: Wentworth's Associations with Laud and Cottington ', pp. 51-73, in History. Vol. 84. January 1999.



form the basis of any political study under Charles I. only reporting that part of the patronage process of which their authors were aware or courtiers had any hope of influencing they took the form of reflections upon the actions of various individuals or groups at Court who did not necessarily have any say in the actual decision itself. Recent work on Court patronage such as that of Dr. Quintrell in relation to the appointment of Lord Treasurer Juxon has in demonstrating how Charles's veiled motives could lead to such mis-interpretations cast doubt upon many of the traditional assumptions as to who was responsible for appointments at Court.<sup>13</sup> It is therefore possible that Charles was involved in the distribution of patronage on a far wider scale than is currently held to be the case. In a similar vein research by Julian Davies in relation to the Caroline Church has suggested that the marked narrowing in its patronage resulted not from the influence of Laud or even out of an intention of altering its doctrinal position, but had merely been an accidental consequence of Charles's emphasis upon obedience in the distribution of its patronage having allowed the effects of his own personal religious preferences to be carried into the Church as a whole.<sup>14</sup> If this increased involvement on the part of Charles was continued throughout the patronage network with similar effects it clearly had the potential to cause major political problems. This thesis therefore sets out to discover whether this was indeed the case. It does so in two parts: first through a detailed examination of Charles's role in the distribution of patronage; then by an investigation of the impact which this had upon its ability to be used as a political tool, both in terms of implementing particular policies and as a means of bolstering the long-term support of the Crown.

According to its most basic definition patronage consists of the allowance of an entity to one person which for some reason was denied to another; and in terms of the seventeenth century Crown patronage could take the form of grants of office (both local and at Court), title, tolerance (in the form of religious or political freedom),

---

<sup>13</sup> B.W. Quintrell, 'The Church Triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual lord treasurer, 1635-1636', pp. 81-108, in The Political World of Thomas Wentworth.

<sup>14</sup> Davies, Caroline Captivity.

financial benefits (directly in the form of grants of money, pensions or lands, or indirectly in the form of monopolies, patents or grants or leases of land at concessionary rates), access, intimacy or political influence. Ideally equal emphasis would have been placed upon the investigation of all of these areas. But due to the due to the constraint of time this has not been possible. So whilst other areas have been taken into account where necessary, as the aim of this study is to determine whether any influence which Charles had over the distribution of patronage was direct or broad enough to have had a significant political impact rather than to produce a definitive account of it research has largely been restricted to an examination of where it would be most likely and where its effects would have proved most disruptive, this being amongst the officers and servants of the royal households and the major ministers of the Church and State at Court. While taking account of recent research which sees a major cause for political change as coming in the person of Charles himself (and therefore making a case for coherence and seeing the definition of a personal rule within Charles's reign as a somewhat arbitrary and artificial construct), the period of patronage covered has ranged from his actions as prince to the calling of the Short Parliament, where under the threat of war and in the light of an ever-present parliament he was subjected to a new set of pressures which may have led him to alter his core objectives.<sup>15</sup>

As the objective of this research is to get behind the ambiguities and biases contained in contemporary accounts in order to determine whether Charles was actually playing an important role in the distribution of patronage rather than to reflect upon who was thought to be responsible for them it has been necessary to base it upon two main types of primary source. These are those directly concerned with the dispensation of patronage produced by the government, which provide information over who was granted which office and when, and who was involved in securing it, and those produced by interested individuals or members of the

---

<sup>15</sup> This is not to deny the serious political impact which the discontinuation of parliaments had after 1629, but to emphasise that they were only a manifestation of a much wider series of problems caused by Charles which had been present before the decision to rule without them had been made.

government in a private capacity, which have provided information not included in administrative sources, such as the background of the person advanced, who was supporting them in their claim, and who was overlooked.

Once the decision to appoint someone to a particular office had been made it had to pass through a number of complex administrative procedures in order for it to be put into effect. First brief directions of the grant under the Sign Manual and counter-signed by a responsible minister were sent to the Clerk of the Signet, who drew them up into a King's Bill. <sup>16</sup> This was then submitted to the king for his signature, after which it was returned to the Clerk of the Signet. A copy was then produced, which with the Signet attached was sent to the Clerk of the Privy Seal. He in turn produced another copy and sent it under the Privy Seal to the lord keeper, who after checking its legality completed the process by making a grant of the position by letters patent under the Great Seal. Given the objective of this study it is necessary to get as close as possible to the initial decision make a grant of a particular office. This intention has been hampered by the fact that none of the brief directions under the sign manual sent to the Clerk of the Signet have survived before 1661. <sup>17</sup> Fortunately, though, not all of their details have been lost, as alongside the details of the grant itself and who it was that procured the king's signature to the King's Bill, the Clerk of the Signet also routinely recorded upon whose warrant the initial order had been made. This information is contained in the Signet Office docket books, which run consecutively throughout the reigns of James I. and Charles I. <sup>18</sup> These cover appointments to a wide range of positions which were in the gift of the Crown,

---

<sup>16</sup> The following explanation is derived from these sources. Henry Churchill Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes on the use of the Great Seal of England. (London, 1926). pp. 96-99.; Geoffrey Soden, Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester. 1583-1656. p. 213.; Current Guide to the Public Record Office. Part I. Administrative histories. Signet Office. 308/1/1.

<sup>17</sup> Current Guide to the Public Record Office. Part I. Administrative histories. Signet Office. 308/1/1.

<sup>18</sup> Current Guide to the Public Record Office. Part I. Administrative histories. Signet Office. 308/1/1.; H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes. p. 99.

including those of archbishoprics, bishoprics, deaneries and other lesser livings in the Church, together with such offices as secretary, lord treasurer, Chancellor of the Exchequer and lord admiral within the State; and in conjunction with the State Papers has provided the backbone of the administrative evidence for this project. However, its scope is by no means universal (not covering, for example, positions to the king or queen's household), and the information provided in the Signet Office docket books has therefore been heavily supplemented by additional sources like the lord chamberlain's warrant books and queen's household establishment books in the Public Record Office, together with household lists in the British in the British Library and the dockets of grants of offices passed under the Great Seal contained in the Coventry Papers held at Birmingham Central Library.<sup>19</sup>

However, while these sources provide invaluable information on the grants themselves and reveal who was involved in the process of seeing them put into execution it does not provide any political context for the appointment or necessarily illuminate those who had been responsible for securing it. So with patronage being so closely linked to the question of faction in the second type of source it has therefore been necessary to consult as wide a range of newsletters and personal correspondence as possible. In addition to those contained in the State Papers Domestic and Venetian printed sources include (amongst others) the personal correspondence of ministers such as William Laud and Thomas Wentworth, that of interested observers like John Chamberlain, the Earl of Clare and the Wynn and Barrington families, as well as those

---

<sup>19</sup> PRO. SO3/6-12. Signet Office docket books, 1616-1640.; Together with, for example, PRO. LC5/132. Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book, 1628-1634.; PRO. -LC5/134. Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book. Warrants ab Anno, 1634-1641.; PRO. LR5/57. Establishment book of the queen's household, 1626-1629.; BL. Harleian 3791. Servants of Prince Charles, 1641.; BL. Egerton 1048. Undated list of queen's servants. c. 1641.; BL. Additional. 15,630. A table to the book of several letters patents, annuities, pensions, commissions &c. under the Great Seal of Prince Charles...for the year ending at Michaelmas in the 13th year of the reign of King James.; Birmingham Central Library. Croome Court Collection. Dockets of grants passed under the Great Seal passed by Lord Keeper Coventry.

contained in the Historical Manuscripts Commission.<sup>20</sup> Amongst primary sources held at the Public Record Office and British Library they include personal correspondence of the Earl of Carlisle, Duke of Buckingham and Charles I. himself, together with series of newsletters by John Pory, Joseph Mead, John Beaulieu and those received by John, Viscount Scudamore.<sup>21</sup>

Using detailed information from a number of administrative sources in conjunction with a wide range of private ones offers a potential means of overcoming the inherent weaknesses to which they are prone and provides a clearer picture of the way in which patronage was distributed under Charles. But unless these were arranged in a manner in which they could be easily accessed and compared the conclusions which it would be possible to draw from them would be limited. So in order to overcome this problem all the information gleaned from the various sources used (both administrative and personal, printed and primary) has been brought together on a chronologically sequenced computer data-base arranged both by office and surname. In using this it has been possible to perform a thorough reconstruction of a wide range of appointments to important offices in Charles's household and government

---

<sup>20</sup> J. Bruce et al eds., Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Charles I. 23 vols. (London, 1858-97).; A.B. Hinds, ed., Calendar of State Papers, Venetian. Vols. 10-25, (London, 1900-25).; W. Scott and J. Bliss, eds., The Works of William Laud, D.D. 7 vols. (Oxford, 1847-60).; W. Knowler, ed., The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches. (London, 1739).; N.E. McClure, ed., The Letters of John Chamberlain. (Philadelphia, 1939). 2 vols.; P.R. Seddon, ed., The Letters of John Holles 1587-1637. 3 vols. Thoroton Record Society. (Nottingham, 1975-86).; J. Ballinger, ed., Calendar of Wynn (of Gwydir) Papers 1515-1690. In the National Library of Wales and elsewhere. (London, 1926).; A Searle, ed., Barrington Family Letters 1628-1632. Camden Society Fourth Series. Vol. 28. (London, 1983).

<sup>21</sup> BL. Egerton 2592-7. Carlisle Correspondence.; For Charles and Buckingham, eg. BL. Harleian 6988, 7000.; BL. Harleian 383, & Additional 4177. Pory Newsletters.; BL. Harleian 390. Newsletters by Joseph Mead.; BL. Harleian 7010. Newsletters by John Beaulieu.; PRO. C115/M31, 32, 35, 36 & PRO.C115/N3, 4, 5. Various newsletters received by Viscount Scudamore.

and a detailed examination of the factors which lay behind them. Through these it is possible to demonstrate that Charles had not only taken appointments to royal office back into his own hands, but in doing so had also had a significant impact upon the politics of the reign through making them in accordance with his own personal objectives and preferences rather than as a means of advancing Crown policies or ensuring the political balance of the Court.

## Section I. Charles and Patronage.

### Chapter 1. Charles and his chaplains:

#### his ecclesiastical patronage as prince and king.

Little attention has been paid to Charles's patronage activities as prince, and there is an assumption that he only entered into his own in 1625. Thus his religious patronage is perceived as part of an attempt to introduce high-church clerics as part of a general policy to alter the religious make-up of the Church and State. However, his preferences are apparent well before he became king, and stemmed from his ability to carry his own dislike of disobedience and personal preference for a ceremonial rather than a scriptural form of religion on to a wider plane by establishing a kind of career pattern based upon his own chaplains in ordinary.

In relation to Charles's ecclesiastical affairs as prince the first evidence we have concerns his chaplains, and comes in December 1612 shortly after the death of Henry in a letter from Sir Isaac Wake to Dudley Carleton, in which he relates that " to keep the Prince from Popery, two sober divines, Dr. Hackwell and another, are placed with him, and ordered never to leave him ".<sup>1</sup> But this appears to have been a stop-gap rather than a permanent measure, the clerics' appointment perhaps reflecting the new importance of Charles as heir to the Crown, as they did not come from Henry's household, which in any case was not dissolved until 31 of December.<sup>2</sup> In the light of this dissolution Charles's new household was established during the first part of 1613, its membership being subject to the scrutiny of the king, and therefore not a

---

<sup>1</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 160. 2  
December 1612. Isaac Wake - Dudley Carleton.

<sup>2</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain.  
Vol. I. p. 399. 31 December 1612. London. John  
Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

very good indication of Charles's own patronage.<sup>3</sup> A good proportion of Henry's chaplains found their way into Charles's household, including Dr. Milbourne, future Bishop of St. David's and Carlisle, Lewis Bailey, future Bishop of Bangor, and Henry Burton as Clerk of the Closet.<sup>4</sup> Whilst Charles may not have had a great deal of a choice over the establishment of his household in 1613, by 1614 it is apparent that he had a degree of influence upon those appointed in his service, for we find Dr. George Carleton writing to Sir Dudley Carleton on 10 of February that he had "entered the prince's service at the request of Sir James Fullerton, and is commended both by king and prince..."; although he also mentions "the shameless avidity of persons about the Court for preferment", something amply demonstrated in Sir John Vaughan's letters to the Earl of Somerset for a place about the Prince.<sup>5</sup>

The major problem in Charles's early ecclesiastical patronage lies in discovering who his chaplains were and how they came to be appointed. Apart from Carleton's case and those who came from Henry on the re-establishment of his household there is scant evidence how they were actually chosen; presumably they were promoted after being heard by the prince, as was the case when Prince Henry had chosen Mr Thomas Gataker, and how Charles later came to appoint Dr. John Preston.<sup>6</sup> Given that there is no definitive list of Charles chaplains in existence we are dependent upon the collection of casual references and other such administrative information as is available, such as that given at James's funeral, which when all taken together

---

<sup>3</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 160. 2 December 1612. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>4</sup> PRO. LC2/4/6. f. 42v. 1612. List of Prince Henry's chaplains.

<sup>5</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. 10 February 1614. p. 273. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.; *Ibid.*, p. 258. October 1614. Sir John Vaughan - Earl of Somerset.; *Ibid.*, p. 261. 1 December 1614. Golden Grove, Carmarthen. Sir John Vaughan - Sir Henry Neville.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Birch. The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, eldest son of King James I. Compiled chiefly from his own papers, and other manuscripts, never before published. (Dublin, 1760). p. 295.; Irvonwy Morgan. Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain. (London, 1957). pp. 74-76.



includes: Dr. George Carleton <sup>7</sup>, Dr. Hackwell <sup>8</sup>, Dr Milbourn <sup>9</sup>, Dr. Winiffe <sup>10</sup>, Leonard Mawe <sup>11</sup>, Matthew Wren <sup>12</sup>, Richard Sennhouse <sup>13</sup>, Dr. Owen <sup>14</sup>, Dr. Preston <sup>15</sup>, Dr. Wemys <sup>16</sup>, Dr. Smith <sup>17</sup>, Richard Middleton <sup>18</sup>, Isaac Bargrave <sup>19</sup>, Dr. Webb <sup>20</sup>, and Dr. Theodore Price <sup>21</sup>. In the only full list of chaplains which survives, drawn up

---

<sup>7</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 273. 10 February 1614. Nuffield. Dr George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 160. 2 December 1612. London. Isaac Wake - Sir Dudley Carleton. Also PRO. SP14/72/111. 1613. Undated. List by Sir James Fullerton of persons to be considered for the prince's new household

<sup>9</sup> PRO. SP14/72/111. 1613. Undated. List by Sir James Fullerton of persons to be considered for the prince's new household.

<sup>10</sup> PRO. LC2/6. P. 70. 1625. List of James I.'s chaplains in ordinary.

<sup>11</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 483. 8 March 1623. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton; Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or the History of the Life and Death of the most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William Laud... (London, 1668). p. 104. In PRO. LC2 6. p. 41. 1625. he is mentioned as a chaplain in ordinary to James I.

<sup>12</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 483. 8 March 1623. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>13</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 144.

<sup>14</sup> Mentioned as chaplain to Prince Charles. Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. Note p. 23.; Davies, Caroline Captivity. (Oxford, 1992). p. 41.; PRO. LC2/6. p. 41 mentions him as chaplain in ordinary to the king.-

<sup>15</sup> PRO. LC2/6. p. 70. 1625. List of the prince's chaplains.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>19</sup> DNB, sub Bargrave, mentions him as a chaplain to Prince Charles.; PRO. LC2/6. p. 41. 1625. List of the king's chaplains.

<sup>20</sup> DNB, sub Webb, mentions him as chaplain to the prince, whilst PRO. LC2/6. p. 41. 1625. List of the king's chaplains.

<sup>21</sup> John Hacket, Scrinia

as the precedent to James I.'s funeral, Charles is ascribed only six chaplains, being a quarter of the number which Henry enjoyed.<sup>22</sup> Why this should have been the case is unclear. Matthew Wren asserted that he waited on the prince for two months a year, which may indicate that he possessed fewer chaplains who attended longer, or perhaps a number had recently been promoted, or that with the prime reason for drawing up the precedent being in order to record the distribution of mourning cloth for James I.'s funeral, that it merely failed to record the full compliment.<sup>23</sup> All of these may be in part responsible, but from other evidence which is available it seems that there may have been another more important cause, being that Charles and James shared chaplains. At the funeral of Queen Anne Dr. John Hanmer had been recorded as a chaplain to James I., yet in 1623 he had been appointed Bishop of St. Asaph, which although not conclusive proof given the dispute over the presentation of this bishopric, at least hints at some connection with the Prince of Wales, something confirmed by the fact that it was a chaplain to the prince, Matthew Wren, who was granted the Rectory of Bingham, Yorkshire, which Hanmer vacated upon his promotion.<sup>24</sup> Further evidence comes from John Hacket, the biographer of John

---

Reserata: a Memorial offered to the great --Deservings of John Williams D.D. (London, 1692). Pt. I. p. 206 mentions him as being chaplain to the prince.; PRO. --LC2/6. p. 40 1625. List of chaplains to the king.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 70. Birch, Life of Henry. p. 351 gives the number of Henry's chaplains as 24, which are all named.

<sup>23</sup> " A transcript of a certain narrative written by the late Bishop of Ely (Matthew Wren) ", in James Bliss, ed., The Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Vol. II. (Oxford, 1954). p. lvii.

<sup>24</sup> PRO. LC5/2. p. 45. 1619. List of chaplains to the prince.; Hanmer was presented to the bishopric of St. Asaph jointly by the prince and king by a conge d'elire and letters recommendatory dated the 9th January 1624. PRO. SO3/7.; CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 175. 2 March 1624. Westminster. Grant of dispensation for Matthew Wren to hold the Rectory of --Bingham; PRO. SO3/7. March 1624. Docket of Wren's dispensation subscribed by Mr Gall and procured by the Duke of Buckingham.

Williams, who confidently asserts that Dr. John Hanmer was a chaplain to the prince.<sup>25</sup> A similar situation arises in the case of Leonard Mawe, who whilst being referred to at James's funeral as a chaplain to the king, was perceived by both John Chamberlain and Peter Heylin as being a chaplain to the prince when he had been sent to attend him in Spain in 1623.<sup>26</sup> Despite their peculiar positions Hanmer and Mawe are not isolated examples, and given that there are at least another four chaplains who were in a similar position, it seems reasonable to assume that Charles and James did indeed share their chaplains.<sup>27</sup> Such a situation is not as unusual as it at first appears, for James and Queen Anne had also shared at least one chaplain in the person of James Forsyth, and Charles's chaplains (as in the person of Dr. Theodore Price) are known to have preached before the king. Such an arrangement within their respective royal households would help to explain why it was that James I. appeared to have so many chaplains at his death in 1625 and Charles so few.<sup>28</sup> Given this information the list of the prince's chaplains given in the precedent of James's funeral is therefore likely to be extremely inaccurate, and could well have included up to another twenty on top of those recorded, meaning that Charles would have already possessed a much wider awareness of which ecclesiastics he wished to promote when he came to the throne than is usually imagined.

That Charles should have had chaplains of his own and some degree of control over their appointment is not too surprising, nor that a number of them went on to further

<sup>25</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 206.

<sup>26</sup> PRO. LC2/6. p. 41.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 483. 8 March 1623. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 104.

<sup>27</sup> Those mentioned as chaplains to the prince and king are Drs. Webb, Hanmer, Mawe, Theodore Price, Owen and Isaac Bargrave.

<sup>28</sup> PRO. LC2/5. p. 36. 1619. List of chaplains to the king and queen; PRO. LC2/6. p. 41. 1625. List of the king's chaplains. James had 69.; Thomas Birch, ed., Court and Times of James I.; Illustrated by Authentic and Confidential Letters, From Various Public and Private Collections. 2 Vols. (New York, 1973). Vol. II. p. 265. July 1621. Christ College. Joseph Mede - Sir Martin Stuteville.

preferment when he became king. What is surprising, though, is the assertion by John Hacket in *Scrinia Reserata* that " the Prince since the time that by his patent he was styled Prince of Wales, had claimed the bishoprics of that principality for his own chaplains...".<sup>29</sup> This short extract has doubtless been noticed many times by countless scholars, but like Charles's actions as prince, nobody seems to have given it much serious consideration. Yet if Hacket's assertion is correct it has important consequences for our understanding of Charles' ecclesiastical patronage; for not only does it demonstrate that his interest in promoting his chaplains was established at a very early point, but also potentially associates him to William Laud, who in being promoted to St. David's in November 1621 would clearly already have had some kind of connection to Charles.

The post of Prince of Wales had been revived in 1301 when Edward I made his eldest son Prince of Wales and granted him the lands of the Principality, and from the case of the Black Prince (whose long duration as Prince of Wales from 1336-1376 was the first of any length, and therefore set many of the standard procedures for the future), St. David's apart it appears that in accordance with Hacket's assertion the Prince of Wales did, in theory at least, enjoy a right of patronage to the bishoprics within his principality, but it remains to be seen whether these rights had lasted intact.

<sup>30</sup> Henry, perhaps due to the fact that no Welsh bishoprics became vacant between his appointment as Prince of Wales and his death in 1612, does not seem to have lain

---

<sup>29</sup>  
I. p. 207.

Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, Pt.

<sup>30</sup>  
D. L. Evans, ' Some Notes on the History of the Principality of Wales in the Time of the Black Prince (1343-1376). ', pp. 25-110, in Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. 1925-26. (London, 1927) pp. 28-9, 94-5.; Geoffrey Barraclough, ' The Earldom and County Palatine of Chester ', pp. 23-59., in Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Vol. CIII. 1951. (Liverpool, 1952). p. 41.; Calendar of Close Rolls, 1354-60. 14 vols. (London, 1896-1913). Vol. X. p. 382.; Any such rights enjoyed by Charles would have come after his creation as Prince of Wales on the 4 November 1616. Thomas Rymer, Foedera. 10 Vols. (Hague, 1737-1745). Vol. VIII. Pt. II. p. 216.

claim to any right of presentation, and curiously there is no mention of any such right in Thomas Birch's usually thorough biography of him, so any proof must come in relation to Charles.

The first test as to the truth of Hacket's assertion is the information contained in the Signet Office records, which give information on the position granted, who received it, and by whom it was signified and procured. Most of the Welsh bishoprics at this time appear to have been procured by Buckingham or his servant John Packer, which whilst adding further credence to the idea that he was a general run-about for the king and prince, gives little indication of who it was that enjoyed the right of presentation.

<sup>31</sup> There is one exception, though, being that of the presentation of Dr. John Hanmer as Bishop of St. Asaph in January 1624, who as a chaplain to both the prince and king, can be used to uphold Hacket's assertion. This bishopric became vacant on the death of Richard Parry on 26 September 1623, at much about the same time as Charles and Buckingham returned from Spain. The Lord Keeper, Bishop John Williams, was evidently pressing the case of his countryman Dr Theodore Price through the means of the Duke of Buckingham, whilst Charles, in whose gift the bishopric actually was, had decided upon Dr. John Hanmer. <sup>32</sup> Nevertheless, there was evidently some dispute over the means of presentation, for on 22 of November 1623 Secretary Conway wrote to Attorney General Coventry that " a commission is

---

<sup>31</sup> eg. PRO. SO3/7. 21 August 1621. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the precentor and chapter of St. David's to be bishop there. Procured. Mr John Packer.; Ibid. November 1621. His majesty's royal assent for Doctor Laud late Dean of Gloucester to be Bishop of St. David's. Procured Mr. John Packer.

<sup>32</sup> Sir Maurice Powicke., ed. Handbook of British Chronology, (Lon,1961), p. 278.; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 206.; PRO. SP14/153/39. 11 October 1623. Royston. Secretary Conway - Lord Keeper Williams.; That the bishopric was undoubtedly in the hands of the prince appears from PRO. SP14/156/10. December 1623, which regarding queries over the presentation, the title states " ...the bishopric of St. Asaph being in the prince's gift...his Highness bestows it upon Dr. Hanmer...". The cause of the dispute evidently lay elsewhere.

to be drawn out of the two Lord Chief Justices, Justice Jones, and the Attorney and Solicitor General, to settle the points in question about the bishopric of St. Asaph ".<sup>33</sup>

The important point here is in discovering why it was that a presentation to St. Asaph should have become a point of dispute when both Llandaff and St. David's had earlier been filled apparently without dispute. Llandaff had become the first vacancy in Charles's gift when Francis Godwin had been translated to Hereford on 14 November 1617 due to the death of Robert Bennet.<sup>34</sup> Here a conge d'elire to the Archdeacon and Chapter of Llandaff was issued in the ordinary way, and on 28 November 1617 Dr. George Carleton, chaplain to the prince, wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton how that he was " appointed by the King and Prince to the See of Llandaff "; with the appointment of Laud to the See of David's (potentially the most likely place for any dispute over jurisdiction between prince and king) in 1621 passing with similar ease.<sup>35</sup> With the problem clearly having nothing to do with a reluctance on the part of

---

<sup>33</sup> PRO. SP14/154/66. 22 November 1623. Secretary Conway - Attorney General Coventry.

<sup>4</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 497. 14 November 1617. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>35</sup> PRO. SO3/6. November 1617. Conge d'elire to the Archdeacon and Chapter of Llandaff. Procured Secretary Lake.; CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 499. 28 November 1617. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Charles appears to have enjoyed a similar joint right of presentation to St. David's. As in 1621 Dr. Owen Gwynn, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, had " by the prince's means, been offered the Bishopric of St. David's...", who was to be replaced by Richard Sennhouse, one of Charles's chaplains. However, Charles was also pressing (perhaps on behalf of his mentor, Lancelot Andrewes) for the appointment of Laud as Dean of Westminster, and when this was undermined by John Willams's refusal to cede it upon his appointment as lord keeper, he attempted to obstruct his appointment, something which prompted Williams to put pressure upon his kinsman (Wynn) and suggest that Laud should be appointed bishop in his place, the desire of him and Buckingham to smooth the way for the prince explaining why they were so anxious to press Laud's case with James. Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 382. 9 June 1621. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 392. 28 July 1621. Same - Same.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 263. 23 June 1621. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid., p. 263. 30 June

James in allowing his son to appoint his own bishops, an explanation must be sought elsewhere. This appointment to St. Asaph was to be the last before Charles became king, and came three years after the last potential appointment in 1621, when Laud was appointed to St. David's. The relative lateness of this grant may be a clue as to why St. Asaph should have become the first dispute over a presentation to a Welsh bishopric; for it at least seems likely that where Charles had before been willing to see his men advanced jointly with the king under his name and seal, advancing age and confidence may have led him to press his case for independence. That the dispute was indeed due not to who named the bishop but the manner of presentation becomes clear through a note contained in the State Papers and written in relation to the commission investigating the problem in December 1623, which is headed " queries as to whether certain rights relating to the bishopric of St. Asaph belong to the king or to the prince, in whose gift it now is ".<sup>36</sup> Under this heading it goes on to detail the nature of the problems to be resolved, which being such questions as who should send the conge d'elire, order the consecration or receive the new bishop's homage, clearly indicate that the problem was not primarily over selection but the wider issue of political power and influence.<sup>37</sup> Although there is no surviving copy of the final judgement, a letter from the commission dated 31 December 1623, in which they relate how that they have " prepared instruments to be passed by himself, the Prince, and the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, for the grant of the bishopric to Dr. Hanmer ", indicates that the problem was again solved through the sharing of power.<sup>38</sup> From this it is clear that Charles did indeed enjoy a right of presentation to St. Asaph, and probably the other bishoprics within the Principality of Wales, too, but never

---

1621. Same - Same.; --Ballinger, ed., Calendar of Wynn Papers. - p. 150. Greenwich. Sir Richard Wynn - Sir John Wynn.; John Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. pp. 63-4, 206.

<sup>36</sup> PRO. SP14/156/10. Undated.  
December 1623.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> PRO. SP14/156/11. Lord Chief Justices, Justice Jones, and the Attorney and Solicitor General - James I. 31 Dec. 1623. Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street.

under his own seal. This helps to explain his apparent lack of patronage, for while he did indeed possess a seal of his own, for the security of the grant and in the interest of the power of the king it was always made under the Great Seal rather than the prince's, thereby concealing the influence which he undoubtedly possessed.

From these examples Charles clearly enjoyed influence over appointments within the Principality of Wales, as well as indicating a wider interest in the direction of the Church in relation to the Deanery of Westminster. Whilst he was unsuccessful in this case there are indications that he was active in other areas outside the principality, with particular evidence being available for the See of Carlisle. It was to this bishopric that Richard Milbourne was translated in 1621, thereby leaving the See of St. David's vacant for Laud<sup>39</sup>, whilst on Milbourne's death in 1624 Charles obtained Carlisle for another of his chaplains, Richard Sennhouse, in this case procuring the conge d'elire in person.<sup>40</sup> As well as this, in 1616 Dr. George Carleton had written to Sir Dudley Carleton that the prince would have obtained him the bishopric of Carlisle, but that the king had been so importuned, possibly by Buckingham, that he otherwise

---

<sup>39</sup> The See of Carlisle became vacant by the death of Robert Snowden in June 1621. By the 9 June 1621 it was being reported that it would go to Milbourne. Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 379. 2 June 1621. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton. Ibid., p. 382. 9 June 1621. London. Same - Same. It was officially granted to Milbourne by a conge d'elire and letters recommendatory dated July 1621, procured by John Packer, and passed the seal at Westminster on the 14 July 1621. The royal assent was drawn up by Secretary Calvert, and passed the seal on 11 September.; PRO. SO3/7. July 1621.; Ibid., September.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VII. Pt. III. pp. 200, 212.

<sup>40</sup> By the beginning of July 1624 it was widely known that the Bishop of Carlisle was dead. Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 465. 1 July 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton. Sennhouse's conge d'elire had been drawn up in June 1624 and procured by the prince himself, passing the seal at Westminster on the 13 of June 1624. PRO. SO3/8. June 1624 and Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VII. Pt. IV. p. 141.



disposed of it, and one " Snowden an obscure fellow come in at the window and shut him out ".<sup>41</sup> Being a chaplain to Charles, though, Carleton did not have to wait long for further preferment, and in November 1617 was appointed through his means as Bishop of Llandaff upon the removal of Francis Godwin to the See of Hereford, and in another demonstration of Charles's growing influence, little over a month later was named as a possible candidate for the vacant See of Oxford.<sup>42</sup> This appointment is revealing in that it demonstrates the struggle which even Charles faced in the unstructured court of James I.; for whilst Charles " was willing to stop all the causes of others to make the way for me, professing that he had a disposition to prefer me ", the pressure for preferments was so great that Carleton had to be happy with the prince's influence " such as he can, for the great bishoprics are not so given..."; and even here, in his own sphere of influence of Wales, he was not unchallenged, with Carleton reporting how that " some of the King's chaplains have been suitors for it ".<sup>43</sup> Yet whilst Charles could clearly hold his own in patronage matters, it may

---

<sup>41</sup> Carleton was linked to the bishopric of Carlisle soon after it became vacant by death in July 1616. By late October it was clear that although the prince had tried to obtain it for him, competition had been fierce and it went to another. -CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 399. 24 October 1616. The Prince's Court. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton, and Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 29. 26 October 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley --Carleton. The Signet Office docket for the royal assent had been procured by the Lord Villiers.

<sup>42</sup> By mid-November 1617 it had been decided to translate Francis Godwin from Llandaff to the See of Hereford, which was vacant by the death of Robert -Bennet, and replace him by George Carleton. This was made official towards the end of the month, with the conge d'elire and letters recommendatory being drawn up and procured by Secretary Lake and passing the seal at Westminster on 27 of November 1617. His royal assent passed the seal on 26 of February 1618.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 118. 14 November 1617. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 166. 29th April 1618. London. Same - Same. PRO. SO3/6. November 1617.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VII. Pt. III. pp. 34, 51.

<sup>43</sup> PRO. SP14/154. 28 November 1617. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.

nevertheless in part have been as a consequence of such competition restricting his influence that he was to so jealously preserve his rights of ecclesiastical presentation as king.

As well as having an apparent interest in the bishopric of Carlisle, which may not have held the same attraction as some of the larger sees Charles also succeeded in getting a chaplain of his, Dr. Winiff, appointed Dean of Gloucester in September 1624, a position which Laud had held before his appointment to St. David's.<sup>44</sup> Whether these are mere coincidences or actual spheres of influence for the prince cannot be definitively answered in every case, but it is nevertheless clear that by the 1620s Charles possessed a much greater role and degree of influence than has previously been ascribed to him, as his very position and growing maturity allowed once he began to take an interest in his rights. That he had developed such an interest can be seen in relation to the Lent sermons, where (in marked contrast to his father) his attendance in 1617, 1620 and again in 1622 indicate that it was by now a regular occurrence, and was something which must have both increased his knowledge of prominent churchmen and brought him into play as an important patron.<sup>45</sup> This increased influence on the part of Charles must in part affect our interpretation of Buckingham. Buckingham still had a part to play, but whilst it was him or his agent, John Packer, who procured most of the Welsh bishoprics at this time, it seems that this was an administrative task after the decision had been made rather than one of influence, and that his true role can be seen in such cases as when George Mountain, Bishop of London, wrote to him in 1623 in order "to recommend my humble service

---

<sup>44</sup> CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 344. 28 September 1624. Grant to Dr. Winiff, the prince's chaplain, of the Deanery of Gloucester.

<sup>45</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 464. 9 May 1617. George Garrard - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 299. 1 April 1620. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., pp. 425-427. 9 March 1622. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 432. 13 April 1622. London. Same - Same.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 304. 12 April 1622. London. To the Rev. Joseph Mead.; Peter McCullough, Sermons at Court. (Cambridge, 1998). p. 131.

and my best devotions to his gracious Highness ".<sup>46</sup> It was clearly this ability to introduce people to the prince rather than direct influence over him which was most important to Buckingham even at this early stage.

On the evidence of his appointments to Welsh bishoprics and other livings in which he could wield influence, Charles evidently took a particular interest in ecclesiastical affairs as Prince of Wales, and this interest was continued upon his accession to the throne, where one of the first things he was reported to have done was to settle his chaplains.<sup>47</sup> Charles had attended his father's sermons as well as his own, where having "...observed the multitudinousness of his father's chaplains, and the disorder of their waitings...puts him on a resolution of reducing them to a lesser number, and limiting them to a more certain time of attendance than before they were ".<sup>48</sup> The large number of James's chaplains in ordinary are already known from the precedent of his funeral, and whilst there is no comparable list for Charles's chaplains as king at this point in time, an indication of the scale of the reduction is given in a letter of Sir Roger Mostyn, who reports late in April that of "...all the late king's chaplains, which were fourscore in number, he hath kept but 48, whereunto he hath added eight of his own chaplains ".<sup>49</sup> The number of chaplains which Mostyn reports seems about right when compared with later sources, as does the assertion that they were reduced to a more regular order of attendance, as this would account for the four chaplains in ordinary which appear to have attended each month.<sup>50</sup> But where Mostyn only

---

<sup>46</sup> BL., Stowe. 743. f.41. 30th March 1623. London. George Mountain, Bishop of London - Duke of Buckingham. -

<sup>47</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 3

<sup>48</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 132.

<sup>49</sup> PRO. LC2/6. pp. 40-41. 1625. Precedent of the Funeral of James I.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn

<sup>50</sup> The Lord Chamberlain's warrant books for 1628-1634 and 1634-1641, PRO. LC5/134 and PRO. LC5/132 confirm this, as does PRO LC3/1, which gives a list of chaplains and their months of waiting for 1641.

mentions the new chaplains as consisting of James's old chaplains and eight which were already in Charles's service, it is clear that others in neither of these two groups were also added at this point. For example, when Charles first set about establishing his household Lord Keeper Williams had recommended a number " of his own family to be preferred; but it was past over without answer: only his domestic chaplain was taken in ordinary service, for whom he made no suit ".<sup>51</sup> This not only indicates that Charles already possessed a knowledge of ecclesiastics wide enough to include those who had neither been in his or James's service, but also demonstrates how he was constantly, if silently, observing people and summing up their worth before personally deciding to appoint them, at once reducing the direct influence of courtiers and increasing his own. This meant that Charles promoted people by worth and not their patron, and is demonstrated in his appointment of a chaplain of John Williams as his own despite already viewing the lord keeper with a degree of suspicion; and is confirmed in that he was at this point also involved in a dispute with the Earl of Bristol, yet having heard his personal chaplain, Accepted Frewen, preach before him whilst in Spain, nevertheless appointed him his own chaplain, " putting him in the list with his own hand ".<sup>52</sup>

All this interest might have been explained by zeal consequent upon recently coming into power; but with the country also preparing for war at this time, it could only have been part of a deliberate policy, and rather than being a passing fad, order and regularity became key-notes in Charles's reign. He made sure not only that his chaplains were well ordered, but used his personal control to ensure they became the single most important element in his ecclesiastical policy. The importance of the chaplaincy and the king's interest in it is clearly demonstrated in Viscount Wentworth's attempts to gain a prebendary of York for his personal chaplain, Mr Watts, which was to become vacant on the promotion of John Bramhall to the Bishopric of Derry in the summer of 1634.<sup>53</sup> Wentworth had evidently held out

---

<sup>51</sup>  
II. p. 3.

Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt.

<sup>52</sup>

DNB, sub Accepted Frewen.

<sup>53</sup>

The Bishopric of Derry was void by the death of George Downham. Laud had evidently

hopes that through Laud's influence he would be able to secure this relatively minor post, but when Laud replied on 23 June 1634 he explained how that the king had given it to Dr. Richard Marsh, " one that himself took liking to when he preached before him at Worksop, in his journey to Scotland ", and that in Watts's case " it would have been vain, for the king will think of no stranger as long as he hath choice of men known to him by services done ".<sup>54</sup> Later he added that " it is impossible for me to help him [Watts] or any other man forward in the Church unless he can get to come into the Court service, and be the king's [chaplain] in ordinary. For that rule the King hath set to himself - he will prefer no stranger as long as he hath fit men of his own, that are in some measure known unto him...".<sup>55</sup> Of course, this may merely have been a defence by Laud against suitors; but he enjoyed fairly close relations with Wentworth, and it is therefore unlikely that he would have deliberately turned him down. At the same time he offered a rationale for the king's policy which he himself supported and seemed to expect Wentworth to do the same, explaining that " the time in Court for preferring noblemen's chaplains, and letting the king's, which bear the brunt and the charge of the service stand by, is past, and I hope shall never return again; for besides all other inconveniences, the men so preferred are more at their old lords' service (as the means of their promotion) than at the king's that gives it...".<sup>56</sup> Such a policy on the part of Charles ties in well with his wishes to increase accountability and dependence upon himself, and further investigation has revealed a

---

pressed Charles for the appointment of -Bramhall. Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 375. 14 May 1634. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy --Wentworth.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 379. 23 June 1634. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 102. 12 January 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>56</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 102. 12 January 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth. That Charles promoted his chaplains can be seen in that Laud was still using this argument in December 1638, informing Wentworth that " I have not been able to prevail with his majesty, the suits of his own chaplains in ordinary coming so thick upon him for all those few preferments which are now left for the Crown...". Ibid., Vol. 6. Pt. II. p. 550. 29 December 1638.

firm tendency in Charles not only to personally select his chaplains, but to select them above all others in relation to appointments to bishoprics and deaneries. This arrangement potentially restricted the ability of all patrons - both lay and clerical - to intervene directly in shaping the direction of the Church; but all would depend upon how Charles's chaplains were appointed, as if it was possible to wield influence in the appointment of chaplains then Charles's decision-making over other preferments would also be similarly controlled. It is therefore of paramount importance to understand the procedure for their appointment and who maintained control.

As members of the royal household, chaplains came under the jurisdiction of the lord chamberlain, and were in theory appointed by him; for as the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery himself asserted in 1639, it was his " duty to provide " chaplains.<sup>57</sup> Potentially, therefore, the lord chamberlain was in a very influential position, but only potentially, for all would depend upon his attitude to the post and his freedom of action. On first appearances it appears that Montgomery did not press his rights particularly hard, for when the king was to go out on progress in 1634 chaplains had to be appointed in the areas he was pass through. Rather than naming candidates himself we find him writing, for example, to the Bishop of Lincoln: " which places being all within your lordship's diocese I have thought fit to acquaint your lordship with and to desire you to take order for a supply of the sermons which are to be preached before his Majesty ", the height of his pressure merely being in mentioning that " if my Lord of Rutland or my Lord of Stanford in whose houses the king lies desire to recommend their own chaplains and that your Lordship shall approve them it may be a fit respect to prefer them before any other ".<sup>58</sup> In reality, though, the role which the Chamberlain could play was very much restricted by factors outside his control; for his influence was great in theory but very much restricted in practice, as of the 28 chaplains in ordinary who were appointed during his period as lord

---

<sup>57</sup> PRO. LC5/134. p. 368. ; John Bickersteth and Robert W. Dunning, Clerks of the Closet in the Royal Household. Five Hundred Years of Service to the Crown. (Stroud,1991). p. 91.

<sup>58</sup> PRO. LC5/134. 24 May 1634. Whitehall. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery - Bishop of Lincoln.

chamberlain, in only two cases is it possible to assert with any degree of certainty that he was responsible for their appointment, this being in that of John Cosin in 1636, on whose behalf he had been moved by Richard Neile, and Thomas Lawrence, his own household chaplain, in 1633.<sup>59</sup>

In being involved in just two cases during the period 1628 to 1640 Montgomery was clearly not the driving force in the appointment of chaplains, and that the system depended upon the personal selection of the king rather than the chamberlain can be inferred from such examples as Robert Skinner, who being appointed to wait in December in the absence of Dr. Dee, was shortly after coming into contact with the king appointed a chaplain in ordinary; and was afterwards promoted to the bishopric of Bristol.<sup>60</sup> Charles's actions are more clearly discerned in relation to Thomas Winiff. Winiff had been one of Charles's chaplains when he had been Prince of Wales, although interestingly he had not been made in ordinary when he became king in 1625. There is no clear reason as to why this should have been the case, for given the fact that England was at this time at war with Spain, Charles was unlikely to have held Winiff's well-publicised sermon of 1622, in which he "compare[d] Spinola to the

---

<sup>59</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. IV. p. 295.; PRO. LC5/134. 16 April 1636. Warrant to swear John Cosin a chaplain in ordinary.; PRO. LC5/132. 28 February 1633. Warrant to swear Thomas Lawrence a chaplain in ordinary.; That both --Cosin and Lawrence were high-churchmen perhaps indicates that Montgomery had to alter his principles to secure appointments. Proceedings in Parliament, 1628., ed. M.F. Keeler et al. 6 vols. (New --Haven, 1977-83). Vol. II. p. 86. 24 March 1628; BL. Harleian 390. f. 370. 29 March 1628. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism. c. 1590-1640. (Oxford, 1987). p. 83.

<sup>60</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 31 October 1629. Letter to Robert Skinner to wait in December in the place of Dr. Dee.; PRO. LC5/132. 15 January 1630. Warrant to swear Robert Skinner a chaplain in ordinary; PRO. SO3/11. June 1636. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory for Robert Skinner to be Bishop of Bristol. By order of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Procured Secretary -Windebank. Issued 18 July 1636. Le Neve, Fasti...Bristol. p. 10.

Devil ", against him. <sup>61</sup> It is far more likely that the reason for his failure to be continued in ordinary was a combination of the competition for places at this time, given the large numbers of chaplains which James possessed, together with the fact that he had recently been promoted by the prince to the deanery of Gloucester, and had thereby already been recently rewarded. <sup>62</sup> By 1628 the necessity of pleasing all who had been servants to his father had passed, and when Richard Corbett was promoted to the bishopric of Oxford in September 1628, thereby creating a vacancy in ordinary, his place was filled by Winiff, who was sworn in ordinary at the beginning of January. <sup>63</sup> Given his previous connections to the prince it would also appear that Charles was the principal figure behind his re-appointment.

A further expression of the king's influence is evident in the case of Richard Marsh. Marsh had first been noticed by the king when he had preached before him at Worksop whilst on his journey to Scotland in 1633. <sup>64</sup> Charles evidently took an immediate liking to Marsh, and hearing him preach again at Nottingham whilst on

---

<sup>61</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 432. 13 April 1622. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>62</sup> PRO. SO3/8. August 1624. The Deanery of Gloucester granted to Thomas Winiff... one of the chaplains to the prince. Subscribed by order from Mr. Secretary Conway, and by him procured. CSPD,1623-1625. p. 344. 28 September 1624. Grant to Dr. Winniff, the prince's chaplain, of the deanery of Gloucester. Le.Neve. Fasti...Gloucester. p. 45. 2 October 1624. Thomas Winiff presented by king. [ie by letters patent under king's seal].

<sup>63</sup> PRO. SO3/9. August 1628. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Oxford. to elect Richard Corbett. Passed the seal at Westminster on the 20 September 1628. Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. II. p. 280.; PRO. LC5/132. 9 July 1628. A letter to Dr. Winniff to wait in the month of January...; Ibid. 15 July 1628. A letter to Dr. Winniff, Dean of Gloucester, to wait in the month of March...; Ibid. 3 Jan 1629. A warrant to swear Mr. Dr. Winniff, Dean of Gloucester, a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>64</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 79. 23 June 1634. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.



progress there in 1634, when a vacancy in ordinary service appeared in September 1635 he was immediately appointed to it.<sup>65</sup> In both these cases Marsh had by-passed the normal normal paths of promotion; and although it is not clear who it was that actually gave him the chance to preach before the king, that it was his interest which brought his appointment is self-evident from the record which was made of his appearances of him, and is confirmed by the fact that at the time he was appointed chaplain the chamberlain was away from the Court at Lyndhurst, with the warrant having to be sent to him there.<sup>66</sup> In this case at least Montgomery knew nothing of the promotion until after the decision to appoint had already been made, with his role in the event being restricted to the formality of countersigning the warrant of appointment.

However, whilst the king retained control of advancements in ordinary, this did not signify that there was a complete lack of action on the part of patrons; what it did mean, though, was that it was restricted to bringing clients into the orbit of the king and if possible of getting him to notice them rather than being based upon direct intervention, which meant that as with Montgomery they had to confront the difficulties established by the personal preferences of the king. And apart from the two appointments orchestrated by Montgomery himself, in only one other case is there any evidence of a minister being involved in securing the appointment of a chaplain in ordinary before he had regularly appeared before the king as an extraordinary chaplain, this being in that of Christopher Potter, who had been promoted by Lord Keeper Coventry.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> PRO. LC5/134. 11 September 1635. A warrant to swear Richard Marsh a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. 11 September 1635. A warrant to swear Richard Marsh a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>67</sup> Despite earlier subscribing to a more radical Calvinism, Potter was by 1630 a firm supporter of the king's Proclamation for the Peace and Quiet of the Church. Whilst Laud's assertion that " Lord Keeper Coventry was his [Potter's] means " is confirmed in that in the election of a new Chancellor of Oxford after the death of Pembroke on 10 April 1630 he backed neither the Pembroke's younger brother, Montgomery, nor Bishop Laud, but Lord Keeper Coventry.; PRO. LC5/132. 13

Therefore whilst there may have been a degree of influence on the part of courtiers the proportion appointed by this means was not likely to have been high, for with Charles believing that Crown patronage should be seen as coming directly from him he preferred to act directly rather than through intermediaries.<sup>68</sup> This was one means by which Charles managed to gain a firm grip over the appointment of his chaplains in ordinary, and was further shaped through his additional requirement that all candidates should at least in part be already known to him, which when added to the fact that he possessed a fixed idea of the type of person which he wanted to promote severely restricted the freedom of action of such patrons as the Earl of Montgomery and Lord Keeper Coventry in the choice of cleric they could prefer, the king's influence thereby in a sense acting as a filter on all ecclesiastical appointments. Despite this evidence that it was the king who was the principal influence upon who was appointed chaplain in ordinary, and that a few officers had been able to take advantage of this, all blame at the time was laid upon William Laud, who at his trial in 1644 was accused by the lord chamberlain's secretary, Michael Oldisworth, of having taken upon himself the appointment of chaplain, and of undermining the traditional

---

January 1632. A warrant to swear Dr. Christopher Potter a chaplain in ordinary in the place of Dr. Daniel Price, Dean of Hereford, deceased.; -Works of William Laud. Vol. IV. p. 295.; Ibid., Vol. III. Diary. p. 211. 10 April 1630.; Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists. p. 79.; Coventry may also have been responsible for the appointment of Gilbert Sheldon, who had been his personal chaplain, although there is no additional evidence for this. PRO. LC5/134. 10 April 1636. Warrant to swear Dr. Sheldon as a chaplain in ordinary. DNB, sub Gilbert Sheldon. Sheldon was one of the chaplains who Charles requested whilst awaiting trial in 1647. BL. Egerton 2618. 27 November 1647. Isle of Wight. Charles Rex - General Thomas --Fairfax.

<sup>68</sup> Hence it was only in August 1639 when Charles wished to bolster his support, and amid rumours of his imminent return that Wentworth at last managed to secure Watts's appointment as a chaplain in.; PRO. LC5/134. 28 February 1639. Warrant to swear Dr. William Watts a chaplain in ordinary upon the death of Dr. Micklethwaite.; HMC, Third Report. (1872). Vol. III. p. 77. 21 August 1639. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

rights of the chamberlain, thereby grasping this important hub of Church patronage. In this his principal charge related to the change in the type of warrant sent to the chamberlain in relation to the appointment of chaplains, arguing that these were now in form "to will and require", rather than a recommendation as had previously been the case, and he asserted that this alteration had been made without consulting the king. Rather than Laud, given his concern for power and the large part which he played in their appointment, it seems much more likely to have been Charles himself who ordered this alteration; and underlining the king's personal involvement, Laud replied, "tis hard to deny the king to hear men preach before they be sworn his chaplains...if his Majesty desire it, since it argues a great care in the King".<sup>69</sup> And he noted approvingly the idea that "none might be put about him [the King] in that service but such as himself should approve of".<sup>70</sup> But whilst Laud clearly supported the king's initiative in taking patronage back into his own hands, this does not signify that he was responsible for it. Being in the early stages of the Civil War, and a time of great danger, many were reticent about their true part concerning appointments, and given popular perceptions Laud was an ideal scapegoat, caught between saving himself and protecting the king. As whilst Laud does not actually assert that it was the king who altered the form of warrants, it was clearly him who had taken the initiative in the alteration, and the very fact that he did not name who was responsible may in itself be revealing given the firm support which he otherwise gave to the plan. Although it is impossible to be absolutely certain in every case, it seems reasonably clear that the decision to appoint chaplains in ordinary had in effect been transferred into the hands of the king whilst in theory remaining in the gift of the chamberlain.

There was, however, a second layer of patronage, being that of the appointment of chaplains extraordinary, who were to be in reserve in case of requirement. At first sight the case here could not appear more different, both in their numbers and in the diversity of patrons involved. There were some 72 vacancies here as opposed to 27 in ordinary; and whilst there is no indication of the chamberlain having any real influence

---

<sup>69</sup>  
IV. p. 295.

Works of William Laud. Vol.

<sup>70</sup>

Ibid., p. 295.

over appointments in ordinary, in relation to the chaplains extraordinary he was able to advance clerics on behalf of such figures as the Earls of Holland and Dorset, and the Countesses of Denbigh and Essex, as well as for himself.<sup>71</sup> The importance of this is marred somewhat, however, due to the fact that the position was of very little importance in itself in anything but name, and that none of those appointed for these figures entered ordinary service, which perhaps indicates why it was that Charles allowed him this freedom.

The importance of this patronage to the chamberlain lay not so much in the office itself but in the fact that it was potentially a step to higher things through offering a means of gaining a preaching slot before the king, the chamberlain in theory being able to implement a second level of patronage through his right and duty to supply alternatives if a chaplain in ordinary was ill or unable to attend. These were only potential powers, though, for they were limited in their value though the king's retention of the decision to appoint them in ordinary and his propensity to go over the chamberlain's head. This is clearly demonstrated through following the cases of a number of people appointed as extraordinary chaplains.

John Dowle had been appointed a chaplain in extraordinary on 14 January 1630 on behalf of one of Montgomery's Welsh relations, but he was still a chaplain extraordinary in 1641, as was Harrington Butler, appointed by Montgomery on 17 May 1630, neither of whom had ever preached before the king. Another, John Elby, who had been sworn a chaplain extraordinary on 2 September 1629, was more lucky, for when in April 1636 two vacancies of chaplains in ordinary occurred through a death and a preferment, and with Montgomery having " had so good experience of your sufficiency and full abilities ", he wrote to him to fill the vacancy.<sup>72</sup> However, despite the support of Montgomery, as well as actually having preached before the king, it is clear that Elby did not enter ordinary service, again in 1641 still being

---

<sup>71</sup> This is derived from the Lord Chamberlain's warrant books: PRO. LC5/134. and PRO. LC5/132.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 2 September 1629. Warrant to swear Mr Elby a chaplain extraordinary. PRO. LC5/134. 15 April 1636. Copy of a letter from the Earl of Montgomery - Mr Elby.

recorded as a chaplain extraordinary.<sup>73</sup> The cases of those advanced by the king, though, could not be more different. Walter Raleigh and Griffin Higgs both had royal connections through their relations with Charles's sister, the Queen of Bohemia, and both managed to enter ordinary service through his means. Raleigh had been appointed as a chaplain in extraordinary on 29 March 1633, and being appointed to serve in the room of Dr. Duppa, who had recently been appointed as tutor to the Prince of Wales, had by June 1637 been appointed a chaplain in ordinary.<sup>74</sup> The case of Griffin Higgs was similar, who being sworn as a chaplain extraordinary at the king's command on 21 October 1638 was ordered at the same time to attend the following January, and was appointed a chaplain in ordinary on 4 July 1639.<sup>75</sup> The chief influence here would clearly seem to have been the royal one, and this is confirmed in other examples where the king's involvement is more clearly expressed. Thomas Howell was appointed as a chaplain extraordinary at the king's command on 30 September 1628 after he had heard him preach at Hampton Court, and by a letter dated 15 January 1630 he was both ordered to attend in October and appointed a chaplain in ordinary in the place of Dr. Primrose, deceased.<sup>76</sup> Yet another example is William Paul, whose appointment as a chaplain extraordinary in November 1637 was procured by Dr. Steward, the Clerk of the Closet, a sure indication of the involvement of the king; and who was on 5 November 1639 sworn as a chaplain in ordinary and

---

<sup>73</sup> PRO. LC3/1. 1641. List of chaplains, extraordinary.

<sup>74</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 29 March 1633. Warrant to swear Raleigh as a chaplain extraordinary; PRO. LC5/134. 30 March 1635. " Letter to Walter Raleigh to wait in May in the room of Dr. Duppa..."; CSPD, 1637. p. 195. Petition to the king in which Raleigh is mentioned as a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>75</sup> PRO. LC5/134. 21 October 1638. Order to swear Griffin Higgs as a chaplain extraordinary; Ibid., 4 July 1639. Warrant to swear Dr. Griffin Higgs, Dean of Lichfield, a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>76</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 30 September 1628. Warrant to swear Mr Howell a chaplain extraordinary; Ibid., 15 January 1630. Warrant to swear Thomas Howell a chaplain in ordinary. Ibid., 15 January 1630. Letter to Dr. Howell to wait in October in the place of Dr. Primrose.

appointed to serve in that month in the place of Dr. Warburton.<sup>77</sup> Charles's patronage in relation to his chaplains extraordinary is therefore remarkably similar to that relating to those in ordinary service; for whilst here too the Earl of Montgomery ought theoretically to have retained some degree of influence, with the king continually going over his head in filling vacancies and in only appointing his own candidates in ordinary it is clear that his role was being seriously undermined. The important question is why was the king doing this ?

It could be argued that like James, Charles had a dislike of new faces, and that his promotion of those whom he had taken a liking to and heard before represented nothing more than this. That this was not the case, though, is shown in that the make-up of his chaplains in ordinary was constantly changing; not only because of deaths, but also due to the fact that believing a churchman should be resident in his diocese, once appointed to a bishopric the incumbent had to surrender his place as chaplain in ordinary. There is some difficulty in tracing the complete number of vacancies in Charles's reign because of the fact that the lord chamberlain's warrant books only begin in 1628, but of the 26 appointments recorded at least 24 of the vacancies were caused by the promotion of chaplains to bishoprics.<sup>78</sup> Of the others, only five were caused by death and one by removal.<sup>79</sup> In some cases the cause of the vacancy is clearly given, as with that of Dr. John Sterne, who was appointed chaplain

---

<sup>77</sup> PRO. LC5/134. 2 November 1637.  
Warrant to swear Dr. William Paul a chaplain  
extraordinary.

<sup>78</sup> From PRO. LC5/132 and PRO.  
LC5/134. Lord Chamberlain's warrant books, 1628-1641.

<sup>79</sup> It is uncertain whether David Dolben (appointed to Bangor November 1631), Dr John Bancroft (appointed to Oxford May 1632), George Coke (appointed to Bristol, November 1632), Augustine Lindsell (appointed to Peterborough, December 1632), or Edmund Griffith (appointed to Bangor, December 1633), were chaplains in ordinary. If they were, then the percentage is even greater. Those who died were:- Dr. Sutton (October 1629), Dr. Raymond (January 1632), Dr. Brooke (January 1632), Dr. Daniel Price (January 1632) and Dr. Bates (March 1632). Dr. Warburton was removed by the king's order in November 1639 for an undisclosed reason. PRO. LC5/134. 6 November. Earl of Montgomery - Dr. Warburton.

in ordinary " upon the remove of Dr. Towers to be Bishop of Peterborough ".<sup>80</sup> In other cases, though, this connection is more difficult to make, as it was common practice when a vacancy arose to bring forward the time of waiting of a chaplain already appointed in ordinary rather than appointing directly to a vacancy. This occurred upon the promotion of Dr. Warner to the Bishopric of Rochester in November 1637, whose replacement as chaplain in ordinary was Dr. James Rowlandson; but perhaps because his month of waiting of January was already so near, it was filled instead by Peter Heylin, whose month of August was then assigned to Rowlandson, thereby giving him nearly a whole year to prepare for his attendance.

<sup>81</sup> Despite these problems in reconstructing the exact chain of events behind each appointment, with those Charles promoted to bishoprics being almost invariably from amongst his chaplains in ordinary the broad trend that vacancies were caused by promotions rather than deaths, together with the fact that their number were constantly changing, is clear to see. So rather than Charles having surrounded himself with a static group of like-minded ecclesiastics, his interest in and observation of his chaplains before appointing them to bishoprics constituted a broad system of royal scrutiny, which allowed him a degree of control akin to personal rule in a large ecclesiastical system over which personal control was otherwise very difficult.

In this context, within the royal chapel itself there were a number of additional posts which seemed to have formed a kind of fast-track or alternative route to higher preferment - these being the almonership, the Clerk of the Closet and the Dean of the Chapel Royal. All of these included close contact with the king, which in allowing him a means of further scrutinising candidates, established the degree of trust necessary for him to appoint them to more influential positions more quickly than would otherwise have been the case. George Mountain served as almoner from 1625 and went on to become Archbishop of York, while his replacement in 1628, Francis

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 2 December 1638. Warrant to swear Dr John Sterne a chaplain in ordinary.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 3 November 1637. Letter to Dr. Heylin to change his month of waiting to January.; Ibid., 12 November 1637. Warrant to swear Dr. James Rowlandson a chaplain in ordinary.; Ibid., 30 October 1637. Letter to Dr Rowlandson to wait in May.

White, was subsequently appointed to Norwich, a See which Laud later informed the Queen of Bohemia Charles felt required " a man whom he might trust...".<sup>82</sup> More important, however, were the posts of Clerk of the Closet and Dean of the Chapel Royal. Richard Neile had held the position of Clerk of the Closet since 1603 and under Charles was appointed in quick succession Bishop of Winchester and Archbishop of York, Laud had temporarily served as a stand-in for Neile as Clerk of the Closet in 1625 and went on to become Dean of the Chapel Royal, Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, whilst William Juxon served as Clerk of the Closet, Dean of the Chapel and was subsequently appointed lord treasurer.<sup>83</sup> Matthew Wren followed a similar career pattern, being translated to the sees of Norwich and Ely whilst serving as Clerk of the Closet and Dean of the Royal Chapel, and in the words of Heylyn " questionless had mounted higher had the times been favourable...".<sup>84</sup> As a consequence of this where appointments to deaneries, bishoprics and other such posts had before been accessible to other patrons, Charles's personal selection of candidates ensured that personal or political influence on its own was no longer sufficient as patronage took on a new form in which the principal

---

<sup>82</sup> Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. I. p. 58. 19 May 1625. Power for George Mountain...the king's almoner.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. pp. 175, 226.; PRO. SO3/9. July 1628. A grant of the place of his majesty's chief almoner unto the Bishop of Carlisle... By order and procured Bishop of Bath and Wells.; CSPD, 1635. p. 375. 11 September 1635. Croydon. Archbishop Laud - Queen of Bohemia.

<sup>83</sup> Bickersteth and Dunning, Clerks of the Closet. pp. 18-19.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 161. 17 April 1625.; Ibid., p. 196. 20 September 1626.; Ibid., p. 215. 10 July 1632.; Ibid., p. 218. 4 August 1633.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VII. p. 268. Royal Assent for Laud's appointment as Bishop of London.; PRO. LC5/132. 24 September 1633. Dr Juxon...sworn Dean of the Royal Chapel.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 482. 6 March 1636. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.

<sup>84</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 27 October 1633. Matthew Wren sworn Clerk of the Closet.; PRO. LC5/134. 6 March 1636. Matthew Wren sworn Dean of the Chapel.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 264.



objective was that of achieving a preaching spot of some form or another before the king.

Nowhere can the personal nature of Charles's promotions be seen more closely than in relation to his appointments to deaneries, of which there were 33 during the period 1625 and 1640. Indicating the importance of this post as a halfway house to a bishopric 19 were caused by the promotion of the previous incumbent (5 being appointed to better deaneries, and 14 to bishoprics), and 14 by death, with 6 of those who Charles appointed himself since coming to the throne being promoted to bishoprics. Charles clearly took an interest in personally selecting his chaplains, and that of the 33 changes of deaneries 27 involved chaplains in ordinary is firm evidence that they, too, were shaped around his chaplains in ordinary; and through a correlation between a vacancy occurring and the time of personal attendance upon the king there is also evidence to suggest that even within this group decisions were shaped by the king's personal involvement. That this should have been the case appears to have been a combination of Charles's personal involvement in the selection procedure, his notion that such grants should be rewards for service, and that they should be seen as coming directly from him rather than through any intermediary.

In this the exceptions prove the rule, as in every case of those appointed who were not chaplains in ordinary, especially where there is firm evidence of patron intervention, the onus was upon the patron and client to make a case as to why they should be rewarded by the Crown - for Charles evidently saw patronage more as a reward for services rendered rather than an incentive for support in the future.

Isaac Bargrave (appointed Dean of Canterbury on 10 October 1625) had been one of Charles's chaplains whilst prince, John Hassall (appointed Dean of Norwich 4 July 1628) and Griffin Higgs (appointed Dean of Lichfield on 22 October 1638) had served served as a chaplains to Charles's sister, Elizabeth, Augustine Lindsell (appointed Dean of Lichfield on 10 September 1628) and Thomas Comber (appointed Dean of Carlisle on 28 August 1629) both had close connections with the Clerk of the Closet, Richard Neile, and had therefore most probably already preached before the king, whilst Griffith Williams (appointed Dean of Bangor in February 1634) would also have been known to the king through his involvement in organising the waiting

times and swearing in of chaplains as personal chaplain to the Earl of Montgomery.<sup>85</sup>

All these examples of non-chaplains appointed to deaneries clearly demonstrate the fact that although preferments could indeed be sought through the intervention of patrons, the actual appointment itself was made by the king and upon his own terms, usually requiring not only some knowledge of the grantee but also a demonstration of past service for which this would serve as a reward. But whilst these dual factors were especially important in relation to the appointment of non-chaplains, of whom Charles was less likely to have been aware, they are confirmed by the appointments Charles made from amongst those that were; for whilst as chaplains they would clearly have been known to the king, therefore potentially making it easier for patrons to intervene, he clearly preferred to depend upon his own judgment, with there being relatively few cases involving patrons and often specific reasons explaining their intervention.

William Peterson had been backed by the Earl of Carlisle in his translation from Carlisle to Exeter (completed in July 1629), but had only recently returned from

---

<sup>85</sup> The main information for these and subsequent appointments are from the Signet Office docket books 1625-1638 (PRO. SO3/8-11). Only any additional sources are listed.; CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 550. 10 October 1625. Grant to Dr. Bargrave of the Deanery of Canterbury.; PRO. LC2/6. p. 41. 1625. List of Charles's chaplains as prince.; DNB, sub Bargrave.; CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 486. Minute of a petition of the Rev. Mr Hassall - Charles I.; Lindsell was Neile's chaplain. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 228.; Comber was close to Lord Cottington and Matthew Wren (Charles's servants as prince), who acted as an intermediary with Neile for Richard Montagu. PRO. SO3/10. September 1631. Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, granted to Thomas Comber. Upon signification of the king's pleasure by Lord Cottington, and by him procured. It was unusual for Cottington to involve himself directly in such grants.; G. Ornsby, ed., The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., lord bishop of Durham, together with other papers illustrative of his life and times. Surtees Society. Vol. 52. (London, 1868). p. 90. 19 May 1626. Richard Montagu - John Cosin.; Ibid., p. 96. 28 June 1626. Same - Same.; DNB, sub Griffith Williams.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 273. 25 June 1629. Winton House. Benjamin Laney - ?.; For Williams's involvement in the appointment of chaplains see PRO. LC5/132. 4 July 1628.

serving him on his " extraordinary ambassage into Italy " and was waiting upon the king as a chaplain in ordinary when it became vacant in February 1628, whilst Dr. Brian Duppa, who was supported by the Earl of Dorset in his appointment as Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (completed in October 1628), had only recently preached a Lent Sermon before the king when the decision to promote the previous incumbent, Matthew Corbet, to the Bishopric of Oxford had been made in early April 1628.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> For Peterson's connections with Carlisle through Bishop Hall see Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 71-2.; PRO. LC5/132. 25 March 1628. Whitehall. Earl of Montgomery - Mr Robert Peterson.; Carlisle left England April/May 1628 and returned in January 1629, after which he was frequently with the king.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 81. 20 April 1628. Exchange. John Hope - ?.; Ibid., p. 169. 19 June 1628. Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 115. 21 January 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Thomas Puckering.; The conge d'elire for Barnabas Potter (the Dean of Exeter's) appointment as Bishop of Carlisle was issued in February 1629.; For Dorset's and Duppa see Works of William Laud. Vol. IV. p. 292.; David L. Smith, ' Catholic, Anglican or Puritan ? Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset and the ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England ', in TRHS. 6th Series. Vol. 2. p. 114.; PRO. LC5/132. f. 2. List of Lent Preachers, 1628.; Corbet resigned as a chaplain in April, perhaps prompted by knowledge of his promotion. Ibid., 28 April 1628. Whitehall. Earl of Montgomery - Dr. Hampden.

In these cases where patrons were involved in seeking office on the behalf of clients timing was secondary only to the importance of the king actually having some knowledge of them and a reason for rewarding them. But with Charles preferring to retain patronage in his own hands such direct influence was rare, and in the vast majority of cases there was no direct intervention by patrons, and here the timing of vacancies and of appearing before the king as chaplain or Lent Preacher were the essential factors, with there being many such examples which demonstrate this direct influence on the part of the king. Thomas Winiff (appointed Dean of St. Pauls on 8 April 1631) had been waiting before the king for a whole month when news came through of the death of the present incumbent Dr. John Donne at the end of March 1631, Christopher Potter (appointed Dean of Worcester on 31 December 1635) was waiting before him when the decision to appoint Roger Mainwaring (the present incumbent) Bishop of St. David's had been made in September 1635, Samuel Fell (translated from Lichfield to Oxford in June 1638) had recently preached before him during Lent and been waiting as chaplain when the decision to promote the present dean (Dr. Duppa) appears to have been made in April, as had Dr. Henry King (appointed Dean of Rochester in January 1639) in the light of the decision to translate Walter Balcanquhall to Durham in early 1639.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 6. 8 April 1631. Charles I. - Bishop of London, President, and the Chapter of St. Pauls.; PRO. LC5/132. 15 July 1628. Dr. Winiff to wait in March...and yearly in that month.; Winiff appeared as a Lent preacher on 5 April. Ibid., f. 3v. List of Lent Preachers, 1631.; Le Neve, Fasti...St. Paul's. p. 28.; Le Neve, Fasti...Worcester. p. 111.; Field's translation from St. David's to Hereford (and therefore Mainwaring's and Potter's) had been planned for September 1635, but was then held up until December.; PRO. LC5/134. f. 5v. 1635. List of chaplains that wait monthly. September, Dr. Christopher Potter.; Ibid., f. 5. List of Lent Preachers, 1638. 23 February, 1638. Samuel Fell.; Ibid., f. 53. 14 February 1635. Dr. Fell to change his month of waiting from June to April.; PRO. C115/N4/8623. 14 March 1638. John Burroughs - Viscount Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; PRO. LC5/134. f. 5v. List of chaplains, 1635-1639.; CSPD, 1639. p. 164. 13 May 1639. Charles I. - President and Chapter of Durham.

Almost invariably selecting selecting his deans from amongst his own chaplains in ordinary, and in those cases where he appointed non-chaplains clearly having some prior knowledge of their character, Charles can be seen to have played a key role in shaping these promotions. And whilst it is sometimes possible to discern the influence of patrons, it must be remembered that whilst their interventions are highly visible in comparison to those of the king, his influence was clearly much more important than theirs, making it by no means certain that their backing was always as influential or as important as is usually imagined, especially when in other cases the direct role of the king is so clear to see. This, together with the nature of the evidence means that whilst it is impossible to be completely certain in every case, it is nevertheless clear that the king played a much more central role in the distribution of this aspect of Church patronage than is usually held to be the case. However, it remains to be seen whether this merely reflected a propensity in Charles to appoint those before him in the shape of his chaplains or whether it actually reflected a real interest in shaping the Church as a whole. This problem can be resolved through looking at his appointments and translations of bishoprics.

In relation to the appointment of bishops Charles made his position clear the moment he came to the throne, declaring " that neither money nor favour shall carry away either a place of judicature, bishopric, or office in the kingdom ".<sup>88</sup> Whilst this was in great contrast to what had gone on under James I. it was not the only change; for as would be expected given their importance in the administration of the Church, the care which Charles took in appointments to chaplains and deaneries is mirrored in his selection of bishops, and is demonstrated in a letter of William Laud, who informed Wentworth in 1635 how that it was now impossible to get any man appointed a bishop " unless he can get to come into Court service, and be the king's [chaplain] in ordinary. For that rule the king hath set to himself - he will prefer no stranger as long as he hath fit men of his own that are in some measure known unto him ".<sup>89</sup> Whilst this could be dismissed as a mere excuse on the part of Laud, it in

---

<sup>88</sup> NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1335. 29 April 1625. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>89</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 102. 12 January 1635. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord

fact appears to have been the case, for out of the fifty alterations to bishoprics during the period 1625-1640 twenty three were appointments, of which eighteen went to chaplains in ordinary. Charles therefore clearly kept as firm a grip on the appointment of bishops as he did in other elements of Church patronage; but this was not the only patronage involved in relation to this office, for on top of these appointments there were twenty-five translations. All of these were caused by the death of a previous incumbent, for it appears that Charles did not enter into translations without cause, perhaps as a consequence of the fact that in September 1616 it had been the opinion of the king's advocate, F. Rives, that it was " against the power of the king to translate bishops for other sees, without the consent of the parties ".<sup>90</sup> But whilst Charles may have had a de-facto rule only to appoint his own chaplains in ordinary to bishoprics these considerations would not by definition have applied to the same extent in relation to translations, for he would clearly have known all of his bishops to some extent. But whilst this gave a potentially greater scope for the intervention of patrons than in other areas Charles had evidently not weakened his grip on patronage, for even here there is evidence to suggest that he retained a major role in the decision making process.

As it is always the exceptions to any rule which prove the most interesting the first task in relation to any claim that Charles played a personal role in the appointment of bishops through his chaplains in ordinary must be to check his relations with those who were not; of which despite Laud's claim that he only appointed his own chaplains in ordinary there are seven examples. In every case, though, there are additional factors which explain why this should have been the case. The patronage of the bishopric of the Isle of Man (successively granted to William Foster and Richard Parre in February 1634 and June 1635) belonged to the Earl of Derby and not the king, Edmund Griffith (appointed Bishop of Bangor in December 1633) was a relation of the present bishop (one of Charles's chaplains as prince, David Dolben), the former Lord Keeper, John Williams (who at one stage appears to have played an

---

Deputy ----Wentworth.

<sup>90</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 396. September 1616. F. Rives - Archbishop of Canterbury.

important role in introducing Welsh clerics to the young Prince of Wales) and one of the present lord chamberlain's chaplains (Griffith Williams, who played an important role in the chamberlain's duties of arranging the king's chaplains), and was therefore likely to have been known if not preached before the king, Dr. John Bancroft (appointed Bishop of Oxford in April/May 1632) was the nephew of Archbishop Bancroft and was "looked upon for his sake chiefly", George Coke (elected Bishop of Bristol on 28 November 1632) was the brother of Secretary Coke and evidently had preached before the king through the influence of the late Clerk of the Closet, Richard Neile, as most likely had Augustine Lindsell (consecrated Bishop of Peterborough in February 1633), who had been Neile's chaplain when he was Bishop of Durham.<sup>91</sup>

In those cases where Charles was left with an element of choice it can be seen that none of those appointed in this way were unknown to him, thereby confirming the idea that Charles's adherence to the promotion of his chaplains was principally because it offered the most efficient means through which he could exert a degree of personal control over appointments rather than because of any set administrative

---

<sup>91</sup> HMC, Twelfth Report. (1889).  
[Hereafter Cowper]. Appendix II., II. p. 440. 3  
September 1633. Bagshot. Sir Henry Vane - Secretary  
Coke.; Ibid., p. 29. 4 September 1633. Coke - Earl of  
Derby and Lord Strange.; Ibid., p. 31. 24 [sic 4th]  
September 1633 Fulham. Archbishop Laud - Secretary  
Coke.; Ibid., p. 31. 18 September 1633. Earl of Derby  
and Lord Strange - Coke.; D. R. Thomas, The History of  
St. Asaph. Vol. I. (Oswestry, 1908).; DNB, sub Dolben.;  
Williams had intervened for Owen Gwynn, and Theodore  
Price. Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 150. 15  
June 1621. Greenwich. Sir Richard Wynn - Sir John Wynn.;  
Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 206.; DNB, sub  
Bancroft.; Cowper, I p. 342. 29 April 1628. Westminster  
College. Dr. Newell - George Coke. Newell (Newhall) was  
Neile's brother-in-law. CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 265. 25 May  
1625. Richard Neile - Francis Windebanke.; Lindsell's  
conge d'elire was prepared in October, but did not pass  
the seal until December. BCL. DV.888/602426/21. 14  
December 1632.; M. Jansson and W.B. Bidwell, eds.,  
Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. (Yale, 1987). Commons  
Debates. p. 325. 6 July 1625. Examination of Richard  
Montagu before the house.

process or rule. This aspect of Charles's patronage is most clearly expressed by looking at examples of how it was that he actually came to select a chaplain in order to fill a vacant bishopric, where it can be demonstrated that there was a marked correlation between advancement to a bishopric and appearing before the king as a chaplain at the point when the decision to make an appointment was made.

Joseph Hall (appointed Bishop of Exeter in October 1627) had been preaching before the king when the decision to appoint a replacement to Valentine Cary had been made in July 1626, Francis White (translated from Carlisle to Norwich in January 1629) and Barnabas Potter (who had been appointed Bishop of Carlisle in his place in February) had both been preaching before him in November when the death of Archbishop Mountain and the decision to replace him with Bishop Harsnet of Norwich had been made, as had Dr. John Bowle (appointed Bishop of Rochester in November/December 1629) when the decision to translate the present incumbent (Walter Curle) to the bishopric of Bath and Wells had been made in late September or early October 1629.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Cary died on 10 June 1626. There was speculation early in July that Leonard Mawe was to be appointed, but by August Montagu was writing "Dr. Mawe is off, Dr. Hall is on". The subsequent delay was caused by the need for money from vacant bishoprics; Correspondence of John Cosin. p. 101. Note.; Ibid., p. 99. July 1626. Richard Montagu - John Cosins.; Ibid., p. 101. 26 August 1626. Westminster. Same - Same.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 84v. 1 July 1626. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. pp. 174-5.; Hall's month of waiting was July. PRO. LC5/132. 13 June 1628. Whitehall. Earl of Montgomery - Humphry Peake. Order to wait in July in the place of Dr. Hall.; Mountain died on 24 October 1628. Le Neve, Fasti...York. p. 2.; White preached before Charles on 5 November, the day before Harsnet's conge d'elire for York was issued. --S.R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 1628-1660. (Oxford, 1897). p. 14.; That Potter waited in November appears from Montgomery's order for Anthony Tyrringham to "wait in November next". PRO. LC5/132. 1 December 1628.; Leonard Mawe, the Bishop of Bath and Wells had died on 2 September. Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. Pt. I. p. 260. Note.; PRO. LC5/132. f. 15 January 1630. Letter to Dr. Beale to wait in September in the place of the Dean of Sarum, bishop elect of Rochester.



This central role of the king in Church patronage fits in with other evidence now emerging over other Church matters, such as the imposition of the Prayer Book in Scotland and the placing of the altar table in England, and adds as much to our understanding of Laud as it does the king himself.<sup>93</sup> For whilst Laud is usually portrayed as grasping all the available patronage in an attempt to bolster the Arminian party, in truth he was not a great supporter of young clergy and never established a following of his own within the Church like Neile or Andrewes had done under James; and always uncertain of his position, was in fact very cautious of how he used his influence, avoiding intervention on the behalf of others and preferring to act alone. Richard Montagu, exasperated in 1624 at the lack of use which Laud was making of his connections with Buckingham on his behalf, declared upon the death of the Bishop of Gloucester that he must act for himself "now and in such cases put for the Church with the Duke, and use his great credit, that we be not swallowed up with a puritan bishopriqy...".<sup>94</sup> However, if Laud did not wield such a degree of influence then there must be some way of explaining the cause of the perception that he did, and this can be found partly in the historiography of the subject and partly in the type of evidence which is available.

When in the 1628 parliament Laud was explaining his part in the decision to publish Roger Mainwaring's sermon, he had explained that it was solely "by his majesty's command", in which argument he was defended by the Earl of Montgomery, who "affirmed upon his honour that he was then present at Woodstock and heard his majesty command the Bishop of Bath and Wells to cause the said book to be printed; and that the said bishop desired his Majesty to think better of it, for that there were

---

<sup>93</sup> Kevin Sharpe, The Personal Rule of Charles I. pp. 334-5, 785.; Davies, Caroline Captivity. p. 246.

<sup>94</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. pp. 59-60.; Henry Isaacson, 'An exact narration of the Life and Death of the Late Reverend and learned Prelate, and painful Divine, Lancelot Andrewes...', pp. i-xxix, in Bliss, ed., Works of Lancelot Andrewes. Vol. II. pp. xvi/xvii.; Correspondence of John Cosin. p. 22. 24 October 1624. Richard Montagu - John Cosin.

many things therein which will be very distasteful to the people ".<sup>95</sup> By the time of the Long and Short Parliaments, though, there was a very different political situation as people acted in defence of themselves and the constitution through placing the blame for bringing matters to such a head not upon the king but such ministers as Laud who had been most loyal to his cause. So rather than the true extent of the king's role coming out at this time, such figures as Laud were used as political scapegoats in the hope that with all problems attributed to them their removal would allow the immediate political crisis to pass without the need to resort to more drastic constitutional change. This tendency to remove the political middle ground as a forerunner to sacrificing political scapegoats was not new or even restricted to the seventeenth century, but because of the underlying problems consequent upon Charles's propensity to demand absolute obedience to what he dictated it was extremely easy to play upon this at this time, with the perceptions formed at this time playing a disproportionate part in shaping our views of the religious patronage of this period. For whilst all contemporaries were pre-disposed at this time to believe that Laud was responsible for all unpopular promotions, the basic evidence available to the historian is not of a form to contradict such a notion.

Most of the accounts of Laud's influence over Church patronage have stemmed from the work of his biographer Peter Heylyn, whose chief source outside what he remembered from his own memory (itself suspect enough) appears to have been the Signet Office docketts, which despite their apparent insulation from bias must be used with considerable caution. Making a case for re-asserting the influence of William Laud as an important ecclesiastical patron, Kenneth Fincham warns of the dangers of reading too much into who procured the king's signature to grants at the Signet Office at the expense of who signified his pleasure, but the inherent dangers of this source appears to go far deeper and apply equally to those who signified the king's pleasure.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Proceedings in Parliament, 1628.  
Proceedings of the House of Lords. p. 642. 14 June 1628.  
Regarding the publishing of the sermons of Roger  
--Mainwaring.

<sup>96</sup> Kenneth Fincham, ' William Laud

This is clearly demonstrated in the proposed translation of Godfrey Goodman from Gloucester to Hereford in 1633, which was subsequently abandoned when Goodman suggested that it would allow him to return " to a private life " and requested permission to hold " the bishopric of Gloucester one year in commendam " to offset its costs.<sup>97</sup> Here, Heylyn mentions that Goodman " had so far prevailed with some great officer of state, that his election passed " before Laud came to know of it "; but from information contained in the Signet Office records it is clear that Laud had in fact been aware of this grant much earlier, having procured the king's signature to the conge d'elire and letters recommendatory for it in person.<sup>98</sup> As Soden demonstrates,

---

and the exercise of Caroline ecclesiastical patronage '.  
-Journal of Ecclesiastical History. Forthcoming. (I am grateful to Dr. R. Cust for the chance to see an advance copy of this work). Here Fincham correctly makes the important distinction that the signifier of a grant was more important than the procurer, but apparently for the wrong reasons, as he appears to have misinterpreted the meaning of the terms in that the procurer of a grant in fact did little more than secure the king's signature to something which had already been agreed upon and set in chain by the signifier (who was the one who had actually informed the Clerk of the Signet of the king's pleasure that such a grant should be made) rather than being responsible for having procured the grant itself. As the official responsible for the Clerks of the Signet, ---Fincham's argument that the secretary had taken on the role of procuring grants during the 1630s as part of Charles's protection of ministerial jurisdiction makes much more sense in the light of this, with the signifier (eg. Archbishop Laud) relaying the news of the grant within his jurisdiction to the Clerk of the Signet, and the secretary then upholding his jurisdiction through presenting it to the king for his signature. This procedure explains both the involvement of Laud and others and the role played by Charles himself.

<sup>97</sup> CSPD, 1633. p. 323. Notes by Secretary Windebank of a message from Goodman to the King.; Soden, Goodman. pp. 211-217. Allowing a Churchman to retire in a living was totally against all that Charles was trying to instil in his clergy.

<sup>98</sup> If Laud only ever signified the king's pleasure to the Signet Office this would have been the case all the time and Heylyn would not have been able to place such emphasis upon its uniqueness.

Heylyn had particular grievances against Goodman, and may well have fabricated this part of his narrative and added it to the genuine reasons for Charles's wrath in an attempt to build up the struggle at Court which Laud was supposedly entering into at this time against Weston and Cottington; or alternatively may have misinterpreted Goodman's later statement that in relation to his election he had done " nothing therein but with the approbation and encouragement of the principal officers of the Exchequer his Majesty's sworn councillors ".<sup>99</sup> But whilst neither of these factors can be totally discounted, what it really appears to represent are the restrictions of such evidence as the Signet Office provides and the misunderstandings which arise as a consequence of them in the light of Charles's silent and highly personal mode of action. As whilst there is no evidence of Goodman actually having paid Weston or Cottington for his position, in the light of the fact that he claimed to have acted with their encouragement there is further evidence of their involvement in this affair. When Goodman's appointment to Hereford had fallen through it went instead to Augustine Lindsell.<sup>100</sup> At this time Lindsell was the Bishop of Peterborough, a position which according to Heylyn he owed to the influence of Laud.<sup>101</sup> Whether or not this was actually the case, when he was questioned at his trial in 1644 about the translation of Lindsell to Hereford Laud denied any part in it, claiming that he was " preferred by the then Lord Treasurer Portland, not by me ".<sup>102</sup> Of course, it is by no means out of

---

Soden, Goodman, p. 213.; PRO. -S03/10. September 1633. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford to elect Godfrey Goodman bishop there.

<sup>99</sup> Soden, Goodman, p. 211.; PRO. SP16/491/137. 30 August 1642. Godfrey Goodman - Secretary Windebank.

<sup>100</sup> PRO. S03/10. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford to elect Augustine Lindsell bishop there. By order Archbishop of Canterbury. Subscribed Mr. Gall. Procured Secretary Windebank. Passed the Great Seal 26 February 1634. BCL. DV.888/602426/27.; PRO. S03/10. March 1634. Royal Assent for Augustine Lindsell to be Bishop of Hereford. Passed the Great Seal 1 March 1634. BCL. DV.907/604012/22.

<sup>101</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 227.

<sup>102</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol IV. p.

the question that both may in part be right, for Laud could well have played a part in Lindsell's appointment to Peterborough whilst Weston had secured his translation to Hereford, which if true, would indicate the importance of gaining access to the king was far greater than the importance of any individual patron. With Laud being indicated in the Signet Office docket as having procured Lindsell's appointment to Peterborough Heylyn's account is to an extent true; but as Laud himself argued at his trial, " the docket is a full proof of who gave order for drawing the bill at the Signet Office; but no proof at all who procured the preferment ".<sup>103</sup> So if Cottington or Weston had indeed earlier been persuaded to press the king to promote Goodman, and if the king had then worked through the normal channel of Laud, only he would be mentioned at the Signet Office and not those who were really responsible for it. As it was, though, even the involvement of Weston and Cottington may not have been what Laud felt it was; for whilst in the light of the apparent power vacuum left by Charles's silent mode of action others always over-emphasised the influence of Laud, so Laud in his turn always exaggerated the power of Weston and Cottington, with his perception of their involvement in the promotion of Lindsell to Hereford being nothing more than a consequence of the fact that they had been involved in the translation of Goodman, and even then apparently only in relation to the financial requirements of this translation relating to an outstanding debt to be paid in Hereford.

<sup>104</sup>

This also raises suspicions over such other claims as Heylyn makes, such as that relating to the translation of Walter Curle from Bath and Wells to the See of Winchester in October 1632.<sup>105</sup> Neile had originally been designed to be replaced at

---

292.

<sup>103</sup>

The king's signature for Lindsell's appointment to Peterborough was procured by Secretary Coke. That parliament did not assume that he had procured the grant itself reveals the difference between the two roles.; PRO. SO3/10. October 1632. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough to elect Augustine Lindsell bishop there. By order of the Bishop of London. Procured Secretary Coke.; Works of William Laud. Vol. IV. p. 292.

<sup>104</sup>

Soden, Goodman. p. 215.

<sup>105</sup>

This had become vacant by the

Winchester by Dr. John Howson, the Bishop of Durham, but an alternative candidate had to be found in the light of his death on the 6 February 1632.<sup>106</sup> As an important see Winchester clearly required someone with a degree of experience, and the man decided upon was Walter Curle, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who was translated on 20 October 1632.<sup>107</sup> Heylyn attributes this solely to the influence of Laud, who he says being concerned " ...to plant such a bishop in that see as might be pliant and subservient unto his desires...thought it most conducive to his peace and power to prefer Curle from Bath and Wells to the See of Winton...".<sup>108</sup> The only available evidence linking Laud to this is the Signet Office docket, showing that he had relayed the king's order; and upon closer investigation it appears much more likely to have been the work of the king. Evidence that Curle was not as close to Laud as Heylyn expressed can be found in his own source of the Signet Office docket books; for whilst Laud may have relayed the order for his appointment to Rochester in July 1628 and to Winchester in 1632, his translation to Bath and Wells had been set in motion by the order of Secretary Dorchester, and by him procured.<sup>109</sup> Whether the fact that

---

translation of Richard Neile to York in the place of Samuel Harsnet, who had died on the 25 May 1631. Le Neve, Fasti...York. p. 3.; PRO. SO3/10. November 1631. --Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of York to elect Richard Neile, Bishop of Winchster, Archbishop there. King's pleasure signified by the Bishop of London.

<sup>106</sup> CSPD,1631-1633. p. 152. 24 September 1631. Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 441. 27 October 1631. Essex House. George Gresley - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Searle, ed., Barrington Family Letters 1628-1632. p. 214. 5 November 1631. Robert Barrington - Lady Joan Barrington.; PRO. C115.M35/8392. 11 February 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; J.C. Sainty, Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642. (London,1970). p. 19.

<sup>107</sup> PRO. SO3/10. October 1632. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Winchester to elect Walter Curle, Bishop of Bath and Wells, bishop there. By order of the Bishop of London. Passed the Great Seal on the 20 October 1632. BCL. DV.888/602426/18.

<sup>108</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 227.

<sup>109</sup> PRO. SO3/9. July 1628. Conge

the action was taken by the secretary rather than Laud can be taken as an indication of the king's personal influence on its own is subject to the same reservations as refer to Heylyn's own claims; but it does nevertheless raise some doubts as to whether Laud was actually responsible for all his promotions. Inconclusive and therefore perhaps insignificant upon its own, these doubts become more significant when it is realised that Curle had been the king's chaplain in ordinary as recently as July 1628, and in an almost unprecedented state of affairs given the pressure for places, had been a Lent Preacher every year between 1628 and 1636, whilst in 1637 he had been sworn Lord Almoner in the place of Francis White, Bishop of Ely, and again served as a Lent Preacher in 1638 and 1639.<sup>110</sup> From Curle's long succession of Lent preaching it is clear that he enjoyed powerful support, something which when compared with the albeit ambiguous evidence that Laud only procured two of his three bishoprics, together with the fact that he was later appointed almoner (a position involving close attendance upon the king which Charles appears to have been using in a similar way to the positions of Clerk of the Closet and Dean of the Chapel as a fast-track to high-office), would indicate that by this point in time Curle had a much more powerful patron than Laud; and that given Charles's propensity for promoting his own chaplains and selecting for advancement from amongst those he

---

d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Rochester to elect Walter Curle bishop there. By order and procured Bishop of London.; PRO. -S03/10. October 1632. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Winchester to elect Walter -Curle bishop there. By order of the Bishop of London. Procured [blank].; PRO. S03/9. October 1629. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Winchester to elect Dr. -Curle bishop there. By order and procured Lord Viscount Dorchester.

<sup>110</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 15 July 1628. Dr. Winiff to wait in the place of Dr. Curle, elect Bishop of Rochester.; Ibid., ff. 2-5. Lent Preachers 1628-1634.; PRO. LC5/134. ff. 2, 3, 5. Lent Preachers 1635-1639.; Ibid. 12 June 1637. The Earl of Montgomery swore the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Curle, Lord Almoner at Greenwich.; PRO. S03/11. June 1637. Grant to the Bishop of Winchester of the place of king's almoner. By order of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Procured Secretary Coke.

himself had observed that this patron was almost certainly the king. This becomes even clearer when those cases where Laud did intervene are investigated more closely; for whilst he was not completely without influence, and could to an extent manipulate Charles through such buzz-words as faction, disorder and rebellion, this was clearly related more to the sphere of policy and Church administration than royal patronage.

This can be seen in the case of Dr. John Towers. Although he had been appointed Dean of Peterborough in October 1630, this was plainly well below what he had expected, for on this occasion and two others beforehand he had attempted to become bishop of that see through the means of William Laud.<sup>111</sup> If Towers had sought this preferment through Laud upon his own initiative then it could be dismissed by retorting that Laud could have already been engaged for another, but it is apparent from a letter sent from Towers to Sir John Lambe that the initiative had in fact come from Laud himself, Towers writing " what an utter discredit it will be to him in his county, when he shall be intercepted by whomsoever, now the third time after his Grace encouraged him to pitch upon that bishopric, in his house at Westminster...".<sup>112</sup> Being as engaged as he was, that Laud did not achieve his end on any of these three occasions clearly demonstrates his lack of influence in Church patronage; and rather than being in a position of power and influence, his position was in fact very weak, and he even seems to have been a little envious of the degree of influence enjoyed by the king. This can be seen in 1631, where in a letter of his to Sir John Lambe he berates him for not informing him of a vacancy in the living of Sudborough (which was in his gift as Bishop of London), complaining " though Green's Norton be almost as far from you as Towcester, yet that being in the king's

---

<sup>111</sup> PRO. SO3/10. September 1630. Deanery of Peterborough granted to Dr. John Towers. Subscribed upon signification of the king's pleasure by Viscount Dorchester, and by him procured. Passed the Great Seal 29 October 1630. Le Neve, Fasti... Peterborough. p. 119.; CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 338. 30 December 1633. Dr. John Towers - Sir John Lambe, Dean of the Arches.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 339. 30 December 1633. Dr. John Towers - Sir John Lambe, Dean of the Arches.



gift, you can give notice of it; but Sudborough being in the poor Bishop of London's gift...you can send me no word of that, though the parson of Sudborough be as dangerous sick (if he be living) as the parson of Green's Norton is...".<sup>113</sup> If Laud had been half as influential as is usually expressed, he should have been able to dispose of this living in the king's gift as well as his own; the obvious inference to be drawn from this being that Laud did not in fact wield anywhere near the degree of influence which is normally attributed to him and that with the king always acting on the behalf of his chaplains in ordinary (an area where Laud enjoyed little influence), he was forced to fall back upon such livings as fell in his own gift. Charles had had exactly the same effect in other areas of his government.

---

<sup>113</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII.  
p. 38. 14 April 1631. London House. Bishop Laud - Sir  
John --Lambe.

## Chapter 2.

### The King's Household.

With Prince Henry having been given overall responsibility for the regulation of his own household upon his creation as Prince of Wales in June 1610 attention soon after turned to Prince Charles, whose age was now similar to Henry's when he had first been given his household. In 1611 he was taken from the care of his governess (Lady Cary) and provided with an all male establishment of his own.<sup>1</sup> As Charles's household expenses were paid to Henry's cofferer, Sir David Foulis, it would appear that its management was undertaken by Henry's officials. Such oversight is also suggested by Henry's attempts to influence the selection of his officers, trying to secure the appointment of Sir James Fullerton to the key positions of master of his robes and chief gentleman and governor of his household.<sup>2</sup> It was James, however, who clearly had the last say in the appointment of his servants at this time. The obvious candidate was Sir Robert Cary, for Charles had lived under him and his wife since infancy. Cary's appointment, when recommended at the Council by Lord Chamberlain Suffolk, was readily accepted by James, Fullerton being granted the lesser positions of gentleman of the bedchamber, master of the privy purse and surveyor-general of his lands.<sup>3</sup> Despite the great interest in who had been appointed to its key positions, Charles's household was clearly chiefly concerned with the care and upbringing of the prince and unlike Prince Henry's as yet had no political role. It contained no ruling council, treasurer, cofferer or comptroller (these probably being

---

<sup>1</sup> Roy Strong, Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance. (London, 1986). p. 151.; Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 162-3, 177.; G.H. Powell, ed., Memoirs of Robert Cary, Earl of Monmouth. (London, 1905). p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 18. Warrant to pay 250l. per month to Sir David Foulis for the household expenses of the Duke of York.; Birch, Life of Henry. p. 352.; Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. . 85-9.; Birch, Life of Henry. PP. 177-8.

shared with Henry) but a number of gentlemen ushers and pages of the bedchamber, and a small compliment of cupbearers, carvers, waiters and sewers. <sup>4</sup>

Perhaps against expectations, this did not change once Charles became heir to the throne on Henry's death 6 November 1612. <sup>5</sup> Whilst there were a number of alterations in which James appears to have fulfilled his promise " to consider the servants of the late prince ", Charles was " not to exceed his ordinary in diet or followers ". <sup>6</sup> Even though it had been determined that he had inherited the title and estate of Duke of Cornwall as of right upon the death of Henry, there was no real scope for enlargement. <sup>7</sup>

These limited alterations were caused by Henry's death and by the need to emphasise Charles's newly established importance as heir to the throne rather than from any pressing administrative need. There subsequently followed a short-lived period of stability before Charles's growing maturity prompted the appointment between September 1615 and March 1616 of a chancellor (Sir Francis Bacon), solicitor (Thomas Trevor), attorney general (John Walter), treasurer and receiver general (Sir Adam Newton) and master of the wardrobe (John Villiers) and horse (Thomas Howard), whilst his tutor (Sir Thomas Murray) was by now being termed his secretary. <sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> PRO. SP14/72/108. Undated, 1613. The names of such as be of the prince's family.

<sup>5</sup> Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 220.

<sup>6</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 394. 18 December 1612. Sir William Fleetwood - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. I. p. 389. 12 November 1612. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>7</sup> M. Coate, ' The Duchy of Cornwall; its History and Administration 1640-1660 ', in TRHS. Vol. 10. Fourth Series. (London, 1927). p. 136.; CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 160. 2 December 1612. London. Isaac Wake - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>8</sup> BL. Additional 15,630. f. 65v. A table to the book of several letters patents, annuities, pensions, commissions &c., under the Great Seal of Prince Charles. 27 September 1615. Chancellor, Sir Francis Bacon. A revocation of this office was issued on the 2 April 1616 and it was granted to Sir Henry Hobart. Ibid., f. 66v.; Ibid., f. 64. 9 November 1615. Solicitor General, Thomas Trevor. Durante bene placito. This had

Although there was no set or customary age at which the heir to the throne had to be created Prince of Wales, these appointments as Charles approached the age when Henry had been created Prince of Wales inevitably led to increased speculation as to when he would take the title, until around Easter 1616 James announced his intention of creating Charles Prince of Wales later that summer.<sup>9</sup> This offered the prospect of a major enlargement in the size of his household, with changes of personnel and led to a significant increase in the number of political manoeuvrings as people jostled for the best positions. These provided a revealing insight into the factors shaping its patronage; for while James still appears to have played an important role part and Charles himself was not without influence, the chief source of influence appears to have rested with the queen.<sup>10</sup> This perhaps was demonstrated most clearly in speculation over who was to become Charles's lord chamberlain. Following their earlier dispute upon the formation of Charles's first household in 1611 Sir Robert Cary and Sir James Fullerton had continually been at odds. Fullerton realised that Charles's household would at some point in the near future have to be placed on a

---

at first been temporarily granted to Sir John -Dacombe on the 4 of November.; Ibid., f. 64. 9 November 1615. Attorney General, John Walter.; Ibid., f. 66v. 4 April 1616. Treasurer and Receiver General, Sir Adam Newton.; Ibid., f. 65v. 11 March 1616. Master of the Wardrobe, John Villiers; Ibid., f. 65v. 11 March 1616. Master of the Horse, Thomas Howard.; Ibid., f. 66v. 4 April 1616. Treasurer and Receiver General, Sir Adam Newton.; Ibid., f. 65v. 11 March 1616. Secretary, Sir Thomas Murray.

<sup>9</sup> Henry had been born on the 19 February 1594 and had been created on the 4 June 1610, aged 16 years and four months. Charles had been born on the 19 November 1600, so was by this time fifteen.; Francis Jones, 'The Historical Background to the Investiture', pp. 24-38, in Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. 1969. Pt. I. p. 26.; Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. pp. 92-3.; Charles Carlton, Charles I: The Personal Monarch. (London,1987). p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> It is possible that the queen (who saw Charles as her favourite child) was perhaps acting at the request of Charles, who subsequently using Buckingham as an intermediary with James, preferred to avoid direct confrontations with his father.; Godfrey Goodman, The Court of King James I. (London,1839). Vol. I. pp. 250-1.

new and permanent basis. The chief position of lord chamberlain was likely to go to his present governor and gentleman of the bedchamber Sir Robert Cary. Fullerton had for some time been attempting to prevent his appointment and secure that of Lord Roxborough in his place. He pointed out " how unfit it was that any man should hold both places; and that there was no example that ever prince had the like ".<sup>11</sup> At one stage it looked as though this plan was going to succeed, as at much the same time as the prince's creation was announced Fullerton apparently convinced both Charles and James of the force of his argument for Roxborough and against Cary holding a position in the bedchamber as well as the office of lord chamberlain.<sup>12</sup> However, realising what a great disgrace it would be for Cary to miss out upon this position under the prince, the whole Court being " fully persuaded that none but myself should hold the place...", yet at the same time determined " that I would not be his chamberlain, to lose my place in the bedchamber ", Cary was determined to hold on to both of his present positions.<sup>13</sup> With things fairly well advanced but not yet finalised he decided to " use the best means I could to get the place and prevent them ", significantly addressing himself to the queen, where he " told her all I knew, and how secretly it had been plotted and wrought ".<sup>14</sup> Queen Anne is usually noted for her pettiness and principally perceived as having lived " for pleasure, passing her time moving from one of the palaces assigned to her to the next ", but she was also " a cultured woman with a life and court of her own ", and her political influence should therefore not be overlooked.<sup>15</sup> As at the end of the day political pressure at this time was based upon those voices which for personal or political reasons James was least able to ignore, and by the very nature of her position the queen was in possession of just such a voice. James's legendary dislike of petitioners led to a corresponding

---

<sup>11</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. pp. 91-2.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pp. 90-92.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp. 91-2.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., pp. 91-92.

<sup>15</sup> Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 16.; B.W. Quintrell, Charles I, 1625-1640. (Harlow, 1993). p. 9.

weakness in the granting of favours, and over time he had developed many ways of overcoming it. In most cases this involved dealing with suitors through favourites such as Somerset or Buckingham (who in effect became screens which he was able to shelter behind); but when it came to household appointments he normally preferred the request to come from his wife. This not only removed the onus of making them away from him, but meant if at a later stage she should, in the words of Archbishop Abbot "complain of this dear one, he might make his answer, it is long of yourself, for you were the party that commended him unto me".<sup>16</sup> For this reason Anne regarded her role in the distribution of household patronage as more than a mere formality, and saw it as an important element within her own sphere of influence. On hearing of Cary's complaint "she could not believe that Roxburgh or his friend [Fullerton], durst or would seek so eminent a place under her son without her knowledge and consent...and told me it was true what I [Cary] had said, but bade me trouble myself no further: her wrong was more than mine, and she would right both herself and me...".<sup>17</sup> This she appears to have done with some energy, for although Roxborough was subsequently created Earl of Roxborough at much the same time as the prince was created Prince of Wales in November 1616, John Chamberlain reported a month later how he was "not well pleased to be put by the place of lord chamberlain to the prince, which he pretends was made sure account of", with confirmation that this was a consequence of the influence of the queen coming from the fact that his wife had also been dismissed from her position as chief lady-in-waiting to the queen and that he was reported as having been "sent into Scotland in her high disgrace...".<sup>18</sup> Neither is this the only example of her influence on Charles's household, for she also engineered the appointment of Cary's youngest son, Thomas, as a groom of the prince's bedchamber; and given her part in the

---

<sup>16</sup> John Rushworth, Historical Collections. Vol. I. (London, 1721). p. 456.

<sup>17</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. p. 93.

<sup>18</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 44. 21 December 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. p. 93. Cary was duly appointed lord chamberlain to the prince.

gracing of Buckingham, and the fact that most of Charles's early political actions also appear to have been taken in conjunction with her, may also have been responsible for the appointment of John Villiers.<sup>19</sup>

After being delayed a number of times over the summer Charles was finally created Prince of Wales on 4 November 1616.<sup>20</sup> No parliament was in being; but otherwise he was created in the traditional manner.<sup>21</sup> In the light of this Charles's household was once more reformed. James had by now relaxed his earlier ban upon an expansion of his servants, and a number of Prince Henry's old servants (who James had previously promised to consider for positions in Charles's household) were able to be appointed to some of the the lesser positions within his household such as that of gentleman of the privy chamber, gentleman usher daily waiters and grooms of the chamber.<sup>22</sup> Charles's old officers for the most part continued in office. There was

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 94.; PRO. LC2/5. f. 43. President of the Funeral of Queen Anne, 1619. Grooms of the bechamber of Prince Charles, Thomas Cary.; CSPD,1611-1618. p. 373. 14 June 1616. Strand. George Garrard - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Roger Lockyer, Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592-1628. (Harlow,1981). pp. 19, 38.

<sup>20</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 10. 22 June 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid. p. 25. 12 October 1616. London. Same - Same.; Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. p. 92.; PRO. SO3/6. October 1616. His majesty's charter of creation of the prince to be Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester. Procured by Mr Secretary Winwood.

<sup>21</sup> J.O. Halliwell, ed., Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., During the Reigns of James I. and Charles I. 2 Vols. (London,1845). Vol. I. p. 91.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 31. 9 November 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; BL. Stowe. 176. f. 60v. 25 November 1616. Whitehall. Sir Ralph Winwood - Sir Thomas Edmondson.

<sup>22</sup> Henry's servants were appointed as gentlemen of the privy chamber, gentlemen ushers daily waiters, gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber, grooms, grooms of the chamber, carvers and equerries. This comes from a comparison of a list of Henry's servants in Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 346-8. with that of Charles's servants in the precedents of Anne's funeral, 1619. PRO. LC2/5, and

little change in personnel or scope for the intervention of patrons. Sir Henry Vane did however replace Sir David Foulis as cofferer. Foulis had been offered the chance of re-appointment, but " thinking too meanly " of the place had sold it.<sup>23</sup> Sir Robert Douglas (who had served Prince Henry) as treasurer of the household (there having previously been no corresponding position in Charles's household) there was little change in personnel or scope for the intervention of patrons.<sup>24</sup>

Any chance of determining an alteration in who was able to wield influence in the distribution of the prince's household patronage is therefore dependent upon any subsequent alterations which took place, in which whilst the king (as in his decision to dismiss Charles's Secretary Sir Thomas Murray for the part which he had played in dissuading the prince from a Spanish marriage) maintained a regulatory role and the queen (until her death in 1619) was unlikely to have been without influence, Charles himself can be seen to have begun playing a greater part.<sup>25</sup> This may be demonstrated in the assumptions underlying the attempts of Edward Nicholas to enter his service.

Nicholas had previously moved in a similar circle to the prince, brought up in the household of the queen's solicitor (Sir Lawrence Hyde); he also had connections with Sir John Dacombe, to whom he had been secretary as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, a position to which Dacombe had been appointed through the influence of the prince.<sup>26</sup> During the summer of 1623 Nicholas was attempting to enter the

---

James's in 1625. PRO. LC2/6.

<sup>23</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 58. 8 March 1617. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 58. 8 March 1617. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>25</sup> Queen Anne died on the 2 March 1619. Birch, Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 144. 6 March 1619. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>26</sup> Donald Nicholas, Mr Secretary Nicholas 1593-1669. (London, 1955). pp. 12-13, 18; Robert Somerville, Office Holders in the Duchy and County Palatine of Lancaster from 1603. (London, 1972). p. 15.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 7. 8 June 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid. p. 25. 12 October 1616. London. Same - Same.; CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 373. 12 June 1616. London. Edward Sherburn



service of Prince Charles through the influence of his new employer, Edward Lord Zouch, the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports.<sup>27</sup> If James was still responsible for the appointment of Charles's servants or had retained an important role in their choice, the efforts of Edward and his brother Matthew would almost certainly have centred around the king's Court. But with Charles at this time in Spain conducting negotiations over his marriage to the Infanta, Matthew assured his brother that " the place you affect under the prince should not be disposed of in the absence of his highness ".<sup>28</sup> It thus appears that Charles himself, like Henry before him, was now playing the main role in appointing and regulating his officers. In apparent confirmation of this their efforts subsequently focussed upon those enjoying direct access him, their hopes depending upon Sir Francis Cottington, the prince's secretary, who being about to re-join the prince in Spain, they felt might " parent [it] if he pleased with ease before his return...".<sup>29</sup> However, both were hampered in the effective implementation of this plan through not being personally acquainted with Cottington, for although the editor of the *Calendar of State Papers: Domestic* believes " the old fox " in Edward's letter of 1 July 1623 was Cottington, from his next of the 9 July it is clear that this was another undisclosed intermediary; as whilst they feared " the old fox [did] deal not sincerely therein...", this was principally because of " his indiscrete motion for us both to Sir Francis Cottington...", not because of Cottington's own actions, whose favour they were still attempting to secure.<sup>30</sup>

---

- Carleton.

<sup>27</sup> PRO. SP14/148/65. 9 July 1623. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas.

<sup>28</sup> PRO. SP14/148/2. 1 July 1623. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas, at Lord Zouch's house in the Barbican.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 1 July 1623. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas, at Lord Zouch's house in the Barbican.

<sup>30</sup> CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 1. 1 July 1623. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas reports that Matthew " fears Mr Cottington does not deal sincerely with him...". PRO. SP14/148/2. 1 July 1623. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas, secretary to the Lord Zouch at his house in [the] Barbican; PRO. SP14/148/65. 9 July 1623. Matthew

With efforts such as these reflecting the realities of political power rather than the popular perception of it this would appear to indicate an increased interest on the part of the prince in the selection of his servants and the shape of his household. There is further evidence of this in June 1624, when his sister, Elizabeth, attempted to get Sir Arthur Sames appointed as an extraordinary gentleman of his privy chamber. Her intermediary Sir Francis Nethersole, however, wrote back to her saying that he had refrained from presenting the request, " finding that he [Charles] is very wary of such appointments ", adding significantly that the prince would be " surprised that the queen should recommend to such a place one whom she never saw...".<sup>31</sup> Both Nicholas and presumably Sames had suffered from being as yet unacquainted with the prince or those around him when they wished to obtain his patronage; but with Sir John Dacombe having previously served the prince as solicitor general before being appointed through his means as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster for those who were it appears to have been quite a different matter, this being demonstrated in the appointment of Sir Robert Dallington as Master of Charterhouse (Sutton's Hospital) in July 1624.<sup>32</sup> Despite " the bishops wishing for one of their profession, according to statutes...the prince " was reported as having " carried it for his servant, Mr Dallington...", who after having served Prince Henry as a gentleman of the privy chamber had in 1613 been re-appointed to the same position under Prince Charles.<sup>33</sup>

---

Nicholas - Edward Nicholas. Nicholas never obtained office under the prince, although whether this was because he failed to gain the support of Cottington, or because Cottington simply lacked the influence with Charles to obtain it is uncertain. --

<sup>31</sup> CSPD,1623-1625. p. 282. 25 June 1624.

Greenwich. Sir Francis Nethersole - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>32</sup> Dacombe had for a short time been Charles's solicitor general in November 1615. BL. Additional 15,630. f. 64. 4 November 1615. Solicitor General, Sir John Dacombe, durante bene placito.

<sup>33</sup> This position had previously been held by a relative of Buckingham's.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 361. 15 January 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 369. 3 July 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPD,1623-1625. p. 297. 10 July 1624. London. Sir Francis Nethersole - Carleton.; Birch, Life of Henry. p. 347.; PRO. SP14/72/111. Undated April 1613.

There was little patronage in Charles's household as prince, partly because he was a younger son, and partly because of James's obligations to Henry's old servants. The relatively few alterations made its establishment make it difficult to draw conclusions about its distribution; but the one general trend which comes from such as there were is that where appointments had previously been made by other members of the royal family on his behalf with increasing maturity Charles was keen to get more deeply involved in them himself. There were already signs that he was taking patronage back into his own hands and showing a marked preference for personal scrutiny of those who were to receive it. These were traits which were to continue and reach their full effect when he became king.

James I. died " on Sunday 27 March, between 11 and 12 noon, at Theobalds ", and that same night Charles had travelled to his own palace of St. James's, where the next morning Lord Keeper Williams found him and Buckingham " busied in many cares ", amongst which according to Williams's biographer John Hacket, " the king spake first of settling his household ".<sup>34</sup> This, however, was no easy task; for as the Venetian Ambassador had observed, " upon the sovereign's death every appointment in the government ceased ", something which inevitably brought about a dispute as to " whether the household of the dead king or that of the prince shall be the household of the present king ".<sup>35</sup> With Charles not wishing " to exclude his father's old servants or abandon his own ", according to the testimony of Sir Roger Mostyn what this brought about was a dual policy in which with Charles having observed the unregulated nature of his father's household and decided that the principal objective in

---

List of servants of the prince. Gentlemen of the privy chamber, Mr Dallington.; Dallington retained his household position after this appointment. PRO. LC2/6. f. 69. 1625. Robert Dallington, Gentleman of the privy chamber to Prince Charles.--

<sup>34</sup> CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 1. March 1625. Notes by Secretary Conway's secretary of the proceedings on the decease of James I. and the accession of Charles I.; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 4.

<sup>35</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 2. 9 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 609. 9 April 1625. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

settling his own was to " bring it to the ancient form " and introduce " the observance of the rules and maxims of the late queen Elizabeth ", he was to " to keep all his own servants in the several places that formerly they enjoyed " under him as prince filling any shortfalls from amongst " his father's old servants...", whilst for political reasons by and large maintaining in office the officers of his father. <sup>36</sup>

This assertion by Mostyn does indeed appear to have been the case. Retaining " my Lord Marquis Hamilton, my Lord of Leppingdon, Sir Robert Carre, and Sir James Fullerton ", and with Sir James Fullerton being continued as groom of the stole, Charles's gentlemen of the bedchamber as king were so far identical to those which he had had when he prince, and to these " was added only the Duke of Buckingham of all those that were of the late king's bedchamber ". <sup>37</sup> Exactly the same pattern can be seen in relation to the gentlemen of Charles's privy chamber, where with the exception of Sir John North all eighteen of the others who had served him in this position as prince were continued in office. <sup>38</sup> However, despite Charles having reduced the number serving in this position from eighty-two to forty-eight these were not sufficient in themselves to fill all the places, and they were therefore supplemented by nineteen of James's ex-servants, including Sir Frederick Hamilton, Sir Robert Gordon, Sir Robert De l'Isle, Sir Francis Stewart, Sir Richard Young, Sir Henry Herbert, Sir Thomas Stepney, Sir James Auchterlony, Sir Henry Shawe, Sir Alexander Hume, Gilbert North, Sir William Balfour, Sir David Murray, William Hinton, Sir James

---

<sup>36</sup> CSPV,1625-1626. p. 19. 15 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. P. 609. 9 April 1625. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton. ; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - his father, Sir John Wynn.; PRO. LC2/6. f. 69. 1625. Sir James Fullerton, groom of the stole to the prince.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., f. 69v. 1625. Gentlemen of the privy chamber to Prince Charles. Sir Arthur Mainwaring, Mr Heathley, Mr Glemond, Mr John Ashfield, John Sandilands, Ralph Clare, Robert Dallington, Sir William Withipool, Robert Barnes, Sir James Young, Sir Edward Lewis, Sir John Stewart, Sir Edmund Verney, Sir Richard Wynn, Sir William Croftes, Edward Lewis, David Ramsey, Sir John Ashfield and Sir Francis Godolphin.

Leviston, Sir John Maynard, Sir Patrick Murray, Sir William Saint-Ravy and Dodmore Cotton.<sup>39</sup> Only twelve were newcomers: Sir Thomas Tyringham, Captain John Penington, Henry Mitten, Richard Neville, Sir Oliver Cromwell, Henry Wentworth, Sir James Scott, Sir Thomas Savile, Sir Thomas Dishington, Sir Thomas Bludder, Robert Lesley and Richard Crane.<sup>40</sup> Indeed, this pattern appears to have applied generally amongst the servants above stairs. It was followed among his grooms of the bedchamber, where Thomas Cary, Endymion Porter, Andrew Pitcairn, George Kirk, James Levingstone and William Murray had all served Charles while prince, and the grooms of the chamber where (with Charles not having possessed any of these as prince) sixteen of James's twenty-six ex-servants were immediately re-appointed to the same position which they had held under him.<sup>41</sup> It applied also to

---

<sup>39</sup> In the absence of any contemporary lists of servants this information has been gained through tracing back from one which exists for 1641 by using information on vacancies and appointments provided in the lord chamberlain's warrant books. PRO. -LC3/1. 1641. ff. 1-5. A list of his majesty's servants in ordinary.; PRO. LC5/132. Warrants ab Anno, 1628-1634.; PRO. LC5/134. Warrants ab Anno. 1634-1641. Therefore in this and following examples only any additional sources are listed in full.; PRO. LC2/6. ff. 37-8. 1625. Gentlemen of the privy chamber to King James.; Cotton had been a carver to James I. *Ibid.*, f. 38v. 1625. List of carvers to King James.; CSPD,1625-1626. p. 582. Charles I. - Sir John Savile.; CSPD,1628-1629. p. 373. 10 November 1628. Westminster. Sir William Sainty-Ravy, Gentleman of the privy chamber.; CSPD,1629-1631. p. 362. 18 October 1630. Hampton Court. Charles I. - Earl of Manchester, Viscount Grandison, Viscount Falkland and Viscount Newburgh.

<sup>40</sup> CSPD,1627-1628. p. 448. 28 November 1627. Grant to Sir Thomas Bludder.; CSPD,1637-1638. p. 466. 28 May 1638. Grant to Sir James Scott, a gentleman of the privy chamber.; CSPV,1626-1628. p. 169. 5 April 1627. Venetian Ambassador in the Netherlands - Doge and Senate.; CSPD,1635. p. 245. 4 July 1635. Charles I. - Attorney General Bankes.; CSPD,1637. p. 197. 7th June 1637. Richard Crane, gentleman of the privy chamber.

<sup>41</sup> PRO. LC2/6. ff. 69-70. 1625. List of Charles's servants as prince.; CSPD,1625-1626. p. 23. 16 May 1625. Grants of 500l. to the grooms of the bedchamber.; *Ibid.*, p. 555. 21 December 1625. Grants of

his grooms of the privy chamber (Francis de Champs, Robert Levingstone, James Eliot, Robert Pitcairn, Philip Proger, Christopher Morland and Thomas Caldwell), his gentlemen ushers (Walter Alexander, Peter Young and Peter Newton), his gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber (Sir William Heydon and Sir William Irwin), his pages of the chamber (Hugh Wood and James Ross) and even his cupbearers (Thomas Reynell) and carvers (John Cockburn and Sir Edward Salter), where Charles's old servants as prince were all re-appointed to serve him as king.<sup>42</sup>

In terms of determining who it was that was responsible for the distribution of patronage under Charles the evidence provided by the settlement of his household servants is therefore inconclusive, and unfortunately he appears to have stuck equally rigidly to the rule which he had set over the selection of his new household's officers. For while none of his own ex-officers had been left uncompensated, in recognition of their past service and higher social and political status it was nevertheless his father's officers who had remained in office. Thus while the Earl of Bristol had been removed from his position as vice-chamberlain for having refused to take the blame for the

---

pensions to grooms of the privy chamber.; *Ibid.*, p. 160. 26 November 1625. Annuity to John -Cockburn.; *Ibid.*, p. 161. Annuity to Sir Edward Salter.; PRO. LC5/134. Undated. 21 January 1633. List of grooms of the chamber. Those re-appointed by Charles were Thomas Thornton, William Price, John Wilson, William Dunthorne, Thomas Henn, Thomas Knivett, Philip Flood, Samuel -Jepp, Francis Brooks, Walter Dies, Thomas Cook, John Drew, Anthony Hilder, George Reading, Francis Holding, and John Wonham.

<sup>42</sup> PRO. LC2/6. ff. 69-70. 1625. List of Charles's servants as prince.; PRO. SO3/8. December 1625. Annuity to Christopher Morland.; *Ibid.*, January 1626. Annuity to Francis De Champs.; *Ibid.*, November 1625. Annuities to Walter Alexander, Peter Young and Peter Newton.; Rymer, *Foedera*. Vol. VIII. Pt. I. p. 107. 11 July 1625. Westminster. Fees to be paid to the ushers of the privy chamber by prelates and noblemen at their creation.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 19. Confirmation to James Ross, Hugh Wood...pages of the bedchamber, of certain fees on grants and dignities.; G. Roberts, ed., The Diary of Walter Yonge, esq. Justice of the Peace, and MP. for Honiton, written at Colyton and Axminster, co. Devon from 1604-1628. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 41. (London, 1848). p. 87. 15 September 1625.

failure of the Spanish Match, and James's cofferer (Sir Marmaduke Darell) had been joined in office by Sir Henry Vane (" being long well rooted in the king's favour "), Charles retained the Earl of Pembroke as lord chamberlain (Robert Cary being compensated by a grant of land worth £500 a year and his creation as Earl of Monmouth early the next year), Sir Thomas Edmondson as treasurer of the household (Sir Robert Douglas being compensated by a pension of £800 a year), Sir William Uvedale as treasurer of the chamber (for which there had been no equivalent position under Charles), Sir John Suckling as comptroller of the household (Sir John Vaughan being dismissed) and the Duke of Buckingham as master of his horse (Viscount Andover being compensated by a grant of £20,000 and his creation as Earl of Berkshire).<sup>43</sup> This is not to say that there was no political wrangling involved in the distribution of these offices or that they fail to provide any individual insights into the distribution of patronage. Indeed the dispute between Cary and Pembroke was particularly heated, whilst that between Andover and Buckingham provides a clear indication that Buckingham was by no means as powerful as is usually portrayed; but with Charles having resolved that he would not take away any of the offices granted by his father against the wishes of those who held them what it does mean is that their

---

<sup>43</sup> Bristol had been pressed to resign in May 1624. Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 160-1, 198; CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 10. 16 April 1625.; Ibid. p. 12. 23 April 1625. Grant to Lord Leppington.; Ibid. p. 366. 2 July 1626. Warrant to pay the Earl of Berkshire...part of £20,000.; Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. pp. 83-97.; PRO. SO3/8. "...Henry Vane and Sir Marmaduke Darell...cofferers of his Majesty's household...".; Ibid. 4 February 1626. Creation of Leppington as Earl of Monmouth.; Ibid. 4 February 1626. Creation of Viscount Andover...Earl of Berkshire. Edmondson remained in office until January 1639. HMC, Tenth Report. (1885). Appendix II. p. 172. 21 January 1639. Andrew Mingay - Framlingham Gawdy.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 82. Undated. December 1625. Grant to Sir Robert Douglas.; Uvedale was still in office in 1640. HMC, De l'Isle and Dudley MSS. [Hereafter De l'Isle]. Vol. VI. (1966). pp. 228-9. 30 January/9 February 1640. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Suckling remained in office until his death in 1627. CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 125. 4 April 1627. Sir John Savile - Duke of Buckingham.

outcome does not necessarily provide a clear indication of the influence of those involved, and that they are in any case too few in number to allow for generalisations to be made from them.<sup>44</sup>

As the settlement of Charles's household upon his accession to the throne failed to provide any real evidence of the distribution of patronage under him we are therefore dependent upon evidence of subsequent changes. However, Charles's preference for familiar faces and his habit of regarding those who served him in personal rather than political terms made him somewhat reluctant to remove them. As there were few household officers in any case, alterations among them were very few. The few cases there are would seem to point to the chief influence being the king. The dual promotions of the Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery to the positions of lord steward and lord chamberlain in 1626, for example, are usually seen to have been the work of Buckingham, the chief evidence coming from the accompanying marriage between Pembroke's heir (the son of his brother, Montgomery) and Buckingham's daughter.<sup>45</sup> But Charles had already announced his intention " that my lord [Pembroke] should be lord steward and my Lord of Montgomery lord chamberlain " upon coming to the throne in 1625; and had subsequently made a number of deliberate attempts to reconcile Buckingham and Pembroke for his own good reasons. Given the weakness of his position at Court at this time Buckingham's subsequent decision to propose this marriage was much more likely to have been an opportunist attempt at bolstering it through his enhanced knowledge of the intentions of the king rather than a sign of his influence over him.<sup>46</sup> The hand of Charles is equally apparent in the granting of the position of master of the horse to the Marquess of Hamilton, who having previously refused to consummate his marriage to Buckingham's niece, and with Charles lying " with her Majesty every night and will bring it up for a fashion at Court...", only received it upon condition that he did, being

---

<sup>44</sup> NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>45</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 333.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 235.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29th April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 11. 18 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.



" forced from the first night, though much against his will, to take his bed with his young wife...".<sup>47</sup>

This, together with the fact that appointments tended to be made from within, as was the case in the appointment of the Earls of Carlisle and Holland to the position of groom of the stole from within the bedchamber, and Sir Henry Vane (the Comptroller of Charles's household) in the place of the treasurer of the chamber upon the retirement of Sir Thomas Edmondes in 1639, would indicate that Charles with his preference for old faces and desire for evidence of service was playing a key role in the distribution of household offices.<sup>48</sup> Given the small number of appointments which were generated amongst Charles's officers, though, it is extremely difficult to argue this with any degree of certainty. It is thus also necessary to look at the appointment of his household servants, of which there were a far larger number.

Jurisdiction over the king's private service within his household above stairs was officially in the hands of the lord chamberlain, so whilst supplemented by others as and when this was necessary, the main source upon which this investigation has been based are the two lord chamberlain's warrant books and the royal establishment book

---

<sup>47</sup> CSPD,1628-1629. p. 310. 1 September 1628. James Hay - Earl of Carlisle.; CSPD,Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 291. 23 September 1628. Sion. Lord Henry Percy - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Carlisle.; BL. --Harleian 390. f. 341. 17 January 1628. Christ's College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 7010. ff. 95v-6. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 518. 25 October 1628. Earl of Clare - Viscount Wentworth.

<sup>48</sup> Carlisle was appointed groom of the stole in February 1631 in the place of Sir James - Fullerton, and upon his own death in 1636 was replaced by the Earl of Holland. PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8 January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPV,1629-1632. p. 558. Note.; Henry Ellis, ed., The Obituary of Richard Smyth, secondary of the Poultry Comptor, London; being a catalogue of all such persons as he knew in their life; extended from A.D. 1627 to A.D. 1674. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 44. (London,1849). p. 12.; HMC, Tenth Report. Appendix II. p. 172. 31 January 1639. Andrew Mingay - Framlingham Gawdy.

which have survived for the tenure of Lord Chamberlain Montgomery, who was appointed at Nonsuch on Thursday 3 August 1626 and remained in office throughout the rest of Charles's reign.<sup>49</sup> The books contain copies of warrants issued by the chamberlain for the appointment and dismissal of the king's household servants. The information is similar in form to that provided in the Signet Office docquet books. But it is much more difficult to interpret as it only occasionally gives any indication who was the prime mover. If this can be established, however, it provides an invaluable insight into how the patronage of the royal household was distributed. In this as in the appointment of his chaplains and household officers, Charles rather than the lord chamberlain or any other patron appears to have played the greatest and most significant role. With the Earl of Montgomery holding theoretical rights of jurisdiction over the king's household by virtue of his office as lord chamberlain, the first problem is in determining whether the right of appointment lay with him or the king; as if it lay with the chamberlain it would clearly undermine any notion that Charles was restricting access to patronage through taking it back into his own hands.

That appointments were made by the king rather than the lord chamberlain may be demonstrated by the small number of cases where, as in the Signet Office docket books, orders in the chamberlain's warrant books contained two signatures, such as in the appointment of Sir Francis Clark as a gentleman of the privy chamber. This was recorded as being by " Mr. Edward Tyringham. My Lord "; from which it is possible to demonstrate that the single name more normally listed in such appointments corresponds with that of the signifier to the Clerk of the Signet of the king's pleasure in the Signet Office docquet books.<sup>50</sup> If Tyringham or some other had secured the appointment of Clark directly from the lord chamberlain, with the king subsequently

---

<sup>49</sup> David Starkey, ' The English Court: from the war of the Roses to the Civil War ', in The English Court.--, ed., David Starkey et al. (London, 1987). p. 4.; The chamberlains warrant books are in two volumes. PRO. --LC5/132. Warrants ab Anno 1628-1634. and PRO. LC5/134. Warrants ab Anno, 1634-1641.; Montgomery's appointment is noted in PRO. LC3/31. p. 1. Royal Establishment Book, 1626-1697. 3 August 1626.

<sup>50</sup> PRO. LC5/132. 22 June 1628.

being requested to sign the warrant as a mere formality, it would not have been necessary to record Tyrringham's name, only that of the person who had secured the king's signature. From this it would appear that Tyrringham had either managed to secure a grant from the king or been ordered by him to carry his order to the lord chamberlain, who had then given order for the warrant to be prepared and subsequently procured the king's signature to it himself. This is confirmed by the appointments of George Vernon (21 March 1637) and Charles Hoogans as esquires of the body (5 October 1635) which were recorded as being " by order from the king ", Charles is hardly likely to have been noted as having procured his own signature. <sup>51</sup>

During the period from 1626 to the end of 1639 there were some ninety or so appointments in ordinary made to positions within Charles's household, but only ten of these contain any information at all as to who was involved in them (let alone containing two signatures). These then would appear to be cases where Charles had granted an individual piece of patronage to someone in his especial favour, thereby forcing the chamberlain's secretary to add additional information. This becomes apparent when those involved in these grants are investigated more closely, such as the appointment of George Boteler as a " gentleman of the privy chamber without quarter " in May 1628, which had been procured by " Dick Graham ". <sup>52</sup> Graham was a gentleman of the horse to the Duke of Buckingham, and that Boteler's appointment was indeed a consequence of the influence of the favourite is confirmed in that he was a distant relation of the duke. His kinsman, John, Lord Boteler of Brantfield, had married Buckingham's half-sister, Elizabeth. <sup>53</sup> This example should not be taken out of context, though, for it appears to have been very much a one-off. Buckingham appeared to be one amongst many enjoying a similar level of access and influence with the king rather than holding a pre-eminent position as he had done before under

---

<sup>51</sup> PRO.LC5 134. 21 March 1637.; *Ibid.* 5 October 1635.; This is substantiated by warrants gained by patrons for extraordinary servants, where in cases where the king's signature was gained to the final warrant by someone other than the chamberlain they were listed separately - containing two names.

<sup>52</sup> PRO. LC5 132. 24 May 1628.

<sup>53</sup> Lockyer, *Buckingham.* pp. 74-75, 136, 139.

James. For amongst the others noted as being involved in the appointment of ordinary servants were Lord Amount [Sic] in that of Sir James Hamilton as a gentleman of the privy chamber in January 1634, Lord De l'Isle in that of John Haves as a gentleman of the privy chamber, the Duchess of Richmond in that of Alexander Erskine as a gentleman of the privy chamber in March 1630, and the Earl of Holland in that of Abraham Dowcett as a " page of the bedchamber...to come in ordinary waiting and fee upon the first and next avoidance ".<sup>54</sup> This indicates that patrons were playing at least a limited role in the distribution of Charles's household patronage, but with the vast majority of the appointments recorded providing no direct evidence as to who was responsible for them the principal obstacle in determining whose influence was paramount is in discovering just what it is which this silence denotes. With the less important extraordinary appointments almost invariably containing patrons's names next to them their omission in ordinary appointments could not have been due to forgetfulness or laziness, and the true cause of this appears to have been a consequence of the different administrative processes which were being followed in them by virtue of the different levels of patron involvement which was allowed, with it being possible to deduce that where there was no name provided the appointment had come directly from the king. As with the regular appearance of patrons's names amongst extraordinary servants clearly discounting any lack of interest in entering royal service the only possible explanation for their absence in a far greater proportion of the more important ordinary ones is that appointments were being regularly made by just one person, which in the absence of a favourite could only have been the lord chamberlain or the king. With the chamberlain already eliminated from having played a major role this only leaves the king himself. This, together with the return of patronage to his own hands, is confirmed by other evidence contained in the lord chamberlain's warrant books. For had patrons merely side-stepped the lord chamberlain and sought the king's patronage direct, the normal administrative procedure would have been for the grantee or person acting in their behalf to have

---

<sup>54</sup> PRO. LC5/132. Erskine (2 March 1630), Hamilton (25 January 1634).; PRO. LC5/134. Haves (17 February 1639), Dowcett (24 March 1639).

brought the king's order for their appointment to the lord chamberlain or his secretary, who (as in the small proportion of " patrons " already listed in ordinary appointments) would then have entered their name in the warrant book. The comparative rarity, although significantly not the complete absence, of such names amongst ordinary appointments indicates that this could not have been occurring; and with patronage already being known to be coming from the king rather than the lord chamberlain, it would appear that in the vast majority of cases Charles was making decisions himself and then subsequently issuing direct - possibly verbal - orders to the lord chamberlain. The small number of cases where patrons are listed as being involved would therefore appear to be occasions where people had intervened directly with the king over the lord chamberlain's head, whilst the equally small number of cases in which the king's own name appeared next to an appointment (as in the the appointment of Vernon and Hoogans) would appear to signify where an order (most likely caused by the absence from Court of the lord chamberlain) had had to be sent directly to the lord chamberlain's secretary rather than through the more usual means of the lord chamberlain himself.<sup>55</sup> This suggests that the small number of cases in which patrons are indicated as being involved, is likely to have been the height of their involvement, and that the equally small number of cases in which the king himself was involved were probably exceptions. The conclusion would be that the vast majority of the ninety or so appointments for which there is no recorded patron were the work of Charles himself. The central importance of the role played by Charles is confirmed in the appointment of extraordinary household servants.

With appointments to extraordinary positions within the household not normally being made to fill actual vacancies amongst them but (at least in theory) to ensure that there were enough servants held in reserve in order to cover possible periods of absence or illness there was no real restriction in the number which could be made, and this meant they tended to be a great deal more numerous than ordinary

---

<sup>55</sup>  
October 1635.

Ibid., 21 March 1637, 5

appointments, roughly 150 of them in the period between March 1634 and the end of 1639. <sup>56</sup> Of these Charles himself is directly linked to eighteen, such as that of John Crew as a gentleman of the privy chamber on 29 June 1638, which was " by his Majesty's direction and command ", or that of John Boteler as a gentleman waiter on 30 June 1634, which was " by reference from his Majesty ". <sup>57</sup> But again, these were only likely to have represented a very small proportion of the king's overall direct patronage, for as with appointments in ordinary the sixty-eight or so appointments for which no actual " patron " was indicated were also likely to have come from him direct through the lord chamberlain. Yet with this leaving an additional eighty six appointments in which " patrons " are clearly indicated as being involved it is at the same time clear that things were very different than in appointments in ordinary.

Reflecting the high level of access which they enjoyed many such posts were secured by those already holding office about the king, such as the Earl of Holland (a gentleman of the bedchamber) in that of Colonel John Douglas and Sir Baynham Throckmorton as gentlemen of the privy chamber, Sir John North (a gentleman usher of the privy chamber) in that of Sir Peter Rocheford as a groom of the chamber and Sir Richard Neville, Sir Thomas Aston and George Clopthorne as gentlemen of the privy chamber, and Endymion Porter (a groom of Charles's bedchamber) in that of Martin King as a gentleman waiter. <sup>58</sup> On the other hand, the intervention of Henry Brown (a page of the backstairs to the queen) on behalf of Thomas Grinsell as a groom of the chamber and Sir George Goring (master of the horse to the queen) on behalf of Thomas Leigh as a sewer of the chamber could equally point to the influence of the queen. <sup>59</sup> Others were clearly made on behalf of family members or

---

<sup>56</sup> Information for the following study comes from PRO. LC5/134.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 30 June 1634, 29 June 1638.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., Colonel John Douglas (29 September 1634).; Sir Baynham Throckmorton (4 December 1634).; Peter Rocheford (24 June 1635).; Richard Neville (13 February 1637).; Sir Thomas Aston (26 April 1637).; George Clopthorne (13 June 1637).; Martin King (30 November 1635).

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., Thomas Grinsell (13 April

friends. This was the case in the appointment of Sir Leonard Bosville as a gentleman of the privy chamber by " Sir William Bosville ", John Cockayne as a sewer of the chamber through the " Lady Elizabeth Cockayne and Mr John Winter ", and Francis Godfrey, whose appointment to the same position in December 1638 was noted as being " for my lady Killigrew, who is aunt to him ".<sup>60</sup>

Although he enjoyed little influence in the distribution of ordinary appointments, given the relative ease with which others seemed to be able to intervene in them the chamberlain may have been expected to wield greater influence in the distribution of extraordinary ones. But Charles was chiefly concerned to see that patronage emanated from him and no other as a means of tying people to himself, and even in these relatively unimportant positions Montgomery was not able to act independently, still having to work through the person of the king. This can also be seen in the case of Robert Pemberton, whose appointment as an gentleman of the privy chamber on 4 December 1634 was noted as being " p[rocured] his lordship ", and is repeated in that of Sir Robert Huddleston to the same position on 8 April 1638, in relation to which it was reported that " his Majesty [was] moved by my lord chamberlain ".<sup>61</sup> As a consequence Montgomery was no more influential than any other person enjoying regular access and the favour of the king. Indeed, it was perhaps only the formal access to the king which he enjoyed as lord chamberlain together with Charles's preference for holding " in his hands the total directory, leaving the executory part to every man within the compass of his charge " which accounts for his securing the single greatest number of appointments next to the king; for a number of people appear to have secured the appointment of clients through his means merely out of ease or courtesy (given his theoretical jurisdiction as lord chamberlain) rather than

---

1637)., Thomas Leigh (3 July 1638)

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., Sir Leonard Bosville (24 June 1634)., John -Cockayne (1 May 1638)., Francis Godfrey (31 December 1638).-

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. Robert Pemberton (4 December 1634)., Sir Robert Huddleston (8 April 1638).

because they lacked the ability to do so on their own account if they had so wished.<sup>62</sup> This was probably the case in the appointment of William Hodges as a sewer of the chamber in February 1638, which was initially " moved to his lordship by my Lady Carnarvon upon Mistress Rawlins her instance " <sup>63</sup> For there appears to have been a close connection between the family of the Earl of Carnarvon and the Earl of Montgomery, who had previously procured the king's signature to the " creation of the Lord Dormer to be Viscount Ascott in the County of Buckinghamshire and Earl of Caernarvon " in July 1628, and been granted the " Lieutenancy of Buckinghamshire, during the minority of Robert, Earl of Carnarvon " two months later in August 1628, and was certainly so in that of Henry Hughes as a gentleman waiter to the king in January 1639. <sup>64</sup> For whilst in order to secure Hughes's appointment " his lordship was moved by my Lady Denbigh ", in being the sister of the late Duke of Buckingham, from a family who were high in the favour of the king and above all a lady of the bedchamber to the queen, she would clearly have possessed the influence to have secured this appointment directly from the king herself had she so wished. <sup>65</sup>

However, whilst Charles's preference for formality may have stifled the Chamberlain's ability to influence the distribution of offices within his jurisdiction, as was also the case in ordinary appointments it does at least appear to have brought him

---

<sup>62</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 339.  
30 September 1628. Hampton Court. Viscount Dorchester -  
Earl of Carlisle.

<sup>63</sup> PRO. LC5/134. 12  
February 1638.

<sup>64</sup> PRO. SO3/9. July 1628.  
Lord Dormer to be Viscount Ascott in the County of  
Buckinghamshire and Earl of Caernarvon. By order under  
his Majesty's sign manual. Subscribed attorney general.  
Procured by the lord chamberlain of his Majesty's  
household.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 337. 25 September 1628.  
Grant to the Earl of Montgomery of the Lieutenancy of  
Buckinghamshire, during the minority of Robert, Earl of  
Carnarvon.

<sup>65</sup> PRO. LC5/134. Henry  
Hughes (8 January 1639).; BL. Egerton 1048. f. 186v.  
Undated. c.1639-1641. Undated list of her Majesty's  
servants in ordinary. English. Ladies of the bedchamber,  
Countess of Denbigh.



one limited benefit. It guaranteed him the patronage at the next level down, that of procuring the king's signature to the final warrant, even in those cases where the original signification of the king's pleasure had come direct from the king or through a courtier. For only rarely was this undertaken by any other than the lord chamberlain. This, for example, can be seen in the appointment of John Boteler as a gentleman waiter, which was " by reference from his Majesty ", and in that of James Mynne, Thomas Aylesbury and Arthur Barnay as gentlemen of the privy chamber in February 1638 where the only subscriptions were " by the king " or " by the king's removal "; which confirming that as in ordinary appointments this denoted who it was that signified the lord chamberlain's secretary of the king's pleasure in the original decision and not who procured his signature to the final warrant, in the absence of any other subscription demonstrates that this must have been undertaken by the chamberlain.<sup>66</sup> This is confirmed by the inclusion of a second name in the small number of extraordinary cases where a " patron " was sufficiently well acquainted with the king and lord chamberlain to be able to secure his signature to the final warrant himself. It, for example, can be seen in the appointment of William Barclay as a cupbearer, where the Earl of Carlisle is noted as having both recommended him to the king and procured his signature to the final warrant, and also in that of Charles Adderley as a gentleman of the privy chamber, which whilst drawn up at the request of " Mr Herbert Price his friend ", in order to get the king's signature attached had been " directed to Sir James Palmer and in his absence to Sir William Anstruther " (who both being gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber controlled access to this area of the household); and is confirmed in relation to that of Henry Hastings as an esquire to the body, his original appointment being secured from the king by Dr. Turner during his month of waiting as a chaplain in ordinary in October 1638, and the king's signature to his final warrant of appointment being procured by Endymion Porter, Turner was no longer in attendance by the time that it was ready to be presented to the king in November.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> PRO. LC5/134. John Boteler (30 June 1634).; James Mynne and Thomas Aylesbury (10 February 1638).; Arthur Barnay (12 February 1638).

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., Barclay. (1 September

With Montgomery's ability to secure a degree of influence (and profit) in relation to extraordinary appointments it is clear that his position was not without its advantages, but with Charles having deliberately channelled patronage through his own hands (as in the appointment of ordinary servants) its usefulness was nevertheless seriously reduced. It is always possible that his main influence lay not with the submission of formal petitions but in direct discussions with the king in which he suggested people to him whenever vacancies (either in ordinary or extraordinary) occurred; unfortunately the wielding of such influence as this would not leave any trace in the official records. However, with other people clearly being able to intervene with the king direct, and the interventions of the chamberlain also normally being recorded, given the trend amongst the selection of chaplains and other ordinary servants this would not appear to have been the case, with the balance of probability lying with the king himself having established a firm grip upon household appointments, this being confirmed by an investigation of the number of people who actually managed to proceed from extraordinary to ordinary service - something which also helps to indicate some of the wider problems in the distribution of patronage under Charles.

Given the inclusion of patrons as diverse as the Duchess of Buckingham, Sir Edward Stanhope, Lady Rich (the wife of the Earl of Holland), the Earls of Carlisle, Pembroke and Montgomery, Arundel and Bedford, the Duke of Lennox, Sir Henry Vane, Lord Mansell, Sir William Anstruther and Lady Dorset (the prince's governess) this might at first sight appear to be a patronage system which was functioning normally; for although access was important, none would expect to be able to dictate to the king who should serve him in his own household, and it is therefore possible that Court patronage was being exercised at a lower level through playing to Charles's preferences and securing the appointment of clients to extraordinary positions in the hope that it would lead to their appointment in ordinary.<sup>68</sup> This,

---

1635).; Adderley (17 February 1637).; Hastings (19 November 1638).; Palmer and Anstruther are noted as gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber in a list in Ibid. 22 January 1637.; Turner's month of waiting was in October. Ibid. 12 April 1631. A letter to Thomas Turner to wait in October.

<sup>68</sup>

Ibid., Stanhope (18 December

however, was clearly not the case, as of the 150 people who had been appointed to extraordinary positions during the period 1634-1640 only five had actually made the transition into ordinary service by 1641, and even these seem to have been restricted to those related or linked to people already holding trusted positions about the king. Sir Paul Neile, for example, had managed to make the transition from an extraordinary (appointed 12 January 1635) to an ordinary gentleman of the privy chamber (reported as such in 1641), but he was "son to the Archbishop of York" Richard Neile.<sup>69</sup> Thomas Windebank, who had been promoted from an extraordinary (appointed 23 October 1637) to an ordinary gentleman of the privy chamber (27 May 1638) was the son of Charles's trusted secretary Sir Francis Windebank.<sup>70</sup> William Barclay's equally swift transition from an extraordinary Cupbearer (appointed 1 September 1635) to a gentleman of the privy chamber (appointed January 1636) had been a consequence of his connections with the Earl of Carlisle.<sup>71</sup>

---

1634)., Lady Rich (26 March 1635)., Earl of Carlisle (1 September 1635)., Sir Henry Vane (18 August 1636)., Lord Mansell (22 March 1637)., Sir William Anstruther (26 April 1637)., Countess of Dorset (2 November 1637).; Earl of Arundel (3 January 1638)., Earl of Bedford (20 December 1638)., Duke of Lennox (25 March 1639).

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid. Barclay's extraordinary appointment is recorded as the work of Carlisle. There were two other examples. Richard Neville from an extraordinary (14 February 1637) to an ordinary (5 November 1638) gentleman of the privy chamber. He had had already been appointed to the household of the prince earlier that summer. The other was Captain William Killigrew, who was appointed as an extraordinary (29 December 1634) and then an ordinary gentleman of the privy chamber (listed as such in 1641) and was the son of Sir Robert Killigrew, the queen's vice-chamberlain; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. pp. 165-7. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; PRO. LC3/1. A list of his Majesty's servants of the chamber in ordinary, 1641.; PRO. LR5/57. f. 24. 27 April 1629. An establishment of ordinary wages allowed by the queen.

Montgomery and other patrons had in many cases been able to intervene in the appointment of extraordinary servants. Had they been able to exert any direct influence with the king rather than merely receiving what he was willing to give a far larger proportion of those they promoted would have been expected to have reached ordinary service. That they did not confirms the general perception that household patronage was being distributed upon the king's own terms. But while the fact that Charles routinely overlooked his extraordinary servants in making appointments in ordinary perhaps explains the relatively free-role which he allowed his courtiers to have in making them, the question remains as to why people actually bothered to secure them. With old habits dying hard some may have retained hopes of being spotted by the king and advanced to high office as under James, whilst in some quarters there may still have been a certain degree of prestige involved in being a royal servant. As is so often the case in the seventeenth century, though, the true cause appears to have been somewhat more mundane and a good deal more practical, in that all royal servants, even extraordinary ones, were " exempt from assizes, inquests, constable, churchmen, or other like office " such as that of being sheriff of a county, the likely benefits of such an exemption being especially great in the light of the advance of prerogative taxation and the development of an ideological element to non-payment which tended to place the incumbent between a king who expected obedience as of right and neighbours who deeply resented having to pay it. <sup>72</sup>

However, with Charles always expecting obedience as of right and perceiving the receipt of office as tying people to himself such shirking of responsibility was not something which he expected from his servants (even extraordinary ones); and whilst the order made at a meeting of the Privy Council in September 1636 aimed at overcoming the attempts of people to become extraordinary servants as a means of

---

<sup>72</sup> HMC, Third Report. (1872). p. 29. 4 November 1628. Certificate by the Earl of Montgomery that Thomas Wilbraham is a servant of the king and exempt from assizes, inquests, constable, churchmen, or other like office.; In 1628 Mr Whorwood was spared from being Sheriff of Oxfordshire on account of " being the king's servant, a gentleman pensioner...". PRO. SP16/98/115. March 1628. List of sheriffs to be spared.

avoiding their selection as sheriffs appears to have had little effect, as there was no real reduction in the number of pleas for exemption, Charles's underlying assumptions clearly remained unaltered. This was demonstrated in April 1639 when he expected them to help form a " regiment of horse to be drawn together to the number of eight hundred, consisting of his Majesty's servants of the privy and presence chambers in ordinary and extraordinary, with their servants " to attend him to Scotland.<sup>73</sup> In taking patronage back into his own hands and allowing the limited involvement of patrons in extraordinary appointments Charles may have felt that he had managed to tie both the patron and client's loyalties to his own person. But the majority of recipients had only sought them out of self-interest, and the truth was somewhat different. This indicates a wider problem in all of Charles's household patronage. In order for it to have operated with any degree of success the degree of involvement on the part of patrons in extraordinary appointments would have needed to have been replicated in the appointment of his officers and ordinary servants. As it was, though, with Charles's insecurity and determination to uphold the authority of the Crown leading him to take appointments to these positions back into his own hands and make them solely as a consequence of his own choice this was something which he was unable to do. That no patron was able to influence the appointment of officers or ordinary servants (either directly through his favour or by manipulating his choice through the appointment of extraordinary servants) in any significant way, meant that he squandered the potential of his household patronage as a political tool. He did not succeed in bolstering support for the Crown and undermined the position of the important office of lord chamberlain.

---

<sup>73</sup> PRO. PC2/46. p. 370. 18 September 1636. Oatlands. Charles himself was present at this meeting.; CSPD, 1638-1639. p. 582. 20 March 1639. Charles I. - Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

## Chapter 3.

### The Queen's Household.

James's firm desire to solve the Palatine problem through a Spanish marriage, initially supported by the prince, had led him into courting the Spanish at the expense of the French. This had not only encouraged the Spanish to raise their stakes, but had left him in a particularly weak position when treatings subsequently collapsed. For although the French did not normally demand the same stringent personal and religious conditions as the Spanish, with negotiations having to begin from scratch the provisions which James had previously agreed over Charles's projected marriage to the Infanta provided a useful point of reference when the prince's union with Henrietta Maria came under consideration. Negotiations began in earnest after the issue of a formal commission from the king and the arrival of the Earl of Carlisle at the end of March 1624, and in June 1624 Louis XIII. finally released the terms for the marriage of his sister, unusually including a confessional insistence on James's suspension of the penal laws against his Catholic subjects. <sup>1</sup> Coming at the same time as the dismissal of La Vieuville and his replacement by Richelieu this demand initially threatened to wreck the whole venture. Perhaps musing over the ever increasing concessions demanded by the Spanish, Charles had written to Carlisle about the French, advising him that " if you find they persist in this new way that they have begun, dally no more with them but break off the treaty of marriage...". <sup>2</sup> Through the intervention of Buckingham and the the Marquess d'Effiat (the French Ambassador), though, both sides were subsequently persuaded to modify their demands, Louis and Richelieu accepting James's written promise not to persecute

---

<sup>1</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain.  
Vol. II. p. 552. 10 April 1624. London. John Chamberlain  
- Sir Dudley Carleton.; J.P. Cooper, ed., Wentworth  
Papers 1597-1628. Camden Society Fourth Series. Vol. 12.  
(London, 1973). p. 189. 27 July 1623. Tuesday noon.  
George Wederhide - Charles Radcliffe.; Lockyer,  
Buckingham. pp. 200-1.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 203.

Catholics as part of a secret " Ecrit Particuler " rather than an article of the marriage treaty. <sup>3</sup> This was the major concession which had been wrested from Charles and James, but given the weakness of their bargaining position it had not been the only one; for whilst they could have had little problem accepting the clause which stated that " the said queen's house shall be maintained with so much dignity and with so great a number of officers as ere any has that was Queen of England ", it must have been far more difficult with another clause which stated that " all the household servants which the said lady shall carry shall be Papists Catholic and French by birth and chosen or appointed by his Most Christian Majesty ". <sup>4</sup> For as well as robbing them of any patronage which they may have hoped to have enjoyed in settling it themselves, in being so visible it was also even more likely to damage their chances of obtaining funds for war against Spain from an anti-Catholic parliament than their far more significant concession of agreeing to a toleration of English Catholics. However, with Charles determined to secure war against Spain and James reluctant to agree to this except as part of a non-confessional anti-Habsburg alliance neither had little choice, and the terms of the marriage treaty were finally accepted by James at Cambridge on 12 December 1624, shortly after an agreement to send a joint force into the Palatinate under the direction of Count Mansfeldt. <sup>5</sup> While these concessions were merely the subject of negotiations in a foreign land they appeared to represent no great problem, but after the arrival of the queen on 12 June 1625 Charles's inability to control her household and its patronage posed a major problem to him on a number of different fronts, the most evident of which was the political ramifications of her religion in Britain. The concessions which had been made to the French over the

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>4</sup> BL. Egerton 27,402. ff. 57-60. Thursday 8 May 1625. A true relation of the marriage concluded and agreed upon between Our Sovereign Lord King of Great Britain and Ireland and the Lady Henrietta Maria sister to the Most Christian King of France.

<sup>5</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 209.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 591. 18 December 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

religious content of the queen's household had been made on the premise that successes in the joint military alliance against the power of Spain would counteract any misgivings at home. But cracks were already appearing in the alliance, and the utter collapse of Mansfeldt's expedition robbed Charles of any chance of playing upon its military achievements. Charles was thus faced with the need to justify an awkward marriage treaty and alliance with France, including toleration for English Catholics, while convincing the first parliament of his reign of its duty to support war against Catholic Spain as supposedly agreed in 1624, a task prefaced by the arrival of his Catholic wife and her household. For the effects of the de facto toleration of Catholics at home which had been agreed as part of the marriage deal were much resented; and with the queen having been informed before she left France that " she must remember that she had been sent into a foreign country expressly to help the Catholics who had suffered for so long...", and her servants acting accordingly, " who at first seemed only temperate Catholics, but now come the old course of the most violent Papists...", her household represented a major focus of discontent. <sup>6</sup> On the very day of Charles's marriage feast one of his own chaplains, Dr. Fell, had given a sermon before him " which was bitterly invective against Popery ", whilst concerns were later expressed over the " encroachments and dangers likely to arise from the exorbitant pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church, and sufferance of priests and Jesuits about the queen's person and Court..."; and although Charles tried to overcome this as best he could, first through ordering that the queen " shall have no subjects of his serve her without they go to Church..." and issuing " a strict command to his porter at St. James...that no one subject whatsoever should be suffered to come to Mass...", and then by conceding to parliament's demand for a tightening of the laws against recusants, by virtue of the marriage treaty these measures only applied to the effects of the queen's household upon English subjects and not to the actions of the French themselves, even this was a difficult task when the queen was being " strangely and strongly assailed for the protection of these people by the intercession

---

<sup>6</sup> E. Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. (London, 1976). p. 51.; PRO. SP16/6. 8 September 1625. Hampton Court. Lord Goring - Sir Dudley Carleton.



of her own ecclesiastics...".<sup>7</sup> The alliance with France was an important element in Charles's war policy, but unless he could persuade parliament to come up with the money to allow him to fulfil his side of the obligation it was practically useless, and this seemed unlikely as long as he was unable to control the queen's household. Neither were the political problems posed by this inability to control the queen's household restricted to the effect of its religious outlook on public opinion. For in the light of the 1625 parliament Charles had immediately set about examining the causes of its failure and, convincing himself that it must have been the result of a plot, had begun to look around for those he thought responsible. They included those MPs who were selected as sheriffs that November and the disgraced Lord Keeper John Williams, but also extended to the queen's French household. As there had already been rumours earlier that the queen's ecclesiastics were "participating more of the Court than Church of Rome...", and at much the same time as Charles was proceeding against these other groups he had written to Buckingham informing him how he believed the French were "making plots with my own subjects", his perception of this likely to have been confirmed by the fact that Williams (who had set about learning French the moment he realised there would not be a Spanish marriage) enjoyed a number of contacts within the queen's household and was on especially close terms with Father Berulle, who was well known for his opposition to Buckingham.<sup>8</sup>

But whilst these were problems which would have been faced by any monarch in a similar political situation, there were others which were more personal to Charles.

---

<sup>7</sup> Proceedings in Parliament, 1625, p. 716. 25 June 1625. John Castle - William -Trumbull.; Ibid. p. 85. 4 July 1625. Minute Book. Speech of the Lord Steward.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 138. Undated, 1626. Advices concerning the...sufferance or Priests and Jesuits about the queen's person.; PRO. SP16/6. 8 September 1625. George, Lord Goring - Sir Dudley Carleton.; P.E. Kopperman, Sir Robert Heath 1574-1649. Window on an Age. (Bury, 1989). p. 95.

<sup>8</sup> BL. Harleian 6988. f. 1. 20 November 1625. Hampton Court. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.; PRO. SP16/6. 8 September 1625. Hampton Court. George, Lord Goring - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 259.

Queen Anne's Court, like those of James and his two sons had been a distinct political entity not subject to the jurisdiction of the king. Charles, while not conceding that Henrietta Maria should have a household of her own, was impelled by his own personal and political insecurity to place excessive emphasis upon his authority as king. He already channelled everything through himself. He was at the same time determined that the queen should not have a separate Court, perceiving it as part of his own and therefore subject to his jurisdiction and control. This is confirmed in official documents subsequently produced by the queen's household, where her servants and officers are repeatedly referred to as the king's servants. Bartholemew de Montague, for example, is in December 1628 referred to as " the king's servant, and one of the grooms of the privy chamber to the queen ", whilst there is an even clearer expression of this in a document prepared by the queen's chamberlain the, Earl of Dorset, where Edmund Fortescue is defined as being " a servant to the king, being a sewer to the queen ".<sup>9</sup> Neither would these appear to be exceptions, for they are repeated in a document of 2 July 1634 signed by the Earl of Arundel and entitled " the king's pleasure signified by the Earl Marshal touching the precedence of Sir Richard Wynn and others the queen's officers ", in which the queen's officers Sir Richard Wynn (treasurer), Sir Robert Aiton (secretary), Sir John Finch (attorney general) and Sir Thomas Hatton (surveyor general) " are noted as being " councillors to his Majesty [&] should have rank, and precedence next after four other eminent offices to his Majesty...", all providing a clear indication that with Charles viewing the queen's household as part of his Court they owed their allegiance primarily to him, serving the king through serving the queen.<sup>10</sup> Having spent a good deal of time and effort in settling it upon coming to the throne Charles's household was strictly regulated, with

---

<sup>9</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 416. 28 December 1628. Whitehall. Warrant to Attorney General Heath to prepare a grant of denization for Bartholemew de Montague.; CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 54. 11 May 1633. Certificate of Edward, Earl of Dorset, lord chamberlain to the queen.

<sup>10</sup> NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1580. 2 July 1634. Arundel House. Endorsed., The king's pleasure signified by the Earl Marshal touching the precedence of Sir Richard Wynn and others the queen's officers.

set times of attendance and high standards of etiquette and behaviour; and seeing that of the queen as being as part of his wider vision of the Court he was determined to see that it was regulated with equal precision. In order to achieve this end soon after Henrietta Maria's arrival Charles had sent a number of the Council " to her with those orders that were kept in the queen mother's house, desiring she would command the Count of Tilliers [her lord chamberlain] that the same might be kept in hers ".<sup>11</sup> Charles had evidently expected that his wife would accept these regulations without comment, but being a daughter of Henry IV. of France (as she herself reminded him) and young and headstrong and used to getting her own way she refused, desiring " leave to order her house as she list herself...".<sup>12</sup> Apart from the affront which she had dealt to Charles's dignity by having given this refusal in public, in itself it represented no real problem. However, all would depend upon the way in which the queen subsequently regulated her household, and unfortunately it was in a style which contrasted markedly with Charles's own. For in common with Charles's sister, Elizabeth, and her sister-in-law Anne of Austria Henrietta Maria showed a marked inability to control the actions or expenditure of her servants, which with the French having " not only picked the worst, but the most mischievous ", not only led to complaints that " there is no establishment in her household ", but also led to her being treated without that degree of state and ceremony which Charles felt was necessary for a queen of England.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Sir Charles Petrie, ed., Letters, Speeches and Proclamations of King Charles I. (London, 1935). p. 42. 12 July 1626. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 42. 12 July 1626. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>13</sup> NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1430. 2 August 1626. London. Owen Wynne - Sir John Wynn.; BL. Harleian 390. ff. 104-104v. 4 August 1626. John Pory - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 383. ff. 33-4. 5th August 1626. London. Pory - Joseph Mead.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 175. 7 October 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p 593. 30 October 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 515. 21 August 1626. Same - Same.

With Charles constrained by the terms of the marriage treaty but determined to see that the queen " is served by his own subjects and not by Frenchmen alone...", he initially attempted to overcome these problems posed by the queen's household through attempting to work within it through gaining control of its patronage and securing the appointment of courtiers who would be conducive to his ends.<sup>14</sup> But when this failed he decided to abandon his former conciliatory tone and resort to force through dismissing en-masse her entire French household, this being clearly expressed in his attempts to secure control of the selection the ladies of her bedchamber.

Charles's differences with Henrietta Maria over this position had begun even before she had arrived in England; for whilst the Earl of Holland (who had been one of the extraordinary ambassadors who had helped negotiate the marriage) had received a promise from the queen that she would appoint his wife a lady of her bedchamber, this was firmly opposed by Charles, not so much because he had any objections to Holland's wife, but because in accordance with his own patronage policy he was against her appointing anyone she had not seen, instead advising " ...her to take time to consider, hear, and see what may be said touching such persons as are to be so near...".<sup>15</sup> The real problems in relation to this position, though, began soon after her arrival, and centered around an attempt to get a number of Buckingham's relations, including his wife and mother, appointed to it.<sup>16</sup> This is usually assumed to be the work of Buckingham. In one sense it was, because if he had not had such close connections with James, and therefore Charles, it is doubtful if any of his dependents would have come into contact with the king, and here lies the caveat; for it was not due to his ability to influence the king, but the means of bringing people into frequent

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 197. 3 November 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>15</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 612. 23 April 1625. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>16</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 252.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 128. 31 July 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ballinger, ed., Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 217. 15 July 1625. Brentford. Henry Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

contact with him which accounts for the promotion of those around him. As these women were no mere strangers to Charles, but had been known and observed for many years, and had in effect been James's surrogate family. Charles had already declared his intention that none of his father's old servants should lose out by his death, but in terms of positions at Court this was much easier to achieve on behalf of men than women, and this explains his determination to settle a number of Buckingham's female relations in positions about his wife almost as soon as she arrived. As this would not only allow him to rest easy in the knowledge that he had fulfilled his obligations to his father's friends, but also that his wife was being served by people who he knew and trusted. However, whether these appointments could be allowed under the terms of the treaty was a question which the French Ambassador had to refer back to France.<sup>17</sup> At first Richelieu appeared prepared to accept them, but with his own position in France depending upon an appearance of strong support for the Catholic Church, he ultimately decided that it would not be prudent to allow the appointment of any non-Catholics about the queen, informing Charles towards the end of August that they could not "break the treaty by conceding...offices about the queen...".<sup>18</sup> After the political sacrifices made and risks taken by Charles and Buckingham in the interests of an alliance with France they deeply resented this move. Coming at much the same time as the problems in the regulation of the queen's household, and strengthening Charles's belief that it had played a part in the failure of his policies in parliament, by November 1625 he appears to have been on the point of dismissing it. He told Buckingham that he meant "to seek for no other grounds to cashier my monsieurs".<sup>19</sup> This, like the decision to appoint his relations in the first place, is also normally perceived to be an act of Buckingham's; but he was at this time on a diplomatic mission to the Hague, and that Charles had had to write to him of his

---

<sup>17</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 149. 26 August 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 128. 31 July 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid. p. 149. 26 August 1625. Same - Doge and Same.

<sup>19</sup> BL. Harleian 6988. f. 1. 20 November 1625. Hampton Court. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

intentions (most likely so that Buckingham, who was also supposed to travel into France, could inform the queen mother) would appear to indicate that the duke had played no part in it.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, with Buckingham's position depending much more upon the outcome of this alliance with France than Charles's, and with him being reported towards the end of January 1626 as attempting to become "as intimate as possible with the queen", it was much more likely that he was attempting to persuade Charles against taking making such a move, especially when Charles had noted that he would "put nothing of this in execution while I hear from you".<sup>21</sup> If this was his intention, though, he had only delayed the outcome of this problem rather than resolved it; for whilst he may have persuaded Charles to change his mind over dismissing the queen's household in a manner which would place the blame upon them, he had not altered his desire to either control her present household or replace it with another. The decision early the next month that "all the French should take the oath of fealty or go..." was therefore likely to have been a compromise resulting from this, aimed at giving Charles a pretext to remove them. But perhaps informed by Buckingham himself, seeing the way things were going only the queen's bishop and secretary caused difficulties, and this allowed the problem as to who controlled the queen's household to continue unresolved a little longer.<sup>22</sup> During the middle of May 1626, however, the French Ambassador, Blainville, whom Charles blamed for much of the discontent between him and his wife, left to return to France, and with Charles emboldened by this, matters came to a head.<sup>23</sup> Charles was determined to be master in his own Court. As a means of demonstrating his authority, he once again attempted to secure the appointment of a number of English women to serve the queen in her bedchamber. In July 1626 he nominated "the Lady Denbigh, the Marchioness of

---

<sup>20</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 28. 7 November 1625. Sir Arthur Ingram - Sir Thomas Wentworth.

<sup>21</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 291. 23 January 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid. p. 302. 31 January 1626. Same - Same.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 274. 9 January 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 417. 15 May 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

Hamilton her daughter, and the Countess of Carlisle ", followed by the Duchess of Buckingham, the Lady Savage and the Countess of Holland, informing his wife " madam, I wish you to receive these ladies as your ladies of the bedchamber, an honour very highly esteemed at this Court...".<sup>24</sup> For reasons of her own influence and pride, though, Henrietta Maria had no intention of conceding without a struggle. Strongly supported by the new French Ambassador, who believed it to be the work of Buckingham, " she replied that his Majesty was master but she would never have confidence with those ladies ", who according to the Venetian Ambassador, " were neither admitted nor excluded...".<sup>25</sup> This blatant challenge to his authority deeply angered Charles, convincing him that the queen's French servants were the root cause of all the problems in her household. There would be no prospect for an improvement so long as he was unable to control its patronage. When, a few days later, the queen attempted to make nominations to the commission regulating her jointure, he finally lost his patience, informing her that " he meant to be master and dispose of her offices as he pleased ".<sup>26</sup> This episode also appears to have prompted him to dismiss her French household, as two days later he wrote to Buckingham informing him that with all its problems being a consequence of the " ill crafty counsels of her servants for advancing of their own ends, rather than her own inclination " he could " no longer suffer those, that I knew to be the cause and formentors...to be about my wife

---

<sup>24</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 95. 15 July 1626. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid. f. 101. 28 July 1626. Same - Same.; Ibid. f. 104. 4 August 1626. London. John Pory - Mead.; Ibid. f. 108. 11 August 1626. London. Robert Gell - Stuteville.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 493. 31 July 1626.; Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 230. 30 July 1626. Unsigned newsletter.; PRO. SP16/33/30. 3 August 1626. Whitehall. Sir Benjamin Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.; HMC, Tenth Report. Appendix I. p. 45. 17 August 1626. Earl of Winton - Earl of Eglington.

<sup>25</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 493. 31 July 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 493. 31 July 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Petrie, ed., Letters of Charles I. pp. 42-3. 12 July 1626. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

any longer ".<sup>27</sup> And whilst wider political factors meant that the queen's household could not be dismissed immediately, plans to achieve it were already clearly underway, as that same day Charles had sent a similar letter to Dudley, Viscount Carleton, who had been " sent expressly to the French king to signify the fuller performance thereof...".<sup>28</sup> With these firmly in place by the beginning of August the plan was ready, and began to be put in execution when after a meeting of the Privy Council Charles passed into the queen's apartments and " took her by the hand and led her into his lodgings locking the door after him, and shutting out all save only the queen...began by degrees to break the matter unto her and to be short, told her he must needs cashier all her attendants, priests and others, males and females (but give her those that were better) ".<sup>29</sup>

The expulsion of the queen's French servants and officers together with Charles's decision to take over the responsibility of running her household had placed a great deal of patronage in his hands, and this immediately led to a great deal of speculation as to who was going to be appointed in their place. With Charles hoping to overcome the disorder with which it had been regulated in the past his initial intention appears to have been to appoint a fresh household for the queen with officers from amongst his acquaintance who he believed would enable him to achieve it. He had evidently decided upon Sir Richard Wynn (treasurer), Henry, Lord Percy (master of her horse), Sir Francis Cottington (secretary), the Earl of Holland (steward), Sir Thomas Savage (chancellor), George, Lord Goring (vice-chamberlain), and the Earl of Rutland.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 493. 31 July 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Petrie, ed., Letters of Charles I. pp. 42/3. 12 July 1626. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>28</sup> Carlton, Charles I. p. 88.; BL. Harleian 383. ff. 37-8. 11 August 1626. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>29</sup> Carlton, Charles I. p. 89.; BL. Harleian 383. ff. 33-4. 5 August 1626. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 104. 4 August 1626. Same - Same.

<sup>30</sup> Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 223. 9 February 1626. London. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1433. 6 August 1626. Henry Wynn - Sir John Wynn.; PRO. SP16/33/30. 3 August



With the majority of these figures having previously had connections with Buckingham and with him also being seen as responsible for the dismissal of the French household he is usually perceived as the key figure in the selection of these figures. However, with Charles himself having informed Buckingham of his decision to dismiss the queen's household it would seem likely that as he himself had informed the Venetian Ambassador " he had nothing whatever to do with it. The king had done everything himself ", and this also appears to have been the case in these appointments.<sup>31</sup> For whilst their connections with Buckingham cannot be denied, their relative importance can, as all were were equally well acquainted with the king himself - Sir Richard Wynn, Sir Francis Cottington and Sir Thomas Savage had all been in Charles's service as prince, Goring had been a gentleman of the privy chamber to Prince Henry, Holland had been one of those who had accompanied Charles to Spain in 1623 and had helped negotiate his marriage to Henrietta Maria, whilst Rutland, along with the Earl of Worcester, was in November 1628 to be exempted from an order to remove recusants from lord lieutenancies on the grounds that Charles " held them to be very good subjects...".<sup>32</sup> However, whilst this could perhaps be taken as an indication that Buckingham's ability to influence the distribution of patronage was restricted to parameters set by the king it does not necessarily prove that they were not his work but that of the king. That this was in fact the case, though, can be seen in the case of Sir Francis Cottington.

Cottington is usually seen as having been advanced to his position as secretary to the prince through the means of Buckingham, but this principally rests upon the fact

---

1626. Whitehall. Sir Benjamin --Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.; BL. Harleian 390. ff. 113v. 17 August 1626. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>31</sup> Petrie, ed., Letters of Charles I. pp. 42-44. 12 July 1626. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 304.

<sup>32</sup> PRO. LC2/6. f. 69v. 1625. List of gentlemen of the privy chamber to Prince Charles.; Ibid. f. 72v. 1625. List of councillors and commissioners of the prince's revenue.; Havran, Cottington. p. 65.; Birch, Life of Henry. p. 347.; Court and Times of James I. p. 374. 14 March 1623. London. To the Rev. Joseph Mead.; BL. Harleian 383. ff. 72-3. 28 November 1628. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

that he had in 1621 written him a note of thanks for having secured the payment of moneys due to him as charge d'affairs in Spain, and had felt it prudent to send another in 1622 in the light of his appointment.<sup>33</sup> And with Charles and Buckingham still favouring military action, whilst only being luke warm over the prospect of a Spanish Marriage, his appointment would appear much more likely to have been the work of James, with the marginal nature of Buckingham's role being demonstrated in Cottington's letter of thanks, where Cottington noted " how near a stranger I am to you...".<sup>34</sup> Being " so long conversant and well seen in all Spanish affairs " and knowing " the bias of that Court to a hair...", as secretary Cottington provided the prince with a vital link in a policy which James was determined to see through and which concerned him deeply; which with Charles subsequently bowing to the inevitable and himself actively pursuing a Spanish marriage, not only provided Cottington with a place at the very centre of affairs, but also an excellent means of working his way into his favour.<sup>35</sup> In February 1623 Charles, accompanied by Buckingham and Cottington, had travelled to Spain with the intention of securing both a wife and a solution to the Palatine problem, but neither of these objectives had been met by the time he returned to England at the end of September, after which relations between the two countries took a sharp decline.<sup>36</sup> Cottington's biographer, M.J. Havran, sees this as a major turning point in his career (at least until Charles again warmed to a closer relationship with the Spaniards at the end of the 1620s). His expertise in Spanish affairs was for the moment no longer required by Charles, and he

---

<sup>33</sup> BL. Harleian 1580. f. 363. 5 March 1621. Madrid. Sir Francis Cottington - Marquess of Buckingham.; Ibid. f. 369. 25 June 1622. St. Vet. Madrid. Sir Francis Cottington - Marquess of Buckingham.

<sup>34</sup> BL. Harleian 1580. f. 369. 25 June 1622. St. Vet. Madrid. Sir Francis Cottington - Marquess of Buckingham.

<sup>35</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 468. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 475. 25 January 1623. London. Same - Same.; M.J Havran, Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington. (London,1973). p. 70.

<sup>36</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 480. 22 February 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

had come to believe that he had slipped into his disfavour (supposedly as a consequence of a death-bed conversion to Catholicism whilst in Spain in October 1623). He concluded that he was about to be removed from office.<sup>37</sup> This, however, was not the way in which the prince worked, for having little understanding of the realities of political life Charles expected obedience from everyone and unlike his father generally appointed people for his personal rapport with them not their political standpoint, such friction as there was appearing to be restricted to relations between Cottington and Buckingham. Buckingham's own relations with the prince whilst in Spain had not been trouble-free, for Charles had on occasions been unsatisfied with both the lack of respect he had shown him and the harshness of his negotiating manner, as a consequence of which he had brought the Earl of Bristol (the resident ambassador) back into the negotiations.<sup>38</sup> With Cottington enjoying good relations with Bristol this last act may have been at his suggestion; but whether he was or no there were already signs that all was not well between him and Buckingham, as in June 1623 the duke wrote to James beseeching him " to tell Cottington that I love him...", hardly necessary if they had parted on such terms or if he had no fear of the consequences of what Cottington, who had recently returned, was able to inform him of his actions.<sup>39</sup> Cottington had by this time returned to Spain, and in the light of the eventual failure of these negotiations Buckingham's great worry was that he (like Bristol) would be able to release information which could be interpreted by James as indicating that the duke had been the cause of failure. With James still unduly optimistic about a successful outcome, the prospect of disappointment triggered attempts to apportion the blame. On 24 September, the Earl of Bristol had already written to Lord Keeper

---

<sup>37</sup>  
77-81.

Havran, Cottington. pp.

<sup>38</sup>  
160-1.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 121. 15 July 1623.  
Westminster College. Bishop John William - Duke of  
Buckingham.

<sup>39</sup>  
Havran, Cottington. p. 34.;  
Cowper, I. p. 143. 15 June 1623. Sir Robert Pye -  
Secretary Coke.; Petrie, ed., Letters of Charles I. p.  
22. 27 June 1623. Madrid. Prince Charles and Buckingham  
- James I.

Williams informing him that " within three days Sir Francis Cottington will be able to begin his journey towards your lordship. He will tell you many truths...", truths which Buckingham wished to conceal. <sup>40</sup> However, just before he was due to leave, along with Buckingham and the prince, Cottington had suffered a re-occurrence of the ill-health which had dogged him throughout his years in Spain, and it appears likely that Buckingham had taken advantage of the delay which this had brought in his departure to discredit or at least marginalise him. <sup>41</sup>

His relations with the prince could not have been more different, though; as rather than demonstrating any sign of disfavour towards him Charles had not only retained him as his secretary but he also wrote " to Berry and one or two other places " in his behalf for a seat in the 1624 parliament (eventually giving him the Duchy seat of Camelford in Devon) and granted him a number of manors and lands in Kent. <sup>42</sup> However, after the death of James circumstances were to work against him achieving a place under Charles as king. Buckingham's cool or cautious attitude towards him seemed to overshadow the continued support which was offered to him by Charles. For whilst Buckingham had been only relaying an order of Charles's when he informed Cottington that his presence was no longer required at Court, it is clear that

---

<sup>40</sup> Cabala Sive Scrinia Sacra. Mysteries of State and Government: In Letters of Illustrious Persons, and Great Agents; in the Reigns of Henry the Eighth, Queen Elizabeth, King James and the Late King Charles. (London, 1654). pp. 22-24. 24 September 1623. Earl of Bristol - Bishop of Lincoln.

<sup>41</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. pp. 516-7. 11 October 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 119. 25 November 1623. Matthew Nicholas - Edward Nicholas.; Spedding, ed., The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon. 7 Vols. (London, 1862-1874). Vol. VII. p. 444. 2 January 1624. Sir Francis Bacon. Conference with Buckingham. " Weeding time is not come. Cott. Car. fill...".

<sup>42</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. pp. 534-5. 15 November 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 542. 31 January 1624. London. Same - Same.; Havran, Cottington. p. 83.; BL. Harleian 1718. f. 93v. 19 November 1624. Newmarket. Prince Charles - Sir Henry Hobart.

he had made more of this than Charles had intended, and that Charles still held him in esteem and had done his best to secure him an alternative position to cushion the blow as much as possible. <sup>43</sup>

Given the normal convention that princes should allow their servants to " hold the places they had under them " when they became king, the obvious position for Cottington would have been that of secretary of state, a position to which he had already been linked in 1623. <sup>44</sup> Being about to embark upon a war in the interest of the Palatinate Charles eventually decided upon maintaining his father's secretaries; for Conway (whatever his other faults) clearly understood military affairs, whilst Morton, although essentially a diplomat like Cottington, had at one time been secretary to the Queen of Bohemia, and his connections and expertise on the Protestant countries of Western Europe would be more likely to be of use at this time than Cottington's Spanish ones. <sup>45</sup> However, this decision had clearly not been an easy one; as whilst Sir Albertus Morton had been re-appointed as secretary by 29 March 1625, two days after the death of James, Conway's did not come until nearly two months later on 23 May 1625. <sup>46</sup> During this whole period Conway had clearly been acting as secretary, and given that it was he who had procured the king's signature for the warrant for Morton's appointment back in April, it would not appear likely that this had been due

---

<sup>43</sup> Havran, Cottington. pp. 82, 85.

<sup>44</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. p. 97.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol II. p. 471. 4 January 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>45</sup> BL. Stowe 176. f. 18. 9 April 1616. London. John Woodford - Sir Thomas Edmondes.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VII. p. 216. 1 October 1616. Annuity Albert Morton, secretary of Elizabeth, Electress Palatine.

<sup>46</sup> PRO. SO3/8. March 1625. Office of one of his majesty's principal secretaries to Sir Albert Morton. By order of the Duke of Buckingham. Procured Conway.; Ibid. May 1625. Office of one of his majesty's principal secretaries to Lord Conway. Subscribed by order of Secretary Conway.; These respectively passed the Great Seal on the 9 April and 23 May 1625. Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. I. pp. 14, 64.

to a lack of time, and seems likely to have been linked to negotiations over his possible appointment as Lord Deputy of Ireland and replacement by Cottington.<sup>47</sup> Negotiations appear to have continued for the best part of April, but had evidently been settled by 23 April 1625, by which time Charles had decided to maintain both Lord Conway Viscount Falkland in their present offices, compensating Cottington with a grant of lands worth £400 per annum and a yearly pension of £200.<sup>48</sup> With this coming to a combined total of £600 per annum it exceeded the grant of £500 which had been made to Lord Leppington in recompense for his position as lord chamberlain to the prince; and whilst it is true that Leppington had retained his position as gentleman of the bedchamber, he had looked after Charles since infancy, and there is therefore no denying that this represented an extremely generous financial package for Cottington. Together with Charles's willingness to consider his re-appointment to high office this contrasts markedly with Cottington's relations dealings with Buckingham at this time, which makes it all the more likely that upon the dismissal of his wife's household it was Charles himself who decided to compensate him through appointing him as her secretary.

---

<sup>47</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain.  
Vol. II. p. 606. 12 March 1625. London. John Chamberlain  
Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid. p. 607. 23 March 1625.  
London. Same - Same.; Ibid. p. 611. 23 April 1625.  
London. Same - Same.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 11. 18 April  
1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Francis  
Bacon had already noted the need to defend against the  
risk of foreign attack through Ireland, whilst Conway's  
military skills together with the fact that his brother,  
Fulke, already held extensive lands there was likely to  
have made him a prime candidate to replace Falkland.  
Spedding, ed., Letters and life of Francis Bacon. Vol.  
VII. p. 446. 2nd January 1624. Conference with  
Buckingham.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 229. 30 March 1627.  
London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>48</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain.  
Vol. II. p. 611. 23 April 1625. London. John Chamberlain  
- Sir Dudley Carleton.; PRO. SO3/8. May 1625. A  
warrant...for granting to Sir Francis Cottington, bt.,  
and his heirs in fee farm, such, and so many manors, and  
lands which immediately before his late majesty's  
decease were within the survey of the Exchequer...  
Subscribed attorney general according to a warrant from  
the lord treasurer. Procured Sir Francis Cottington.

Driven by his own preferences and in some cases also a sense of personal obligation, then, Charles had personally selected a number of candidates who he wished to appoint to key offices within the queen's household either in advance or at least soon after the dismissal of her French ones. No longer bound by the terms of the French marriage treaty and having gone to such lengths to achieve control of the queen's household patronage it would not appear that anything could have prevented their subsequent appointment. However, whilst when Queen Anne had died in 1619 " the white staves [the staffs of office of her household officers] of her household [had been] broken over the grave " in recognition of its dissolution, it is possible that many of her servants had held patents for the duration of their lives to whoever happened to be queen at the time rather than for hers; but more importantly before she had died she had made a " nuncupatory will, or [one] by word of mouth, giving all she had to the prince, with charge to pay her debts, and reward her servants ".<sup>49</sup> With Charles having already selected a number of new officers to serve his wife he would not appear to have been aware of the possibility that those who had served his mother were in legal terms still in possession of their office, but when reminded of this by some of them after the dismissal of the French, the promise which he had given to his mother ensured that he took them seriously. This obligation appears to have led to a similar situation to that which had existed in relation to his father's officers upon his death in 1625, when Charles would have preferred it if they had stepped aside; but he would not remove any of them against their will. In cases where Anne's officer had died, as appears to have been the case in relation to the High Steward of her revenues, this posed no problem, enabling the immediate appointment of the Earl of Holland.<sup>50</sup> But where they were still alive it inevitably led to a series of compromises. So whilst the Earl of Totnes was re-appointed as the queen's treasurer and receiver general, Sir Richard Wynn receiving a grant of the position " so soon as as the same shall become void and in his majesty's hands to dispose ", this appears to

---

<sup>49</sup> Court and Times of James I.  
p. 144. 6 March 1619. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>50</sup> BL. Harleian 390. ff. 113-4.  
17 August 1626. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

have been on condition that he relinquished any right which he had in the position of vice-chamberlain to the queen, which allowed the appointment of George, Lord Goring.<sup>51</sup> Similar deals appear to have been struck in relation to the positions of chancellor and master of the horse to the queen, with Sir Thomas Richardson (who had served Queen Anne) being compensated by his appointment to the vacant position of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas so as to allow Sir Thomas Savage to become chancellor.<sup>52</sup> Sir Thomas Somerset apparently relinquished his claim to the mastership of her horse (which went instead to Henry, Lord Percy) in the hope of using it as a bargaining counter to extract some other benefit; this was evidently only partially met by his creation that December as " Viscount Somerset de Castle in County Tipperary, Ireland ", as he noted in a petition to the king after the appointment of his nephew, Sir John Winter, as the queen's secretary in 1638 how " he gave up his place of master of the horse without recompense, whereas all others that had places under the late queen, your majesty's mother, were restored to places or had other recompense...".<sup>53</sup> Sir Robert Aiton's desire to re-enter Crown service (having in 1623 attempted to use his pension for serving Anne as a means of

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., f. 113v. 17 August 1626. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; PRO. SO3/8. March 1627. Newmarket. A letter whereby his majesty is please to confer on Sir Richard Wynn, kt., the place of receiver general to the queen...so soon as the same shall become void and in his majesty's hands to dispose.; BL. King's 136. ff. 503, 506v. Undated list of Queen Anne's former servants used by the French c.1624-1625.

<sup>52</sup> E. Foss, The Judges of England; with sketches of their lives and miscellaneous notices connected with the courts at Westminster, from the time of the conquest. (London,1857). Vol. VI. pp. 220, 359-60.

<sup>53</sup> BL. King's 136. f. 503. Undated list of Queen Anne's former servants used by the French c.1624-1625.; CSPD,Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 174. 8 December 1626. Patent creating Sir Thomas Somerset to the dignity of Viscount de Somerset in County Tipperary, Ireland.; Caroline Hibbard, Charles I. and the Popish Plot. (University of North Carolina,1983). pp. 62, 154.; CSPD,1637-1638. p. 531. 27 June 1638. Viscount Somerset - Secretary Coke.



obtaining the Provostship of Eton upon death of Sir Thomas Murray) meant that it was impossible for Charles to secure the appointment of his candidate as secretary.<sup>54</sup> This was also the case in relation to Sir Francis Cottington, who before his eventual appointment as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1629 appears likely to have received a similar promise of this position about the queen as given to Sir Richard Wynn over his, in the meantime undertaking a number of administrative tasks about the Court being compensated by a grant of Freemantle Park in Hampshire and a continuation of his pensions.<sup>55</sup>

The task of appointing a lord chamberlain to the queen, though, was to prove more difficult. With Queen Anne's old officer, Robert Sidney, first Earl of Leicester, having died in July 1626 there should not have been any problem in securing the appointment of Charles's initial choice of the Earl of Rutland.<sup>56</sup> However, confirming the fact that Rutland's selection had been the work of Charles rather than Buckingham, by the middle of August it was being reported by John Pory that " my Lord of Rutland refuseth to be her [the queen's] lord chamberlain ", whilst a week or so later the Venetian Ambassador stated how that he had " practically declined the position ", with it appearing that in the light of the recent impeachment of his son-in-law and attacks upon his own person in parliament he had no wish to take up such a position, and had therefore placed such conditions upon his appointment as amounted to a refusal.<sup>57</sup> Whatever the cause, by the end of August it had been decided that Rutland

---

<sup>54</sup> BL. Stowe 743. ff. 48-9. 10 April 1623. Sir Robert Aiton - Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>55</sup> Havran, Cottington. pp. 86-88.; PRO. SO3 8. July 1626. Office of keeper of Freemantle Park in Hampshire in the County of Southampton granted to Sir Francis Cottington... By warrant under the king's royal signature. Procured Conway.; Ibid., SO3/9. April 1629. Grant to Sir Francis Cottington of the office of Chancellor and Under-treasurer of the Exchequer during life.

<sup>56</sup> DNB, sub Philip Sidney.

<sup>57</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 113v. 17 August 1626. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 519. 28 August 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; For the personal attacks upon Rutland in the 1626 parliament see eg. Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. Vol. II. p. 357. 24 March 1626. Speech of Sir John

was not going to be appointed as the queen's chamberlain, which placed Charles in the unique position of having to look for a new candidate rather than trying to overcome the problems consequent upon having too many, eventually deciding upon the Earl of Dorset.<sup>58</sup> With Dorset staunchly backing the line taken by Charles in the 1621 parliament and his subsequent decision to dissolve the 1626 parliament (in direct opposition to the advice given by Buckingham) and taking a firm line against the judges who refused to subscribe to the forced loan he would appear to be a long-term ally of his, and this is confirmed in that he had along with the Earl of Holland and Viscount Andover been elected as a Knight of the Garter soon after Charles's accession to the throne.<sup>59</sup> Dorset's own political ambitions at this time appear to have centered around the position of Lord Deputy of Ireland, but with Charles determined to restore the queen's household to order his hard-line approach together with the fact that he had spent three years in France made him an ideal candidate as chamberlain to a French queen.<sup>60</sup> Again, however, factors were working against the implementation of Charles's plans. His intention in removing the queen's French household had been merely to restore it to some kind of order. Neither he nor the

---

--Eliot.

<sup>58</sup> CSPV,1625-1626. p. 519. 28 August 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>59</sup> D.L. Smith, 'The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Politics of the sixteen-twenties', pp. 37-53., in BIHR. Vol. 156. 1992. p. 40.; W. Notestein, et al eds., Commons Debates, 1621. (New Haven,1935). Vol. II. p. 454. 27 November 1621. Speech of Sir Edward Sackville.; Ibid. p. 487. 3 December 1621. Speech of Sir Edward Sackville.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 267.; CSPV,1625-1626. p. 146. 26 August 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 167v. 1 December 1626. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; CSPD,Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 14. 16 May 1625. Thomas Locke - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 619. 21 May 1625. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>60</sup> CSPV,1625-1626. p. 479. 18 July 1626. Extraordinary Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; PRO. C115/N3.8538. Undated. November 1626. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; D.L. Smith, 'The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Politics of the Sixteen-Twenties', pp. 37-53, in BIHR. Vol. 156. pp. 40-1.

French authorities wished it to escalate into open conflict. As a means of healing the wounds which had been caused, the French had sent over the Marshal de Bassompierre as an extraordinary ambassador, arriving in London on 27 September 1626, apparently before Dorset had been formally appointed as lord chamberlain to the queen.<sup>61</sup> Then, with negotiations continuing for the best part of the next month all further appointments were put on hold; and with the vacant position of chamberlain being one of the main bargaining chips in them, by the beginning of November an arrangement had been reached by which it was agreed that whilst most of the English around the queen were to remain in office, they were to be supplemented by a number of French, with Charles's single largest concession being that he agreed (albeit for a limited period) to admit a French Chamberlain.<sup>62</sup> However, this delayed rather than prevented Dorset's appointment, as demonstrated in the fact that when the Earl of Carlisle had escorted Bassompierre to his audience with the queen, some had thought that "Dorset should have been more properly his conductor..."; and with relations between Charles and Henrietta Maria having by this time improved, and the need to court the French having been removed by virtue of the fact that England was now at war with them, Dorset was finally appointed as chamberlain to the queen at the same time as a number of minor alterations were made to accommodate the resignation of Henry, Lord Percy in July 1628.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 349.

<sup>62</sup> PRO. SP16/39/25. 4 November 1626. Whitehall. Sir Benjamin Rudyerd - Sir Francis - Nethersole.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 55. 10 November 1626. London. John - Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid. f. 157. 11 November 1626. Christ College, Cambridge. Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

<sup>63</sup> Goring became master of the queen's horse, and was replaced as vice chamberlain by Sir Robert Killigrew.; Smith, 'Dorset', in BIHR. p. 30.; PRO. LS13/169. p. 42. 16 July 1628.; Cowper, I. p. 358. 17 July 1628. Humphry Fulwood - Secretary Coke.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 218. 18 July 1628. Denmark House. Sir Robert Aiton - Earl of Carlisle.; HMC, Fourth Report. (1874). p. 290. 18 July 1628. Nicholas Herman - Carlisle.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 424. 19 July 1628. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 87. 23 July 1628. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.

The principal problem in relation to the settlement of the queen's officers had been caused by the fact that Charles had nominated a number of people before realising the claims of his mother's old servants, but with the exception of the position of lady of her bedchamber this was not something which he had repeated in any of the other positions in the queen's household, where the re-appointment of his mother's old servants, supplemented where necessary by new ones selected by him, now provided a convenient way of combining his determination to restore it with his preference for familiar faces and evidence of service, it being reported that " all the late queen's servants shall be returned to their places...".<sup>64</sup>

That this was the case can be seen in relation to the position of of groom of the chamber, of which Anne had had thirteen at the time of her death in 1619.<sup>65</sup> Of the twelve selected by Charles to serve Henrietta Maria in this position in August 1626 eight, Robert Barrett, Robert Mosely, Henry Bold, Thomas Ayre, Hugh Smith, Edmund Bayly and Edward Castleford had served under Anne.<sup>66</sup> Of the others two, Richard Scott and Robert Smethwicke, had served as grooms of the chamber to James I., whilst William Price had been a groom of the privy chamber to Charles as prince.<sup>67</sup> This meant that the only person appointed with no previous connection in Crown service was Henry Poskin. Indeed, this same pattern of re-appointing old servants of the Crown appears to have lay behind the settlement of all the positions in the queen's household.

Charles's concern to control his wife's household through its patronage did not lessen in the years ahead. As the same determination to promote those with previous connections with the Crown which had lain behind appointments upon its

---

<sup>64</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 113v. 17 August 1626. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; PRO. SP16/33/30. 3 August 1626. Whitehall. Sir Benjamin Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.

<sup>65</sup> PRO. LC2/5. p. 36. 1619. List of grooms of the queen's chamber.

<sup>66</sup> Comparison of Ibid with PRO. LR5/57. f. 13v. 1626. List of grooms of the chamber.

<sup>67</sup> PRO. LC2/6. f. 70. 1625. Grooms of the chamber to King James.; Ibid. f. 43. 1625. Grooms of the chamber to Prince Charles.

establishment is equally apparent in such alterations as were subsequently made. For although the queen was likely to have played a large part in the appointments of John Garnier as a groom of her privy chamber in the place of Anthony Mansfield and Monsieur Coignett as a gentleman usher daily waiter in the place of John Stewart at some point between 1629 and 1635 (both of them being French and their wives serving as ladies of her bedchamber), it was Charles who was in control.<sup>68</sup> Evidence is provided by the appointment of David Williams as a groom of the queen's chamber in the place of Hill Ross in 1637, who was noted as being "made choice of by the king to serve the queen".<sup>69</sup> That this was indeed the case is confirmed in appointments to the position of lady of her bedchamber. For when in the light of the death of the Countess of Buckingham the duchess had in January 1637 attempted to introduce her daughter in her place the queen (being opposed to this) was reported to have "looked her out", yet when a second vacancy was caused by the death of the Marchioness of Hamilton in 1638 it was she who was appointed to it.<sup>70</sup> Given the queen's earlier attempt to prevent her appointment it would appear unlikely to have been a move of hers, and squares much more easily with Charles's earlier promise to take care of the late duke's children, in the pursuit of which he had raised them along with his own children and had married Mary to his own cousin, the Duke of Richmond and Lennox.<sup>71</sup> Subsequent appointments therefore carry the clear stamp of Charles through his preference for evidence of service. Some, such as that of Toby

---

<sup>68</sup> Comparison of PRO. LR5/57. f. 24v. 1629. with PRO. E101/439/3. ff. 8-13v, 62v. Acquittances for the wages of the queen's servants and officers 1634/5.

<sup>69</sup> CSPD, 1636-1637. p. 525. 28 March 1637. Warrant for payment to David Williams, made choice of by the king to serve the queen as one of the grooms of her chamber, in the place of Hill Ross, deceased.

<sup>70</sup> Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. p. 151.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 47. 22 January 1637. Sion. Lord Conway - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>71</sup> G.D. Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. Characters and Episodes from the Great Rebellion. Selected from the History and Autobiography of Edward, Earl of Clarendon. (Oxford, 1889). p. 129.

Baily as a groom of the queen's chamber (in the place of Richard Baily between 1627 and 1629) and Frederick Curvile as a cupbearer (in the place of Sir Ambrose Curvile between 1626-1629) appear to have replaced family members.<sup>72</sup> Others, such as that of Valentine Clark (whose brother, Edward, was a groom of the bedchamber to the queen and had previously held the same position under James and been high in the favour of the Duke of Buckingham) as a groom of the queen's privy chamber in the place of William Gomledon at some point between 1629 and 1635, and Mr Tunstall (whose relation, Sir John Tunstall, had served Queen Anne and remained in Henrietta Maria's service throughout the 1630s) as a gentleman usher daily waiter in the place of Zachary Bethell during the same period appear to have been appointed as a consequence of still having family members in office.<sup>73</sup> That it was the reassurance which these family connections gave to the king which made them important, though, rather than their ability to intercede with him, is demonstrated in that they were by no means essential provided the king had some other knowledge. This can be seen in the appointments of Henry Brown (at some point between 1629 and 1635) and James Ross (at some point between 1635 and 1639) as pages of the chamber in the place of Arthur Boderon and Alexander Stephenson.<sup>74</sup> As Henry Brown was already in the

---

<sup>72</sup> Comparison of PRO LR5/57. f. 12 1626 with Ibid f. 4v. 1627. and Ibid ff. 24, 25v. 1629.

<sup>73</sup> Comparison of Ibid f. 24v. 1629 with PRO. E101/439/3. ff. 10-13v. 1634/5. and BL. Egerton 1048. f. 186v. Undated c.1639-1640.; CSPD, 1637-1638. p. 123. Undated 1637. Petition of Valentine Clark, one of the grooms of the queen's privy chamber - Charles I. Valentine Clark is not mentioned in the 1634/5 list, whilst Gomledon disappears after 1634/5.; For Edward Clark see PRO. LC2/6. f. 38. 1625. List of grooms of the bedchamber to King James.; Proceedings in parliament, 1625. p. 413. Commons's Journal. 6 August 1625.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 546. 25 September 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; CSPD, 1627-1627. p. 163. Undated, 1627. Edward Clark - Secretary Conway.; PRO. LC2/5. 1625. f. 35. 1619. List of gentleman ushers, daily waiters to the queen.

<sup>74</sup> Comparison of PRO. LR5/57. f. 25. 1629. with PRO. E101/439/3. ff. 23-24. 1634/5. and BL. Egerton 1048. f. 187. Undated. c.1639-1640.

service of the king, having been jointly appointed by him as under-keeper of Denmark House and keeper of the wardrobe and privy lodgings there upon Charles's accession to the throne in 1625, whilst James Ross had been a page of the chamber to Charles as prince and continued in the same position under him as king.<sup>75</sup> Neither was this personal control of the patronage of the queen's household on the part of the king restricted to her servants, as exactly the same thing can be seen in relation her officers. This is clearly demonstrated in the appointment of a new secretary upon the death of Sir Robert Aiton in February 1638.<sup>76</sup>

Confirming his predominant role in the distribution of her patronage it was the personal preferences of the king which were at first reflected in the candidates linked to this position, Sir William Beecher, Sir William Boswell, Robert Kirkham, Henry Jermyn and Robert Long all being Protestant and having previous connections with him.<sup>77</sup> Beecher, for example, was a relatively minor official of the Crown who had offered consistent support to Buckingham during the 1620s, whilst Boswell (perhaps through the links which he had enjoyed with Lord Keeper Coventry and the Earl of Carlisle) had served as Ambassador to the Hague before replacing William Trumbull as Clerk of the Council upon his return in 1635.<sup>78</sup> Similarly, Robert Kirkham's claim

---

<sup>75</sup> PRO. SO3/8. May 1625. Office of under-keeper of Denmark House. Procured Endymion Porter.; PRO. LC2/6. f. 69. 1625.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 19. 15 March 1628. Confirmation to James Ross, Hugh Wood, Hayward Rogers and Hugh Henn, pages of the bedchamber...

<sup>76</sup> PRO. C115 N3/8815. 24 January 1637. London. Sir John Finet - Viscount Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters.- Vol. II. p. 148. 7 February 1638. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 152. 20 March 1638. Strand. Same - Same.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 152. 20 March 1638. Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>78</sup> PRO. SO3/8. June 1627 Sir William Beecher, one of the Clerks of the Privy Council.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 583. 16 March 1635. Note of business transacted by the commissioners of the treasury.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. Vol. II. pp. 357-8. 24 March 1626. Speech by Beecher.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1628. Vol. IV. p. 121. 5 June 1628. Speech by Beecher.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 537. 31 January 1628.

to this position appears to have come through his being the Clerk of the Signet who had attended as secretary Sir Thomas Edmondes as extraordinary ambassador to France in 1629, whilst Henry Jermyn was already in her service as a gentlemen usher of the privy chamber and Robert Long had served as secretary to Lord Treasurer Marlborough during the 1620s.<sup>79</sup> However, growing affection between king and queen and the measures which Charles had taken to restore Henrietta's household to order had greatly improved relations between them and reduced his previous tendency to ignore her own preferences; and this had brought an alteration in the type of person under consideration.

With Charles having assumed direct control of the queen's household patronage upon the dismissal of her French servants in 1626, Henrietta Maria had little scope for independent action. The one exception, though, was in relation to religion, where Charles's lack of interest in her personal religious preferences together with his hopes of the final instalment of her jointure had led him in 1629 to " allow her eight Capuchins, four other priests and one bishop ", who arrived shortly after the birth of

---

Sir John Hippisley - Edward Nicholas.; Ibid., p. 541. 2 February 1628. Hippisley - Duke of Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 453. 19 January 1629. Barbican. William Peterson - Sir William --Boswell.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. p. 617. 1625. Note.; Cowper, I. p. 454. 11 April/1 July 1632. Star Chamber. Richard Willis - Secretary Coke.; CSPD,1625-1626. p. 42. 26 March 1625. Westminster. Warrant to pay to William Boswell...; BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 318-9. 12 January 1632. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/M35/8390. 14 January 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. P. 467. 3 October 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; CSPD,1636-1637. p. 404. 31 January 1637. Charles I. - Boswell, as Clerk of the Council.

<sup>79</sup> BCL. DV.896/603183/35. 1 June 1629. A patent granted to Philip Warwick, gent., of the office of Clerk of the Signet in ordinary. The present officers, Francis Gall, Francis Windebanke, Robert Kirkham and Sir Humphry May.; CSPD,1628-1629. p. 571. 9 June 1629. Westminster. Warrant to pay Robert Kirkham.; CSPD,1636. p. 417. 10 May 1636. Robert Kirkham - Charles I.; PRO. LR5/57. f. 12. 1626.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 148. 7 February 1638. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.



Prince Charles in March 1630.<sup>80</sup> Their actions, such as preaching over "vows and observation of Lent, that whosoever did eat flesh in that time without licence or dispensation was ipso facto damned..." caused "a great stir among all the puritan party".<sup>81</sup> Whilst Charles had tried to limit the wider effects of this through banning any of his own subjects from going to Mass in the queen's chapel, the direct involvement of the queen made enforcement difficult.<sup>82</sup> Her protection in effect allowed them to implement their plan of advancing the cause the Catholic Church. The inherent strength of Charles's belief in the doctrine of the Church of England meant that this was effectively a non-starter. But like many of his own subjects the Vatican read into his emphasis upon ritual and ceremony a sympathy for the Catholic faith which led them to hold out hopes for his eventual conversion; and in order to advance this cause as well as settle the differences between the various Catholic factions in December 1634 a Papal agent, Gregorio Panzani, was sent to the queen's Court.<sup>3</sup> The arrival of such a figure caused general alarm amongst Protestants, but essentially a diplomat rather than a religious zealot, Panzani posed no great risk. He had managed to open negotiations over a possible re-union of the two Churches, but on Charles's part this was only acceptable on the assumption that the Roman Catholic rather than the English Catholic Church would have to alter its position. This was not an attitude well received in Rome. Nevertheless it continued to hold out hopes for the conversion and re-integration of the English Church to that of Rome, and in December 1636 replaced Panzani with George Conn, a Scotchman who added great

---

<sup>80</sup> CSPV, 1626-1639. p. 213. 19 October 1629. Venetian Ambassador.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 265. 24 October 1629. Essex House. George --Gresley - Thomas Puckering.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 500. 6 March 1630. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., f. 503v. 13 March 1630. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 304. 22 March 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>82</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 504. 20 March 1630. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 304. 22 March 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 309. 29 March 1630. Same - Same.

<sup>83</sup> Hibbard, Plot. p. 44.

personal charm with an ability for subterfuge.<sup>84</sup> This charm tempted Conn to ingratiate himself with both the king and queen; and whilst his ambition was the same as that of Panzani, to try and obtain " a position of ever greater favour for the Catholic Church ", his way of going about it was different; for where Panzani had mainly looked at removing the religious differences which stood between the Churches of England and Rome, Conn hoped to establish a form of ' Devot ' party as a means of putting pressure on the king, focussing his intentions upon increasing the number and profile of Catholics around the queen, according to the Venetian Ambassador, to " devote himself with enthusiasm to this matter...".<sup>85</sup>

With this in mind, when Sir Robert Aiton died in March 1638 Charles had been persuaded by Conn and the queen to allow her a Catholic replacement; and amongst those believed to be in contention were Walter Montagu, Sir William Howard, Sir Kenelm Digby, George Gage and a Mr Abingdon, a son-in-law of William, Lord Herbert of Powys.<sup>86</sup> Abingdon was likely to have been advanced by his uncle, Powys, who was himself a Recusant and in the favour of the king. He had recently gained access to Charles in an attempt to prevent a proposal made at the Council by his kinsman, Philip, Earl of Montgomery (whose estate Powys's grandson would inherit if Montgomery's son died) to " take away the eldest sons of all who were Popishly affected, and breed them up in the religion established in the Church of England...".<sup>87</sup> Whilst George Gage was a Catholic priest who had been deeply involved in the negotiations over a Spanish marriage in the early 1620s and had then been linked to the position of secretary to the Infanta.<sup>88</sup> Sir Kenelm Digby, on the

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., pp. 44, 46.

<sup>85</sup> CSPV, 1636-1639. p. 97. 14 November 1636. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Hibbard, Plot. pp. 49, 51.

<sup>86</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 148. 7 February 1638. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 152. 20 March 1638. Strand. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. Same - Same.; Hibbard, Plot. p. 62.

<sup>87</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 147. 7 February 1638. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>88</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol.

other hand, had worked himself into the favour of the king through his conversion from Catholicism and their mutual interest in the navy, being appointed by him in 1630 as admiral of the narrow seas in the place of Sir Henry Mervin and a principal officer of the navy.<sup>89</sup> The skill with which Digby carried out these duties allowed him to rise in the esteem of the king, so much so that when Secretary Carleton died in February 1632 he was one of those mentioned as a possible successor.<sup>90</sup> However, 1633 had seen a significant downturn in the development of Digby's career, as following the death of his wife in May he resigned all of his positions in the navy and then compounded the consequences of this in 1636 through moving to Paris and re-converting to Catholicism; a move which not only alienated Archbishop Laud and Secretary Coke (who had been two of his staunchest and most influential supporters), but more importantly also the king.<sup>91</sup> For as Laud informed Digby at the time, his becoming a Catholic had prevented him from receiving any other office under the king, who was "not a little sorry to lose the service of so able a subject...".<sup>92</sup> His Catholicism may have prevented him from re-entering the service of the king, but it need not have prevented him from entering that of the queen. Yet whilst Charles had

---

II. p. 339. 3 February 1621. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>9</sup> CSPV,1629-1632. p. 627. 18 June 1632. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; CSPD,1625 1626. p. 407. 25 October 1625. Edward Nicholas - Sir Henry Marten.; M.B. Young, Servility and Service. The Life and Work of Sir John Coke. (London,1986). p. 207.; PRO. C115/M32/8180. 25 September 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD,1629-1631. p. 358. 12 October 1630. Charles I. - Sir Kenelm Digby.; HMC, Report on Various Collections. (1914). Vol. VII. p. 398. 18 October 1630. Henry Skipworth - Sir George Clifton.

<sup>90</sup> PRO. C115/M35/8394. 18 February 1632. London. John -Pory - Viscount Scudamore.

<sup>91</sup> Young, Servility and Service. p. 212.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. Appendix II. p. 454. 15 February 1636. Archbishop Laud - Sir Kenelm Digby.; Cowper, II. p. 154. 15 February 1637. Paris. Digby - Secretary Coke.

<sup>92</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. Appendix II. p. 454. 27 March 1636. Archbishop Laud - Sir Kenelm Digby.

nothing against Catholics as such, he placed a great premium upon constancy; and where those born Catholics were accepted for what they were, Digby's conversion and re-conversion had caused considerable embarrassment, and in his eyes may have pointed to an inconstancy which made him ineligible for public office.<sup>93</sup> The two front runners for this office were therefore Walter Montague and Sir William Howard. Montagu was the son of Lord Privy Seal Manchester, who had carved out a niche for himself at Court as an intermediary between Charles and the Courts of France and Italy.<sup>94</sup> With the queen remaining deeply interested in the affairs of her home country and perhaps even possessing some official involvement in the development of policy these connections brought Montagu into particularly close contact with Henrietta Maria, as a consequence of which in addition to being linked to the position of secretary of state upon the death of Dudley, Viscount Carleton in 1632 he was a year later linked with the position of vice-chamberlain to the queen upon the death of Sir Robert Killigrew.<sup>95</sup> During the 1620's this favour would have been shared by the king, but during the 1630s Montagu appears to have become distanced from him and increasingly dependant upon the queen, first through becoming involved in attacks upon Lord Treasurer Weston, and then by his conversion to Catholicism and above all his attempts to convert others.<sup>96</sup> The

---

<sup>93</sup> Hibbard, Plot. p. 62.

<sup>94</sup> CSPV,1625-1626. p. 526. 4 September 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; CSPD,1628-1629. p. 81. 20 April 1628. The Exchange. John Hope - Earl of Carlisle.; HMC, Various. Vol. VIII. p. 75. 2 March 1631. Whitehall. Viscount Dorchester - Henry Percy.

<sup>95</sup> CSPV,1629-1632. p. 526. 18 July 1631. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; H. Ellis, ed., Original Letters Illustrative of English History; Including Numerous Royal Letters: From Autographs in the British Museum and One or Two Other Collections. (London,1827). Vol. III. p. 266. 23 February 1632. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/M31/8156. 13 July 1633. London. John Flower - Viscount -Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 468. 2 October 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>96</sup> CSPD,Addenda. 1625-1649. pp. 381-2. 5 November 1630. William, Lord Powys - Sir Henry

queen's new papal agent had arrived in England towards the end of 1636, and early the next year he was joined by Montagu, who now that his conversion was open knowledge, became " a great companion of signor Conn's ".<sup>97</sup> Under his direction and the protection of the queen Montagu and such figures as Toby Matthew were able to act in relative freedom in advancing the Catholic Church; not through the official channel of the Church (for both Charles and Laud were opposed to the Catholic religion), but through the conversion of a number of prominent Court figures, particularly amongst the Court ladies who mixed with the queen. This reached crisis point in October 1637 with the conversion of the Countess of Newport, whose husband " was so fierce in complaining " that the matter was raised at the Council, where Archbishop Laud openly criticised " the freedom of Denmark House " and had some occasion to speak of particularly Mr Walter Montagu ", stating that he " is grown very busy, and is in my opinion too much suffered...".<sup>98</sup> These revelations appear to have genuinely disturbed Charles, who not only " said he would have these things remedied, and since hath given order to his bishops concerning this business ", but " did use such words of Wat Montagu and Sir Toby Matthew, that the fright made Wat keep his chamber longer than his sickness would have detained him...".<sup>99</sup> What concerned Charles most was not the fact there were English Catholics

---

Vane.; CSPV,1625-1626. pp. 526-7. 18 July 1626. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; CSPV,1632-1636. p. 144. 16 September 1633. Same - Same.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. p. 502. 23 December 1635. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Viscount Conway.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. p. 233. 23 January 1636. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - --Wentworth.

<sup>97</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 73. 28 April 1637. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>98</sup> Gardiner, The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 Vols. (London,1883-4). Vol. VIII. p. 239.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 125. 23 October 1637. Viscount Conway - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 229. 22 October 1627.; Ibid., Vol. VII. p. 379. 1 November 1637. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Wentworth.

<sup>99</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 125. 23 October 1637. Viscount Conway - Lord

but the fact that they were trying to convert others and were being directed and manipulated by outside powers; and in order to remedy this and " to show that I am of the religion which I profess ", on 20 December 1637 he issued a proclamation which although stating severe punishments for those who openly celebrated mass or withdrew subjects from the Church of England, was only intended as a reminder to Catholics that " they live in England, not in Rome ", and as a demonstration of the fact " that the quiet which Catholics enjoy is derived from my clemency " and not from any outside figure, characteristically tying people to his own person rather than using an outside figure such as Northampton under James.<sup>100</sup> And although with Lady Newport subsequently attending a Mass with the queen Conn reported to Barberini how that the queen had declared to him " you have now seen what has become of the proclamation ", things were not necessarily as rosy as he wished to have them portrayed in Rome; for Charles's main objective had been to prevent further conversions, and in the light of his anger the queen had not only sent for the rector of her Capuchins " chid him, and admonished him from doing the like again, especially to women of quality..." , but would also appear to have had to apologise, or at least form a reconciliation, with Laud.<sup>101</sup> For whilst at the beginning of November 1637 she was reported to have taken great exception against him and been very angry, after a meeting together on Tuesday 12 December Laud reported that they had " parted fair ", which with the anger principally being on her side alone, must have indicated some shifting of ground on her part.<sup>102</sup> Whilst Charles and Laud frowned upon the conversion and proselytising of Montague, to Conn and Henrietta Maria he was playing an essential role in achieving their religious objectives, and upon the

---

Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>100</sup> Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. pp. 241-42.

<sup>101</sup> Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. p. 242.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 128. 9 November 1637. Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>102</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 339. 1 November 1637. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., Vol. III. Diary. p. 229. 22 October 1637.; Ibid., p. 230. 12 December 1637.

death of Sir Robert Aiton he would therefore appear to have been their preferred choice as secretary.<sup>103</sup> With Charles retaining the right of appointment in his own hands he had no intention of advancing someone who had been responsible for so much disruption, but having given his promise was nevertheless obliged to appoint a Catholic. The principal obstacle to fulfilling this promise was his demand for religious constancy, as most of those about the Court who were named in relation to this position had only declared their religion after gaining royal protection or patronage. As the appointment of a foreign (although naturally Catholic) secretary was out of the question, Charles made his selection from amongst one of the old Catholic families, with Sir William Howard appearing most likely to have been his initial and favoured choice. The Howard family had long seen themselves as the head of the secular English Catholics, and having been uniformly constant in their religion and loyalty under both James and Charles, they were accepted for what they were, a number such as Northampton and Suffolk (and possibly Arundel, who attended Church of England services) even receiving Court office. Howard would therefore have had none of the odium attached to him of a recent convert, but there were also reasons more specific to him. Much of the suspicion against Catholics stemmed from their propensity to seek conversions and look to foreign powers for support and direction. The problems linked to this had been noted by many established Catholic families, who having been repeatedly let down by these same foreign powers and perceiving the Papacy as a distant and often ill-informed bureaucracy, were now seeking accommodation with the government rather than confrontation. Sir William Howard was a leading figure in this group, and made himself particularly amenable to Charles through his adherence to his authority, primarily through his willingness to take the Oath of Allegiance if no suitable alternative could be found.<sup>104</sup> The appointment of such a figure may at first sight appear to have been highly acceptable to a queen who had previously been served primarily by Protestants, but belying Charles and the Howards' worst fears over the intentions of the papacy in promoting the most zealous kind of Catholicism regardless of the consequences, neither Conn or the queen wished for the

---

<sup>103</sup>

Hibbard, Plot. p. 62.

<sup>104</sup>

Ibid., p. 62.

appointment of such a person.<sup>105</sup> Just through what means Howard had been working with the king is unclear. Given his relations it is possible that he was an acquaintance of the king of some duration, but there is also some indication that it may have been through Laud, who was at least known to support his candidacy for this position.<sup>106</sup> However, given Laud's cautious nature and the known intentions of the queen it is unlikely that he would have supported him had he not also been the preferred candidate of the king, whilst given the emphasis which Charles placed upon his own authority, if this were the case then it was unlikely that he would have changed his opinion solely because of the necessarily veiled reservations of Conn and the queen; and with Howard eventually missing out upon the office, there must therefore be some alternative reason to explain it. As a Catholic, albeit in a different factional group, Howard would have been much more aware of their intentions than either the king or Laud. Still holding out hopes of leading an alternative group of English Catholics, and fearful of the consequences of Conn's plans for them, it is therefore possible that Howard did not wish to associate himself too closely with the actions of this group, or that they had persuaded him not to accept it.<sup>107</sup> But whilst for whatever reason Howard had decided or been persuaded against accepting the office, given his wider intentions he would not have been averse to knowing more of what was going on in the queen's Court, and it would therefore appear to have been at least in part due to him that the king's selection eventually fell upon his brother-in-law, Sir John Winter - a wealthy and controversial industrialist who possessed a similar background of long-term Catholicism to Howard, being a relative of one of the gunpowder plotters.<sup>108</sup> This last point cannot have worked in his

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., pp. 62, 70. Given the king's tenderness for his authority and the delicacy of the position of both Conn and the queen in relation to this (in that the Howards were nominally Conn's patrons, and the pros-elytising intentions of their actions could not be revealed), it is unlikely that Henrietta Maria would have made any objections to this except in general or personal terms.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>108</sup> Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. pp. 151, 160.



favour, but his wealth, constancy and shared stance with his brother-in-law would in Charles's eyes always make him preferable to any of Henrietta Maria's recent converts; but there were additional reasons beyond self-interest for advancing members of this family ahead of any other. For as in other areas of his patronage Charles always placed a high premium upon old faces and families, particularly upon those who had served the Crown, and Winter's great uncle, Edward Somerset, Earl of Worcester had been master of the horse to Queen Elizabeth and his father and his own lord privy seal, whilst his uncle, Thomas, Viscount Somerset had been master of the horse to Queen Anne, as he himself reminded Charles shortly after Winter's appointment in 1638.<sup>109</sup> Howard therefore seems to have declined the position as secretary to the queen and had perhaps recommended his cousin, which together with the fact that Charles always paid great attention to previous examples of service, appears to have been instrumental in his decision to appoint him; that it had been done behind closed doors and upon the king's own preferences and without reference to the queen goes some way to explaining why the position had gone " to a man never thought of " rather than one of the candidates preferred by Conn and the queen.<sup>110</sup> With his chief connections being amongst the Howards and the Somersets (the English Catholics upon whom Charles was later to place so much reliance), Winter was a very different kind of Catholic to that which Conn and the queen envisaged when they had petitioned Charles to allow one upon the death of Aiton; but whilst the king's eventual selection was equally distasteful to Conn and the Queen, popular

---

<sup>109</sup> Worcester exchanged his position as Master of the Horse for that of Lord Privy Seal in January 1616 to make way for Buckingham. Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 25.; BL. Kings 136. f. 503. List of Queen Anne's former servants used by the French c.1624/5.; Winter was the nephew of Henry, 5th Earl of Worcester, whilst with Thomas, Viscount Somerset being uncle to Worcester's son, Lord Herbert of Raglan, it would appear that he was Worcester's brother, and therefore Winter's uncle. Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., Vol. II. p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

opinion in England tied all Catholics together, and focussed upon the fact that he was a relative to one of the gunpowder plotters. <sup>111</sup>

Charles had never paid much attention to popular criticism of his appointments. But given the heightened political situation of the time even he must have been aware of the fact that his decision to allow a Catholic secretary to the queen was deeply unpopular and that it had been against his better judgement; and whilst he may have taken little effort to curb the direct actions of the queen herself, it is interesting to note that this was not a step which he repeated in relation to later grants of office within the queen's household, subsequent candidates all being Protestant. Important political lessons also appear to have been learnt by the queen herself. These years are usually seen as ones in which Henrietta Maria was increasing her influence over the king in political affairs. However, this may not appear to be all that it seems; for whilst her political influence would appear to have been based primarily upon persuading him to exert his already highly developed sense of authority and not to back down or negotiate, the increase in her influence over the distribution patronage appears to have been more apparent than real, being prompted by a change in style.

When a replacement to Aiton was first being considered it had been felt by most that " Mr Jermyn will carry it " because of his connections with the queen; but this had failed to materialise because of the queen's wish (probably at the instigation of Conn who was acting according to an agenda of his own) to be served by a Catholic.

<sup>112</sup> However, this plan had seriously backfired when because of the king's insistence upon making the actual appointment himself she had found a stranger foisted upon her; and determined not to be outdone again and to be served by people of whom she herself approved, she now reverted back to mirroring Charles's own style of patronage through supporting candidates from amongst her acquaintance who she knew were already being considered or were at least equally acceptable to the king.

---

<sup>111</sup> Hibbard, Plot. pp. 62, 153-155.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy --Wentworth.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 152. 20 March 1638. Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

This can be seen in the subsequent support which she gave to the appointment of Jermyn as master of her horse in 1639 in the place of the recently promoted George, Lord Goring; for whilst he was something of a favourite with her, in being a Protestant with whom the king was thoroughly acquainted and who had already been considered in relation to the position of her secretary he was equally acceptable to Charles.<sup>113</sup> So whilst by the very nature of her position Henrietta Maria was ensured a central position in the life of the Court and could use this in order to dabble in politics and patronage through such indirect means as parading people before the king, or even occasionally through making suggestions or hints, with Charles retaining a firm grip of the patronage of her household and using it as a means of upholding his vision of order and authority and of tying people to himself through the appointment of tried and trusted figures it was only through acting along parameters set by him that she was able to be seen to enjoy any influence.

---

<sup>113</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 204. 21  
November 1639. Unsigned.; PRO.LR5/52. f. 12v. 1626.  
Hibbard, Plot. p. 62.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol.  
II. p. 152. 20 March 1638. Strand. George Garrard - Lord  
Deputy Wentworth.

## Chapter 4.

### Charles's role in the selection of ministers.

From the Church and the households of the king and queen it is clear that Charles had taken patronage back into his own hands and significantly reduced the role played by patrons. However, it could be argued that this came down to nothing more than a wish to control those who were regularly around him. His effect upon the patronage of the Church was simply a consequence of his preference for advancing his own chaplains, and the character of his household staff the predictable outcome of combining a dislike of strangers with a propensity to promote from within, an influence which extended to his queen's officers as well. This, however, is to underestimate the scale of the impact which Charles had had upon the patronage system. If he had been a king who was happy to surround himself with familiar faces and indulge in his own personal interests of the arts whilst allowing others to get along with the important task of running the country then arguably he would not have caused half as much trouble as he actually did. But although he may have lacked the political instincts of his father Charles nevertheless took his role as king extremely seriously, and therefore devoted as much time and had as significant an effect upon the appointment of ministers to administrative positions within his government as he did in those where his personal interest was more obvious. This can be seen in the appointment of a Secretary of State upon the death of Dudley, Viscount Dorchester on 15 February 1632.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> PRO. C115.M31/8144. 18 February 1632. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115.M35/8394. 18 February 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD,1631-1633. p. 278. 27 February 1632. Whitehall. Henry Vane - Sir Henry Vane.; CSPV,1629-1632. p. 593. 27 February 1632. Venetian Ambassadors in England - Doge and Senate.

With Dorchester's death being totally unexpected and with both he and Secretary Coke having been firmly entrenched in office since the aborted attempt of the queen to replace him with Francis, Lord Cottington in January 1631 there was no obvious successor to replace him; and as was usual with Charles in such a situation rather than rushing into making a rash appointment or entering into discussions with his advisers as to who should replace him, he carefully reviewed the various options before him without revealing his own intentions.<sup>2</sup> In the absence of any clear lead from the top, though, this void was soon filled with speculation, with Sir Thomas Roe, Lords Cottington, Weston, Aston, Herbert and Falkland, Sir Kenelm Digby, Walter Montague and Sir Henry Vane all being linked to this position; but a number of factors soon combined to make Sir Isaac Wake the most favoured candidate.<sup>3</sup> Firstly, he had long been highly regarded by Charles, who as prince had attempted to secure his appointment as warden of his old college of Merton upon the death of Sir Henry Savile in 1622.<sup>4</sup> Wake also had considerable experience as a diplomat, having succeeded Sir Dudley Carleton (to whom he was secretary) as Ambassador to Venice upon the latter's removal to the Hague and then held the same position in France, where " by reason of his sufficiency " he had been able to carry " all smooth before him...as if there had never been English upon the Isle of Rhe ".<sup>5</sup> In addition Wake

---

<sup>2</sup> M.V.C. Alexander, Charles I.'s Lord Treasurer. Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland. 1577-1635. (Plymouth, 1975). p. 157.

<sup>3</sup> CSPD, Addenda, 1625-1649. p. 434. 15 February 1632. Sir Thomas Roe - King.; PRO. C115/M31/8144. 18 February 1632. London. John Flower - Viscount - Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M35/8394. 18 February 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; Ellis, ed., Original Letters. Vol. III. p. 266. 23 February 1632. Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/N3/8548. 2 March 1632. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 286. 11 March 1632. Sir Francis Crane - Sir Henry Vane.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 598. 12 March 1632. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>4</sup> BL. Stowe 176. f. 221. 26 February 1622. Lambeth. Archbishop Abbot - Sir Thomas Edmondes.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 425. 9 March 1622. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>5</sup> M. Lee, ed., Dudley Carleton

enjoyed the firm support of both the Earl of Carlisle and Lord Treasurer Weston, which together with the known favour of the king meant that although there had been no formal announcement, by the beginning of March the secretary's position was " by consent almost...cast upon Sir Isaac Wake ", it being felt that all that was lacking was a formal announcement from the king. <sup>6</sup> Having no firm foundation in fact this optimism foundered a little towards the end of March when "...Secretary Coke having kissed the king's hand, had conferred upon him my Lord of Dorchester's employment of opening foreign packets, and making foreign dispatches...", " by which we guess, that his Majesty hath yet no intention to make another secretary...". <sup>7</sup> But by April this uncertainty had disappeared and it was being reported that with Wake having dispatched all business in France, " though some other do keep the place in store for him for the present, yet is there no doubt, but at his coming home he will be principal secretary above all others...". <sup>8</sup> In all probability being viewed by now as a foregone conclusion the months of April and May saw a reduction in speculation, but early in June this perception was shattered by the news of Wake's sudden and unexpected death of a fever and a short time later on the twelfth by the revelation that Secretary Coke had informed Francis Windebank that " the king has taken notice of his worth

---

to John Chamberlain. 1603-1624 Jacobean Letters.----  
 (New Jersey,1972). pp. 137, 157, 189, 314. notes.; PRO.  
 SO3/8. November 1625. Warrant to...pay Sir Isaac Wake,  
 his majesty's ambassador at Venice...; CSPV,1629-1632.  
 p. 57. 14 May 1629. Venetian Ambassador - his colleagues  
 in France.; PRO. C115.M31/8144. 18 February 1632.  
 London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO.  
 C115/M35/8338. London. 7 April 1632. John Pory -  
 Scudamore.

<sup>6</sup> Cowper, I. p. 394. 7  
 December 1629. Lord Conway - Sir Isaac Wake.; PRO.  
 C115.N5/8548. 2 March 1632. Henry Herbert - Sir John  
 Scudamore.; CSPV,1629-1632. p. 598. 12 March 1632.  
 Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>7</sup> PRO. C115.M35/8398. 31 March  
 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO.  
 C115.M31/8147. 31 March 1632. John Flower - Scudamore.;  
CSPV,1629-1632. p. 607. 9 April 1632. Venetian Ambassador  
 - Doge and Senate.

<sup>8</sup> PRO. C115.M35/8383. London. 7  
 April 1632. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.

and long service, and has made choice of him to be one of his principal secretaries...".

<sup>9</sup> Due to the timing of Wake's death, the appointment of Windebank and the fact that no official announcement over a replacement to Carleton had ever been made it is impossible to state with any degree of certainty as to whether Charles had really intended to appoint Sir Isaac Wake, but given the previous connections between them and the certainty which had existed amongst political commentators it would at least appear to have been a strong possibility. Whether this had been his original intention or no, reactions to his eventual choice could not have been more different from the certainty which had surrounded Sir Isaac Wake, with the appointment of such a relatively unknown person as Francis Windebank causing general surprise, so much so that Sir Thomas Roe could only declare " that there is a new secretary brought out of the dark ". <sup>10</sup> This statement is slightly misleading, though. That Windebank's appointment had caused such a great deal of surprise was not because he himself was a particularly obscure person, having " served near three apprenticeships in the place " of Clerk of the Signet " , but because he was not known to be allied to any of the main factional groups at Court. <sup>11</sup> This immediately led to speculation as to who it was that was responsible, with a number of half-truths and coincidences leading to the belief that it was a consequence of the influence of Archbishop Laud when it was the decision of the king. Crucial in the development were the long-standing ties which existed between them.

Laud and Windebank had been acquaintances since childhood, and based upon their " like facetiousness in both wit and company " this had developed into true friendship at St. John's College, Oxford (where Windebank had been one of Laud's students),

---

<sup>9</sup> CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 349. 9  
June 1632. Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.;  
Gardiner, History. Vol.. VII. p. 200.; CSPD, 1631-1633.  
p. 352. 12th June 1632. Greenwich. Secretary Coke -  
Francis Windebank.

<sup>10</sup> Gardiner, History. Vol. VII.  
p. 200. 1 May 1632. Sir Thomas Roe - Queen of Bohemia.

<sup>11</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 252. 9  
August 1628. Haines Hill. Francis Windebank - Secretary  
Conway.

and had continued thereafter with Laud not only regularly staying at Windebank's country houses but also using his influence on behalf of his sons and marrying one of his own chaplains to one of Windebank's daughters.<sup>12</sup> In the absence of any other visible patron and with proximity to the king being equated with political influence these connections between Laud and Windebank would in themselves have been strong enough to suggest that it was he who was responsible for Windebank's appointment, but was especially the case given the way in which it tended to confirm existing political perceptions of Laud. Outside the inner circle of the Court tying in with the belief that he was the head of a religious faction attempting to use his influence as a means of bringing about that revolution in Church and State which in conjunction with the financial developments of Lord Treasurer Weston would reduce the country to the kind of arbitrary Catholic style of government which existed on the continent, whilst within it being interpreted as part of a power struggle with Weston in which he was attempting to bring government policy more into line with his overall vision of the Church. As a consequence of this speculation there is abundant contemporary evidence from a wide range of sources all indicating that it was Laud who was responsible for the appointment of Windebank, this much being stated in a letter of Sir Thomas Roe to the Queen of Bohemia on 1 July 1632, by Laud's disciple and biographer Peter Heylyn, and perhaps most crucially of all in Laud's own diary, where in the entry for 15 June he writes " Mr Francis Windebank, my old friend, was sworn Secretary of State; which place I obtained for him of my gracious master King Charles...".<sup>13</sup> With this view being firmly ingrained into the Whig narrative of history it was for long accepted by historians. However, as can be seen in the distribution of Church patronage under Charles this belief in the influence of Laud was in fact nothing more than a consequence of the unpopularity of Charles's policies and the

---

<sup>12</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. pp. 25, 225.; Hugh Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud 1573-1645. (London, 1988). p. 33.; Charles Carlton, Archbishop William Laud. (London, 1987). pp. 55, 57 83.

<sup>13</sup> Gardiner, History. Vol. VII. p. 200. 1 July 1632. Sir Thomas Roe - Queen of Bohemia.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. 15 June 1632.



secretive and highly personal way in which he went about making them having caused a perceived vacuum of power which was in the absence of any other more acceptable explanation filled by the belief of a corrupt minister acting according to his own agenda. This must place even greater doubts upon the belief that he could have been responsible for the appointment of Sir Francis Windebank to such an important position as that of Secretary of State, especially in that whilst Charles had given Laud "leave to move him in any business of the Church whatsoever", he had at the same time also specifically given him "a charge withal that I should not be earnest in temporal causes, save where I was called in".<sup>14</sup> And when the appointment of Windebank is examined more closely without the preconception of the influence of Laud there is a good deal of evidence which ties in with information from elsewhere and points to Charles himself as the person most likely to have been responsible for his selection. The first of this evidence coming from Laud himself.

Desperate for some kind of Court office as a means of advancing the interests of the Queen of Bohemia and John Dury's efforts to unite the European Protestant Church, upon his return from foreign service at the end of the 1620s Sir Thomas Roe had contacted a number of high-profile figures at Court, including Lord Treasurer Weston, the Earl of Holland, as well as the king himself; and upon the death of Viscount Carleton had evidently hoped to be appointed through their means to the vacant secretaryship.<sup>15</sup> The appointment of Windebank therefore represented a major setback in Roe's campaign, and meant that he was more interested than most in determining who was actually responsible for it and therefore where true power at Court actually lay. Like most other contemporaries Roe assumed that it must have been the work of Laud, and as a consequence of this in April 1634 advised Elizabeth

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., Vol. VI. Appendix I. pp. 315-6. 16 September. Archbishop Laud - Bishop of Lincoln.

<sup>15</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 485. 2 March 1629. The Hague. Queen of Bohemia - Sir Thomas Roe.; CSPD, 1629-1631. p. 369. 29 October 1629. Roe - Sir Robert Anstruther.; Ibid., p. 306. 14-24 July 1630. Roe - Queen of Bohemia.; Ibid., p. 320. 2 August 1630. Roe - Charles, Viscount Wilmot.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 434. 15 February 1632. Roe - Charles I.

to open up a correspondence with him, by her influence hoping to secure the support necessary to secure his objectives. <sup>16</sup> However, through looking at the Court from the outside by relying upon rumours rather than facts, Roe had completely misread both Laud's power and his character; for whilst he optimistically wrote to Elizabeth how that " his nature had rather do her one great service than twenty trifles, for...he cannot be eminent and show it to the world by treading in beaten paths and the exploded steps of others...", given the restrictions of his remit from the king and his uncertainty as to how he stood with him he in fact preferred to do Elizabeth small favours which were in his own hands within his own sphere of the Church rather than those wider ones which were outside of it or required intervention with the king. <sup>17</sup> So with Charles uninterested in Dury's mission to unite the Protestant Churches of Europe and Laud's own position over it being ambiguous the fact that it was being overseen by the Foreign Committee of the Privy Council (of which Laud was not at this time a member) provided him with an excuse for giving it only a limited level of support, assuring Roe that although he " he is of the Court, yet he is as far almost from being able to give assistance as Roe " himself. <sup>18</sup> More interesting in relation to this particular case, though, are the comments which he made in relation to Roe's own hopes of preferment, where he assured him that whilst he had " spoken more and more often to his Majesty than ever he promised Roe to do, or than he ever thought he should have opportunity to do; and though he has received very good answers, he sees not yet any footing given him upon which he can ground any hopes to serve Roe. It may be because he had once the happiness to join to help his old acquaintance Secretary Windebank forward, Roe may conceive him able to do more than he is; but he would very willingly have Roe understand that if Windebank had not had more

---

<sup>16</sup> CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 562. 22 April 1634. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Sir Thomas Roe.; Ibid., p. 565. 24 April 1634. Roe - Queen of Bohemia.

<sup>17</sup> CSPD, 1635. p. 9. 5 April 1635. Sir Thomas Roe - Queen of Bohemia.

<sup>18</sup> CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 562. 22 April 1634. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Sir Thomas Roe.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 284-5.; Carlton, Archbishop Laud. pp. 98-9, 109.

powerful friends than the writer he had never been where he is...".<sup>19</sup> With this clear admission of political impotence on the part of Laud contrasting directly with the assured and self-congratulatory air of influence contained in his diary this could easily be dismissed as a not very subtle way of avoiding an obligation which he would rather not have to fulfil; but with it being backed by other doubts in relation to the actual granting of the office and the evidence upon which it was based, it appears much more likely that it is the traditional view of Laud's influence which has been based upon a mis-reading of Court politics.

Due to a failure on the part of the messenger the letter which Secretary Coke had sent to Windebank on Tuesday 12 June informing him of his appointment had failed to be delivered in time for him to attend at a meeting of the Council the next day as had originally been planned, and this prompted him to write another the next day ordering him to attend the following Friday.<sup>20</sup> This letter, however, was delivered inside another written by Bishop Laud congratulating Windebank upon his advancement, something which could perhaps be taken as direct confirmation that he had been advanced through his means. This, however, is not as significant as it first appears, as by this point in time Windebank would already have been aware of his appointment; for whilst the letter which Secretary Coke had sent to him on 12 June 1632 had arrived too late for him to attend the Star Chamber the following afternoon, it had nevertheless arrived there that day. The fact that Windebank had been informed of his promotion by Secretary Coke rather than Laud himself is significant enough in itself, but it is more puzzling that he had not written to congratulate him upon his appointment until the next day.<sup>21</sup> Had Laud actually been responsible for Windebank's appointment he would as an old friend have been expected to have

---

<sup>19</sup> CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 562. 22 April 1634. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Sir Thomas Roe.--

<sup>20</sup> CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 352. 12 June 1632. Greenwich. Secretary Coke - Francis Windebank.; Ibid., p. 352. 13 June 1632. Star Chamber. Same - Same.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 352. 13 June 1632. Star Chamber. Secretary Coke - Francis Windebank.; Ibid., p. 352. 13 June 1632. Fulham House. Bishop Laud - Windebank.

congratulated him either before or at the same point as Coke had informed him of the king's pleasure; and given the content of Coke's second letter to Windebank and the fact that Laud specifically stated in his that Windebank's appointment was due to be announced by Secretary Coke at a meeting of the Council that afternoon what appears to have happened is that Laud himself was unaware of his selection as secretary until he was informed by Secretary Coke on the morning of 13 June. Coke apparently failed to mention the " negligence of the bearer " the day before (which prevented Windebank from being present that day himself) and merely told him that that afternoon he was " by the king's command...to declare it to the lords ", which led Laud to assume that Windebank himself was as yet ignorant of it, hence his quip that " although he thinks perchance that the bishop is apt enough to jest, yet he knows Windebank will believe the inclosed [presumably the letter of Coke's]...".<sup>22</sup> With Windebank having perhaps acted immediately upon the arrival of Secretary Coke's first letter and therefore been present at Court earlier than expected, he was " sworn one of his highness's principal Secretaries of State and sat at the Board and signed letters..." a day earlier than originally planned on Thursday 14 June.<sup>23</sup> There is further evidence of the marginal role played by Laud in the actual passing of Windebank's patent under the Great Seal on 21 June 1632; in keeping with the original letter it was Secretary Coke who delivered the order to create the King's Bill to the Clerk of the Signet, and it was Coke also who procured the king's signature to it when it had been written.<sup>24</sup>

The circumstances surrounding this appointment therefore provides good grounds for doubting the traditional role which Laud is usually assumed to have played in it,

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 352. 12 June 1632. Greenwich. Secretary Coke - Francis Windebank.; Ibid. p. 352. 13 June 1632. Same - Same.; Ibid. p. 352. 13 June 1632. Fulham House. Bishop Laud - Windebanke.

<sup>23</sup> PRO. PC2/42. p. 86. Star Chamber. 14 June 1632.

<sup>24</sup> PRO.S03/10. June 1632. Office of principal Secretary of State to Sir Francis -Windebank, kt. His majesty's pleasure signified by Mr Secretary Coke, and by him procured. Passed the Great Seal 21 June 1632. BCL. DV.896/603183/207.

and this is confirmed by additional evidence later on in Windebank's career; for like William Juxon (whom Laud is believed to have appointed as Clerk of the Closet later that same month in order to watch his back in old age) Windebank proved to be no stooge of the archbishop but an independent person with a mind of his own who was determined to serve the king as he thought best, something which is very clearly demonstrated in the diametric positions which they took in relation to the monopoly held by the Company of Soapmakers of Westminster.

Faced with many long-term structural problems such as rising inflation and static incomes the financial position of the Crown was already in an extremely precarious position when called upon to support the unparalleled demands of five years of war during the opening period of Charles's reign. But whilst the immediate crisis had been overcome by the establishment of peace and a corresponding increase in customs revenue, the underlying problem of a lack of regular income had by no means been resolved. Dealing with the consequences of this formed the basis of both Laud's attempts to improve the financial position of the Church and Weston's that of the State in general, and had they been able to work together they might have been able to come to some lasting solution. But rather than Charles encouraging his officers to work together, his dual approach of restricting them to affairs within their own remit and dealing with them direct tended to breed a feeling of mutual suspicion which more often than not saw them working against rather than with one another. Both Lord Treasurer Weston and Archbishop Laud possessed prickly and reserved characters and a pre-disposition to believe that those who were not entirely with them must be against them; and there was always going to be the potential for any dispute between them to get out of hand.<sup>25</sup> Such disagreements were to prove much more frequent than expected, given Charles's compartmentalization of officers. This was a consequence of the distinctive political position of Laud who, unaccustomed to the norms of political and financial life, possessed a particularly radical definition as to what constituted corruption; something which at first led him to join with the

---

<sup>25</sup> Alexander, Weston. pp. 187-9.; Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 23-31.; Carlton, Archbishop Laud. pp. 80-81.

treasurer's political enemies in attempting to remove him from office, and then when the king had made it clear that he would not allow such a blatant attack upon his own authority and when he himself realised that he had merely been used by the others involved to act as a kind of sentinel upon corruption, continually questioning Weston's actions and the objectives of his policies. This was the case in relation to their respective approaches to the soap monopoly. In December 1631 a syndicate which included a number of Weston's (as well as the queen's) Catholic friends claimed " to have discovered a superior means of making soap ", upon the basis of which they were in 1632 awarded as the Company of Soap Makers of Westminster a monopoly on the production of all soap in the country made according to their new method, for which they were to pay a royalty to the Crown of four pounds a ton. <sup>26</sup> If the new company had merely depended upon the quality of their product to extract profit from their discovery there would perhaps have been little problem, but there was also a clause in their patent which allowed them to " test the quality of all soaps and prohibit the manufacture of those it deemed to fall short of standard...". <sup>27</sup> The ability of the new company to put them out of business was obviously deeply resented by the old soap producers, especially when there were many doubts surrounding the quality of the new product itself; but it was also resented by the public at large, who believed that it was yet another means of introducing arbitrary taxation through the back door. <sup>28</sup> At the end of the day, though, what mattered was the political influence which the respective sides were able to muster, and the new company enjoyed the support of both Lord Treasurer Weston and Chancellor of the Exchequer Cottington, who given the financial penury of the Crown and the king's trust in their financial acumen had understandably succeeded in gaining his support. <sup>29</sup> On the other side, however,

---

<sup>26</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 259.; Hirst, Authority and Conflict. p. 172.; Carlton, Archbishop Laud. pp. 114-5.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 223. 12th July 1635.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 446. 30 July 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>27</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 260.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 260.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., pp. 260-1.

Court opposition to this scheme was left almost entirely in the hands of Archbishop Laud, whose suspicion of the company stemmed from the Catholic connections of many of its members and above all the fact that he saw in the involvement of Cottington and Weston sufficient proof that it was being regulated in the interest of private individuals rather than that of the Crown. However, with the Crown being dependent upon such revenues as this and Laud having to avoid the appearance of excessive factionalism what he at first lacked was an argument which would allow him to gain the interest of the king; but with the new company failing to raise as much money for the Crown as they had originally promised he eventually found one in 1635 though supporting an offer made by the old company to take over the monopoly of the new upon better terms for the Crown. This move was given an initial filip by the death of Lord Treasurer Weston on Friday 13 March 1635 and Charles's decision not to appoint an immediate successor, as with the treasury now being ruled by a commission of which Laud was a senior member he was at last able to initiate a review of all Weston's actions as treasurer over the last five years.<sup>30</sup> Laud's chief political objective in initiating this review was to reveal conclusive proof of Weston's corruption and to attempt to draw a line under it through initiating policies of his own, and it began just as he had hoped. For an investigation of the income from the soap monopoly revealed that over the last two years the Crown had received only £6,000-7,000 rather than the £10,000 which had been promised, which not only gave Laud the chance to argue that the policies of Weston and Cottington had allowed the Crown to be sold short, but also provided him with a means of advancing his own in their place through again advocating that the old companies (which were offering the Crown double the rate per ton) be allowed to take over the terms of the patent.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Ellis, ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 10.; CSPD, 1635. p. 583. 16th March 1635. Portsmouth. Notes by Secretary Windebank, of business transacted by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. pp. 412-3. 14 April 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>31</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 223. 12 July 1635.; Ibid., Vol. VII. pp. 171-7. 4 October 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy

Since Laud saw this as a vital element in his wider objective of cleaning up the process of government Windebank would surely have taken the same line in supporting the old soapmakers had he indeed been appointed through his means; but despite their long friendship Windebank was no political lackey, and (as with his earlier attacks upon Weston) Laud's excessive sensitivity to corruption had once again led him seriously to misread the political situation. For whilst Charles was equally determined to draw a line under the past at this time unlike Laud he was not motivated out of any belief that Weston had been excessively corrupt, and was merely hoping to eradicate the constant squabbling and infighting which had existed amongst his ministers. In order to achieve this objective, though, everybody involved had to be willing to let bygones be bygones and pull together in the interest of the king; but in constantly pressing for a retrospective condemnation of Lord Treasurer Weston (which would necessarily reflect upon Chancellor of the Exchequer Cottington) Laud was actually making things worse.<sup>32</sup> This in itself would have caused the cautious Windebank to be on his guard, but Laud was also on weak ground in relation to the policy which he was advocating in its place; for whilst he was able to point out that the old companies were willing to pay twice the amount of the new, given his own political stance he had no argument to answer the assertion that the king could not in honour back out of an agreement into which he had legally entered merely because others subsequently offered a greater sum of money.<sup>33</sup> So aware of both the objectives of the king and the force of Cottington's arguments, and forming his actions along the lines of what he felt best for the Crown, rather than supporting the line of Laud (as would have been expected if he was merely an unthinking client) Windebank in fact took the part of Cottington throughout; and whilst in conjunction with Charles's wider objectives the dispute was eventually resolved through an

---

Wentworth.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., Vol. III. Diary. p. 223. May-July 1635.; CSPV, 1632-1636. p. 399. 13 June 1635. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. pp. 430-1. 16 June 1635. Lord Cottington - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>33</sup> Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. pp. 75-76.



agreement by which the new company retained its patent but agreed to match the offer of the old, and therefore did not represent a complete defeat for the Archbishop, it fell far short of what he had initially hoped and led him to break off all relations with Windebank.<sup>34</sup> He did so not so much because he was resentful at the lack of support which Windebank had given him after being responsible for his appointment, but because of the blow dealt to his self-confidence by the awareness that their long friendship had been betrayed by the same forces of corruption, self-interest and delay which he had associated with Weston and had hoped had been eradicated upon his death.

That Laud and Windebank were on opposite sides in a policy to which Laud had attached such great importance in itself makes it extremely unlikely that he was responsible for the appointment of Windebank, but more important in making this case are the effects of the factors which lay behind it, especially Laud's excessive fear of the power of Weston and Cottington. Despite a great deal of uncertainty in much of the available evidence concerning the respective roles of those involved in the appointment of Windebank, Laud has been regarded as his true patron for so long largely in consequence of the apparent certainty of the relevant entry in his diary. This statement, usually taken literally and indeed containing an element of truth, can also be demonstrated to have been shaped considerably by the political circumstances of the time and to have distorted our view.<sup>35</sup> Even though Laud may have written his diary merely for the benefit of his own reputation to posterity, it is extremely unlikely that he would have intentionally lied in something which was at the time of writing intended solely for private use. Regarding Cottington and especially Weston as nothing but self-interested and corrupt, and believing himself to be engaged in a titanic battle with them over the direction of the government (as can be seen in his letters to Wentworth), he was not only desperate for support, but was an intensely

---

<sup>34</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 223. 12 July 1635.; Hugh Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud. p. 223.; Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. pp. 75-6.

<sup>35</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. 15 June 1632.

insecure person after repeated political setbacks. He also wanted some indication that he was getting somewhere. This significantly affected his private political perceptions and led him to put the best possible interpretation upon events in which he was involved. His diary should thus be used, as a basis of fact, with extreme caution. For given the highly secretive way in which Charles conducted his actions assuming responsibility for an appointment was not always the same as actually being responsible for it. While Laud does appear to have had some limited involvement (which given his current state he himself perceived as being crucial to Windebank's appointment and therefore wrote as much in his diary), in reality it was of little real importance.

Laud was never likely to have made any great secret of his friendship with Windebank which, as Laud was regularly involved in the signification of grants of ecclesiastical office to the Signet Office and Windebank was a long-standing Clerk of the Signet, must surely have been known to the king. The delay in making an appointment upon the death of Dorchester perhaps indicated that Charles was not absolutely sure as to whether to appoint such a relatively unknown person as Windebank or the familiar but otherwise engaged Wake. Besides making his own observations, he appears to have sounded a number of people for their opinion of Windebank. They included Cottington who, together with Weston, was to work alongside Windebank in their secret dealings with Spain, as well as Laud who, as an old friend and tutor, knew his character better than most.<sup>36</sup> But whilst this could subsequently be interpreted as evidence of influence on the part of someone desperate to see things moving in their direction like Laud, or by someone hoping to uphold their reputation like Cottington, by the time that these third parties became involved Charles had to a large extent already made up his mind and only wanted confirmation, and in any case appears to have questioned them without revealing his full intentions; for according to Cottington Laud did not openly move on Windebank's behalf until after he was "told the king was resolved to make him secretary", which not being until a day after Secretary Coke had first informed Windebank of the king's selection,

---

<sup>36</sup>

SRO. DD/Ph/221. f.  
30. Undated, 1635. Sir Robert Phelips - Archbishop Laud.

means that any role which he could have played must have been an unconscious one, and therefore under the control of the king, who had taken the decision to consider him some time before.<sup>37</sup> This limited role on the part of Laud or any other patron is confirmed by certain observations of the Court by Sir Robert Phelips a few years later in 1635 at much the same time as the culmination of the soap dispute, where in the light of changed political circumstances the story of who was responsible for Windebank's appointment can be seen to have turned full circle.

Seeing Laud as one of the more Protestant and less self-interested members of the government, and perhaps still hoping for some position at Court, or more likely looking to open some line of communication to use in relation to his dispute over Ship Money rating with Henry Hodges, Sir Robert Phelips wrote to him in 1635 stating how that " in being in London I collate by several ways that Mr Secretary Windebank was not so fast witted to your service as opinion did conceive he ought to have been ", and that he had " noted a dissent from you in all public occasions, and observed in him towards my Lord Cottington all respects and concurrency...".<sup>38</sup> No longer so well acquainted with the Court as he had once been when Phelips had first been acquainted with this information he was amazed " at these encounters and objected [to his informer] against the possibility of him [Windebank] your present familiar forlorn friend, being here than for any other man ", especially when he believed " that you [Laud] had been his sole raiser from that difficulty in which you found him...".<sup>39</sup> To this, however, Phelips had been informed that Laud was " nothing less than that, for twas my Lord Cottington which then thus preferred him [&] that you [Laud] being told the king was resolved to make him secretary...[were] willed to take notice of his majesty's intention...".<sup>40</sup> With both Cottington and Laud

---

<sup>37</sup> Undated, 1635. Sir Robert -Phelips - Archbishop Laud. Ibid. f. 30.

<sup>38</sup> Somerset 1625-1640. A County's Government During the Personal Rule. (Cambridge, Massachusetts). p. 234.; SRO. DD/Ph/221. f. 30. Undated, 1635. Sir Robert Phelips - Archbishop Laud.

<sup>39</sup> Undated, 1635. Sir Robert Phelips - Archbishop Laud. Ibid., f. 30.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., f. 30.

being likely to have played a limited role in recommending Windebank like all Court rumour this report perhaps contained an element of truth, but clearly indicating the way in which the perception of such events were moulded by prevailing political circumstances rather than any sense of objective truth, Phelips could only assume that " the drift of this story by them that use it is to take off blame and the note of ingratitude from Mr secretary "; the most likely explanation for this event being that whilst out of respect for their long friendship Windebank had been willing during the early years of his period as secretary to ignore or actually continue the myth that he had been promoted by Laud, with the latter's attacks upon various policies and members of the government (together with the claims that he was ungrateful) becoming increasingly embarrassing he subsequently decided to drop the pretence, with certain political commentators now alternatively filling the gap through the time honoured way of linking it to his present actions in combination with Cottington. <sup>41</sup>

So whilst the vast majority of this evidence surrounding the appointment of Secretary Windebank is inconclusive on its own, when taken together and interpreted in its proper context it can be seen that the belief that it was the work of Laud largely rests upon nothing more than the assumption of his influence and their prior acquaintance; and that his true patron was most likely to have been the king himself. For although it is possible that the initial delay in making an appointment upon the death of Carleton had been a consequence of Charles having to wait for Sir Isaac Wake to settle affairs in France, it was in any case extremely rare for Charles to rush into making an appointment without careful consideration and long observation of the person involved; and with Windebank appointed less than a week later (hardly time for such an observation) he could well have been Charles's initial choice, and even if he was not his appointment would still not have been inconsistent with the work of Charles, for he was already likely to have surveyed the various options before him upon the death of Carleton, in which always placing a high premium upon loyalty and preferring to appoint people with whom he was personally acquainted, he was already

---

Undated, 1635. Sir Robert - Phelips - Archbishop Laud.

<sup>41</sup>

Ibid., f. 30.

Undated, 1635. Sir Robert Phelips - Archbishop Laud.

likely to have included Windebank, who came out well in both of these criteria, having succeeded his father in a position in which he must have come into frequent contact with the king, with his relative obscurity as compared to the other candidates making it all the more likely that as Secretary Coke had informed him on 12 June 1632, Charles had selected him to be his secretary after having " taken notice of his worth and long service..." rather than because of any influence which Laud or any other courtier had been able to exert on his behalf.<sup>42</sup> This much is confirmed by the testimony of Henry Herbert who, on 23 June 1632 reported Secretary Windebank's appointment to John Viscount Scudamore without mentioning Laud.<sup>43</sup> Scudamore, as a close friend of Laud, would surely have wished to have been informed of any part he had played. Herbert relates how "...to take away pretentions the king hath called into his secrets Windebank, lately Clerk of the Signet, and now one of his principal secretaries ", significantly adding " though it cannot be believed that he looked not for it, few men looked he should have it. By which rule your lordship is nearer preferment at Craddock than courtiers at Court, especially when the king is pleased to reach men by his choice wheresoever they are, and rather to fit men for places, than places for men...".<sup>44</sup> With much of the evidence being understandably ambiguous on its own this example of the role of Charles in the appointment of Windebank could be dismissed as an exception. But exactly the same thing can be seen in the appointment of Bishop William Juxon as lord treasurer in 1636.

Lord Treasurer Weston died after a prolonged illness on 12 March 1635.<sup>45</sup> This inevitably brought a flurry of speculation as to who was to replace him, but Charles

---

<sup>42</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. p. 225.; CSPD,1628-1629. p. 252. 9 August 1628. Haines Hill. Secretary Windebank - Secretary Conway.; CSPD,1631-1633. p. 352. Greenwich. Same - Same.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 225.

<sup>43</sup> PRO. C115/N3/8549. 23 June 1632. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> CSPD,1633-1634. p. 67. 23 May 1633. Worksop. Earl of Arundel - Sir Henry Vane.; Ibid. p. 488. 5 March 1634. Secretary Windebank - King.; CSPV,1632-1636. p. 221. 12 May 1634. Venetian Ambassador - --Doge and Senate.; Ellis, ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 10.

himself was in no mind to rush into making a rash or hasty decision. For whilst as a matter of personal authority he had earlier chosen not to act upon the allegations of corruption which had been made against Weston he had nevertheless been aware of them, and now that he was dead he was determined to ensure that the same situation did not arise again. The first phase of this process began on Saturday 14 March 1635 when Charles appointed Archbishop Laud, Lord Privy Seal Manchester, Lord Cottington and Secretaries Coke and Windebank as commissioners of the treasury.<sup>46</sup> They were to undertake the duties of the lord treasurer until such time as Charles appointed a new one; but were also to look back at all of Weston's actions over the last five years so that the new treasurer could begin from a clean slate.<sup>47</sup> Of equal importance in removing past divisions and preventing new ones, though, would be the identity of the new treasurer. Although early speculation at Court had linked Sir Henry Vane, Archbishop Laud, Lord Deputy Wentworth and even Lord Keeper Coventry to the position, already being Chancellor and Under-Treasurer of the Exchequer the obvious candidate was Francis, Lord Cottington; and had Charles's mind been free from other considerations there is little doubt that he would have selected him.<sup>48</sup> Cottington, however, was closely associated with the policies advanced by Weston, which given Archbishop Laud's self-appointed task of challenging corruption wherever he perceived it now placed Charles in something of a dilemma. As if he made Cottington lord treasurer it would undoubtedly undermine his

---

<sup>46</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 223. 14 March 1623.; CSPD,1634-1635. p. 583. 16 March 1635. Notes by Secretary Windebank, of business transacted by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury.

<sup>47</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 412. 14 April 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., pp. 386-7. 12 March 1635. Earl of Dorset - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 388. 12 March 1635. George Garrard - Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 393. 26 March 1635. Wentworth - Lord Cottington.; CSPD,1634-1635. p. 585. 17 March 1635. Robert Dixon - Lord Montague.; CSPV,1632-1636. 23 March 1635. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 355. 30 March 1635. Same - Same.

wider objective aimed at establishing unity amongst his ministers, yet at the same time given the general convention of promoting the chancellor upon a vacancy occurring in the treasury he must also have been aware of the slight which this would inevitably represent to Lord Cottington, whose financial and diplomatic skills he could ill-afford to lose and who was after all a long-standing servant of his. A more dynamic ruler would have bitten the bullet and stuck to his original intention, but Charles characteristically set about resolving the situation himself through delaying the appointment of a new treasurer in the hope that the tensions of the past would eventually ease and allow the appointment of Cottington. In the meantime he balanced the appointment of Laud to the committees for trade, foreign affairs and the treasury by naming Cottington Master of the Court of Wards in the place of Sir Robert Naunton, who had been persuaded to resign.<sup>49</sup> The link between Cottington's appointment to this position and Charles's wider plans over the treasury can be seen in that at much the same time as Weston died on the evening of Thursday 12 March Naunton had returned the seals of his office to the king, which the following Sunday (the day the treasury commission was officially announced to the Council) were given to Cottington, whose patent as Master of the Court of Wards passed the Great Seal soon after on Wednesday 25 March.<sup>50</sup> However, the faction which Charles had hoped to eradicate arose again in the disputes between Laud and Cottington within the treasury commission, which became progressively more serious as the year went

---

<sup>49</sup> Carlton, Archbishop Laud. p. 119.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 115. 27 March 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 372. 1 March 1635. George Garrard - Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 369. 16 February 1635. Lord Cottington - Wentworth.; PRO. C115/M36/8541. 26 February 1635. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 529. Undated. February 1635. Lord Cottington and Secretary Windebank - Earl of Salisbury.

<sup>50</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 389. 17 March 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; PRO. SO3/11. March 1635. Office of Master of the Court of Wards...granted to Lord Cottington during pleasure. By warrant and under his majesty's Sign Manual, and procured Windebank. Passed the Great Seal 25 March 1635. BCL. DV. 896/603183/363.

on.<sup>51</sup> As a consequence of this Charles had to abandon his earlier hope of appointing Cottington and seek an alternative candidate for treasurer. With Charles determined to retain the services of Cottington as Chancellor of the Exchequer, though, this was no easy task. For in addition to the criteria of personal acquaintance which Charles always set in any major appointment, in order to avoid exacerbating the faction which already existed around the position of treasurer he now had to find a candidate for it who was sufficiently above the suspicion of corruption to be acceptable to Archbishop Laud, yet who was at the same time sufficiently flexible and independent of him to be able to work alongside Cottington. However, far from this being the case the eventual choice of William Juxon, Bishop of London, is usually seen as a client of Laud's, advanced to the treasury out of the same motives which it was felt had led him to secure the appointment of Sir Francis Windebank as a Secretary of State. But when his selection and appointment is examined more closely it appears that the evidence upon which this belief rests is both small and tenuous, and that Juxon's prime backer was in fact almost certainly the king.

Juxon first appears to have come to the attention of Charles in August 1627 when in his capacity as vice-chancellor of Oxford he greeted him at Woodstock with a " Latin speech in laudation of the late and present king ", and must have made quite an impression upon him in this for he was soon after appointed as a chaplain in ordinary and Dean of Worcester (in which capacity as a Lent Preacher he appeared before the king four times between 1628-1631), and then subsequently advanced to the Clerkship of the Closet in July 1632, and the bishoprics of Hereford and (with Archbishop Abbot dying before this appointment came to confirmation) London, together with the Deanery of the Chapel Royal in 1633.<sup>52</sup> Charles would therefore

---

<sup>51</sup> Quintrell, ' The Church  
 Triumphant ? ', The Political World of Thomas Wentworth.  
<sup>52</sup> CSPD, 1627-1628. p.  
 280. 1 August 1627.; Mason, Juxon. p. 34.; BL. Harleian  
 390. f. 314v. 10 November 1627. John Pory - Joseph  
 Mead.; PRO. SO3/9. December 1627. Deanery of Worcester  
 granted to Dr. Juxon his Majesty's chaplain...; PRO.  
 LC5/132. ff. 2-3v. Lent Preachers 1628-1631.; Ibid., f.  
 172. 24 September 1633. Dr. Juxon...sworn Dean of the  
 Chapel.; --Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p.



have had ample opportunity of gaining a personal insight into Juxon's character; and given the great role which he played in appointments to positions within the Church through selecting them primarily from amongst his chaplains in ordinary, having successively promoted him to the positions of Clerk of the Closet and Dean of the Chapel Royal (which both involved close personal attendance upon his person) and the important See of London, he must have approved of what he saw. Laud's links with Juxon, on the other hand, are more obscure. In an extract for his diary on 10 July 1632 Laud notes " Doctor Juxon, the Dean of Worcester, at my suit sworn Clerk of his Majesty's Closet. That I might have one that I might trust near his Majesty, if I grow weak or infirm; as I must have of time...".<sup>53</sup> This appears to provide incontrovertible evidence of Laud acting in Juxon's behalf, but as demonstrated in the exaggerated claims which he had previously made of the part which he had played in the appointment of Secretary Windebank just three weeks before, with Laud using his diary more as a means of expressing his own private hopes and fears than as a true record of historical fact this is a source which has to be used with extreme caution.<sup>54</sup> So whilst with Laud having had a long working relationship with Juxon it is not beyond reason to believe that Charles consulted him over his suitability for this position, it is extremely doubtful whether this move actually proceeded from Laud himself. And rather than being part of a deliberate plan by which he " promoted one that I might trust near his Majesty...", with Laud becoming increasingly aware of his own isolation through the deaths of his old allies George Mountain, John Buckeridge and John Howson and the removal of Richard Neile from his position at Court as Clerk of the Closet to the distant See of York, and perhaps also reflecting on the part

---

215. 10 July 1632.; *Ibid.*, p. 218. 4 August 1633. PRO. C115/M32/8209. London. 10 August 1633. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. SO3/10. 22 September 1633. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of the Church of St. Pauls to elect Dr. Juxon, bishop elect of Hereford, Bishop of London. Subscribed upon signification of his majesty's pleasure by Secretary Windebank, and by him procured.

<sup>53</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. Tuesday 10 July 1632.

<sup>54</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. 15 June 1632.

which they had all played in marginalising Archbishop Abbot and of the rapid advance under the patronage of the king of such new men as Juxon, his subsequent decision to interpret the small part which he had actually played in his promotion as amounting to such was more likely to have been made out of a need to assure that such a move was not detrimental to his position than as a true representation of what had actually occurred.<sup>55</sup>

This is confirmed by other evidence in their relationship. As although Juxon played a small but by no means insignificant part in the election of Laud as President of St. John's College, Oxford, in 1611, they do not appear to have been particularly close.<sup>56</sup>

There is a similar lack of conclusive evidence linking Laud to Juxon's subsequent career at Court. As with his appointment as a chaplain in ordinary coming not as a consequence of his having being allotted a slot as a Lent Preacher (the selection of which Laud in conjunction with the Clerk of the Closet (Richard Neile) may have been able to exert a degree of control) but as a result of his having preached before the king (over which Laud, not appointed as Chancellor of the University of Oxford until April 1630, would have been able to exert little influence), and his appointment as Dean of Worcester soon after being handled entirely by Secretary Coke, given his known preferences they would both appear to be entirely the work of the king

---

<sup>55</sup> On Archbishop Abbot's suspension in July 1627 the duties of his office were undertaken by Laud, Buckeridge, Mountain, Neile and Howson.; Carlton, *Laud*. p. 64.; Mountain had died on the 24 October 1628. Ellis, ed., *Obituary of Richard Smyth*. p. 3.; Buckeridge had died on the 23 May 1631. Le Neve, *Fasti...Ely*. p. 8.; Howson died February 1632. PRO. C115/M35/8392. 11 February 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; *Ibid.*, C115/M35/8394. 18 February 1632. London John Pory - Viscount -Scudamore.; It was the translation of Neile (the only surviving member of this group) to York which had created the vacancy as Clerk of the Closet filled by Juxon.

<sup>56</sup> T.A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon. William Juxon, 1582-1663. Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury*. (Newark, 1985). pp. 26-8.; Carlton, *Archbishop Laud*. pp. 16-19, 34.; Quintrell, '*The Church Triumphant ?*'. p. 92.

himself.<sup>57</sup> And although there is an indication of his having played some role in Juxon's proposed appointment as Bishop of Hereford in May 1633, having signified the Clerk of the Signet of the king's pleasure that a King's Bill for granting this position should be prepared for his signature, as demonstrated in relation to the Church this does not necessarily signify that he was responsible for it and appears to have been nothing more than an administrative task undertaken on behalf of the king, the same measure being undertaken by Secretary Windebank in Juxon's subsequent appointment as Bishop of London.<sup>58</sup> Laud was therefore unlikely to have played any great role in advancing Juxon's career; and this is confirmed in his actions over the treasury later that summer.

Charles may have considered Juxon as a possible candidate for the treasury even before the death of Weston, but the decision to appoint him was likely to have been made at some point over the summer of 1635 once it became clear that he was not going to be able to appoint Cottington.<sup>59</sup> However, Charles was determined to resolve the problems of the past before making either an announcement or appointment; and this action had the direct opposite effect to that which he had intended. For with those most interested in this matter being in the absence of any clear direction from above guided by their own fears and preconceptions, in the short-term at least this led to a continuation of disunity along previous lines, and in

---

<sup>57</sup> PRO. S03/9. December 1627. The Deanery of Worcester granted to Dr. Juxon, his Majesty's chaplain in ordinary... Procured Mr Secretary Coke.

<sup>58</sup> PRO. S03/10. May 1633. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford to elect William Juxon...to be Bishop of Hereford. Subscribed upon signification of his Majesty's pleasure by the Lord Bishop of London.; Ibid., 22 September 1633. Conge d'elire and letters recommendatory to the Cathedral Church of St. Paul's recommending Dr. Juxon...to be elected unto the Bishopric of London. Subscribed upon signification of his majesty's pleasure by Secretary Windebank, and by him procured.

<sup>59</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 388. 12 March 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Quintrell, ' The Church Triumphant ? ' p. 101.

the case of Archbishop Laud to a prolonged campaign and a number of direct but fruitless interventions with the king aimed at influencing the patronage process.

Whilst Laud viewed Cottington with suspicion this was at first more a consequence of his association with Lord Treasurer Weston as from any belief that he was himself inherently corrupt, as reporting to Wentworth the ending of quarrels upon the Weston's death he had initially looked forward to the possibility of being able to work with him in investigating the practices of his former ally.<sup>60</sup> However, as a result of their clashes in the treasury commission and his belief that Cottington was about to secure the release of his old enemy Bishop Williams from the terms of his Star Chamber sentence Laud eventually concluded that Cottington was as corrupt as Weston.<sup>61</sup> He became convinced that the only way of preventing the effects of this from spreading throughout the government was through attempting to block his appointment through securing that of a treasurer he felt he could trust. The person who he chose for this, though, was not Bishop Juxon but Lord Deputy Wentworth, who whilst as prone to using public funds for private benefit as Weston or Cottington, in Laud's eyes still carried the reputation of the stern advocate of upright government which he had demonstrated as leader of the Commons in securing the Petition of Right. As whilst Wentworth had initially been assisted in his entry into the government through his connections with Lord Treasurer Weston, given the suspicion that he wished to replace him as lord treasurer their relationship had soured somewhat and Laud had subsequently forged a common cause with him over Weston's corruption through the latter's attempts to bring Irish revenue into the English Exchequer.<sup>62</sup> However, lacking the degree of intimacy and influence to

---

<sup>60</sup>

Works of William Laud.  
Vol. VII. pp. 114-5. 27 March 1635. Archbishop Laud -  
Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>61</sup>

Ibid., p. 129. 12 May  
1635. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy -  
Wentworth.; Ibid., pp. 157-161. 3 August 1635. Croydon.  
Same - Same.; Ibid., pp. 174-178. 4 October 1635.  
Hampton Court. Same - Same.; Ibid., pp. 220-1. 2 January  
1636. Lambeth. Same - Same.

<sup>62</sup>

Their common cause  
against Weston's policies are expressed in Ibid., pp.  
129-30. Lambeth. 12 May 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord

persuade the king directly Laud's campaign against Cottington in fact rested upon nothing more than his ongoing attempts to reveal the corruption of the past under Weston through the work of the Treasury Committee and a few outspoken comments in the presence of the king how that this would continue if Cottington was appointed in his place; which given Charles's determination to retain the services of Cottington, ultimately led to nothing more than his discovery of things " which I would have been content not to have known...".<sup>63</sup> His campaign to secure the appointment of Wentworth rested upon an equally weak basis. Given Charles's preference for taking important decisions himself Laud was, like others, restricted to making positive comments over Wentworth's suitability for the post in the presence of the king; he was further handicapped by having to proceed on the assumption, rather than the knowledge, that Wentworth would be interested in taking it on, as until August 1635 the question had never been directly raised between them, and when it was Laud discovered that Wentworth had no intention of putting himself forward.<sup>64</sup>

When the treasury had been put into commission in the Spring of 1635 it had been assumed that it was " likely to be afoot till Michaelmas..."; and with that time fast approaching, in preparation of the appointment of Juxon during early August Charles appears to have informed the queen of his intention of retaining Cottington in his present position of Chancellor of the Exchequer, who subsequently appears to have informed him.<sup>65</sup> She did so probably on the visit which she made to at Hanworth from Oatlands and as a means of smoothing the way for Charles's plans and gaining an important piece of patronage in her own right.<sup>66</sup> For in the light of this visit

---

Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., pp. 143-5. 12 June 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., pp. 160-1. 3 August 1635. Croydon. Same - Same.; Ibid., pp. 176, 183. 4 October 1635. Hampton Court. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 205. 30 November 1635. Same - Same.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., pp. 161-2. Croydon. 3 August 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>65</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. pp. 412-3. 14 April 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>66</sup> CSPD, 1635. p. 385. 18 September 1635. George Garrard - Wentworth.

Cottington wrote to Wentworth firmly assuring him how that there was " no more intention in the king to make me his treasurer, than to make you Archbishop of Canterbury...", the truth of which Wentworth immediately tried to convince Laud.<sup>67</sup> Had the appointment of Juxon been made soon after as planned this would not have really mattered; but whilst there were rumours around the middle of September 1635 that " his Majesty hath an intention to call the Bishop of London to be of his Council now at Hampton Court..." (which given the rumours of an imminent appointment at this time were perhaps a precursor to his appointment as lord treasurer), things then appear to have met a stop, either through the reluctance of Charles to make an appointment until all previous accounts had been settled, Laud believing at the beginning of October that "...we shall not see a lord treasurer till that be done...", or the reluctance of Juxon to accept the position, Charles having already apparently attempted to either remove his objections of a heavy workload or increase pressure upon him to accept it through removing his duties as Dean of the Chapel Royal.<sup>68</sup>

Rather than looking to succeed Weston in the treasury Cottington had in reality been fearful that he might be dismissed from office altogether; and in the light of the

---

<sup>67</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. p. 449. 4 August 1635. Lord -Cottington - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 171. 4 October 1635. Hampton Court. Same - Same.; --Ibid., p. 203. 30 November 1635. Same - Same.

<sup>68</sup> In a letter dated 11 August 1635 Laud informed the Queen of Bohemia that Matthew Wren was already acting as Dean of the Chapel Royal, even though he was not formally sworn into office until after the appointment of Juxon as treasurer. Juxon had either asked for a reduction of his workload in advance of taking office, feared the objections of Laud to his holding too many offices, or been using these excuses as a means of holding out against his appointment.; CSPD, 1635. p. 385. 18 September 1635. George Garrard - Edward, Viscount Conway.; Ibid. p. 375. 11 September 1635. Croydon. Archbishop Laud - Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 467. 3 October 1635. Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 171. 4 October 1635. Hampton Court. Laud - Wentworth.; PRO. LC5/134. 6 March 1636. Dr. Wren sworn Dean of the chapel.

queen's visit to Hanworth he was therefore able to relax.<sup>69</sup> However, isolated from the mainstream of political opinion, Laud viewed the queen's visit to Hanworth and Cottington's subsequent new-found confidence as hard proof that he would be appointed treasurer. As a result he became increasingly desperate at Wentworth's continuing lack of interest in the post, and unaware of the king's intention of appointing Juxon appears to have ignored both Wentworth's and his own advice of leaving " it as a desperate case " through taking advantage of Cottington's absence from Court due to ill-health during January 1636 in order to launch a last-ditch attempt to prevent his appointment, in the course of which he appears to have directly petitioned or at least given the impression that he wished to be appointed treasurer himself.<sup>70</sup> For when in the light of initial rumours spurred by Charles's receipt of the " true information of his estate..." Juxon was summoned to the Council by Secretary Windebank and appointed Lord High Treasurer (largely to the satisfaction of all those present) Charles felt it necessary to make a " public declaration...that he would have made choice of Canterbury for that place if it had not been out of the consideration of over pressing his aged body with affairs...", which with such a face-saving measure

---

69

On 4 of August 1635

Cottington wrote to Wentworth assuring him how that " if you should ask me then, who the king will give the staff to, I answer that in my opinion, it will be either your lordship, or to my Lord of Canterbury...", and as late as 30 October wrote how that the king was about to make a treasurer and that " we can gues[s] at no man but the archbishop...".; -Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 449. 4 August 1635. Lord --Cottington - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Quintrell, ' The Church Triumphant ? '. pp. 88/9.

70

Cottington was was absent from Court for the first two weeks of 1636.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. pp. 176-7. Hampton Court. 4th October 1635. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 203. 30 November 1635. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 207. 30 November 1635. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 223. 14 January 1636. Same - Same.; Ibid., pp. 230-33. 23 January 1636. Lambeth. Same - Same.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 374. 4 January 1636. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 510. 25 January 1636. George Garrard - Wentworth.; PRO. C115/N4/8605. 27 January 1636. Westminster. Secretary Windebank - Viscount Scudamore.

hardly being necessary if Laud was actually or even just perceived as Juxon's patron, substantiates the idea that he had been a compromise candidate personally selected by the king.<sup>71</sup> With Laud's subsequent reflection in his diary that " I pray God bless him [Juxon] to carry it so, that the Church may have honour, and the King and the State service and contentment by it. And now if the Church will not hold up themselves under God, I can do no more " being much more likely to have been an admission of his own political impotence or a statement of his intention to withdraw into himself upon being supplanted by another Churchman than a self-congratulatory note upon securing the appointment of a client.<sup>72</sup>

From the appointments of Windebank and Juxon it can be seen that it was Charles who was likely to have played the major role in their appointment. However, as is hinted in the actions of Laud and Cottington in the appointment of Secretary Windebank, and that of Laud and the queen in that of Lord Treasurer Juxon this did not mean that there was a total lack of activity on the part of patrons. What it did mean, though, was that their activities were restricted by parameters set by the king. With Charles vigorously defending his right to make decisions over the distribution of patronage himself and discouraging the intervention of others, this meant that those who wished to secure the appointment of a candidate to a specific office had to do so

---

<sup>71</sup> The first rumours of Juxon's appointment as treasurer arose at the beginning of March; and at a meeting of the Privy Council on Sunday 6 March, just under a year since -Weston's death, he was appointed as a Privy Councillor and given the treasurer's staff.; -Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 523. 24 March 1636. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; HMC, Fourth Report. p. 334. 1 March 1636. Earl of Clare - Earl of Middlesex.; Ibid., p. 257. 11-21 March 1636. Whitehall. Marquess of Hamilton - Basil, Lord Feilding.; PRO. C115/N3/8856. 2 March 1636. Westminster. Robert Reade - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. PC2/46. p. 10. 6 March 1636. Whitehall.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 482. 6 March 1636. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. p. Diary. 226. 6 March 1636.; PRO. SO3/11. March 1636. The office of Lord High Treasurer of England granted unto...William, Lord Bishop of London.

<sup>72</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. p. 226. Sunday 6 March 1636.



through first getting them to the attention of the king and then waiting for a vacancy. As Charles was reluctant to remove his officers these waits could often be long, and with him also discouraging politically motivated attacks upon his ministers there was little prospect of being able to force a minister from office as a means of speeding up the process. As a consequence of this once a potential successor had been secured in the favour of the king the activities of patrons switched from being aimed at the king to the present minister, who was persuaded or bribed to resign in the hope that Charles would appoint their candidate. With Charles being very much his own man, though, even when his own preferences were complied with influencing the distribution of patronage remained a very haphazard process in which nobody was assured of success. And as a consequence of this those such as the queen who wished for a general appearance of influence rather than the ability to appoint a specific person had to be willing to roll with the punch and fall in with his own choices. This is clearly expressed in the activity to secure the replacement of Secretary Coke by the Earl of Leicester.

Contrary to what would be expected given the direction of much of the historiography of Charles's views upon religion Secretary Coke's religious persuasion appears to have caused him little trouble; for although he was a staunch Protestant, and has sometimes even been termed a Puritan, if he was then he was very much a " Church-Puritan " of the type acceptable to Charles - as he was not only a firm supporter of the monarchy and Church of England, but also shared the king's loathing for Separatists.<sup>73</sup> It is therefore particularly interesting to note that he was one of the few people with whom the unpopular crypto-Catholic Lord Treasurer Portland enjoyed untroubled relations right until his death; and whilst much is made of his exclusion from the secret negotiations with Spain which were being conducted by Cottington, Weston and Windebank, this was more an example of Charles's preference for keeping his policies in as few hands as possible rather than a reflection upon Coke's abilities, his chief problems coming not from any religious or political

---

<sup>73</sup>  
Service. pp. 65-69.

Young, Servilty and

position which he held, but from his increasing age.<sup>74</sup> Already fifty years of age when he first entered the Crown service under Elizabeth Coke was sixty-two when appointed secretary of state in 1625, which meant that by the time of Secretary Windebank's appointment in 1632 he was almost seventy.<sup>75</sup> In itself this was not necessarily a problem, as compared to the relatively frequent illnesses suffered by Buckingham, Cottington and Weston as far as can be discerned Coke himself only suffered one serious illness throughout the 1630s, and even as late as 1639 was still robust enough to accompany the king on his journey to suppress the Scots.<sup>76</sup> There were also more positive reasons for keeping him in office. Coke may not have been the quickest or most imaginative of secretaries, but he was dependable. His long service had made him a mine of information upon the way in which the domestic duties of the office of secretary were regulated, while his detailed knowledge of maritime affairs was also helpful to a king determined to increase both the size and role of his navy.<sup>77</sup> Nevertheless, with increasing age Coke's efficiency had inevitably suffered to some extent. For whilst he was not forced to devolve the writing of letters to a secretary until 1638, before this point there had been complaints over the length of time it took him to answer his correspondence and over their lack of content when they arrived, the Earl of Northumberland, for example, in June 1637 complaining to Secretary Windebank how that "...I find your elder brother [Secretary Coke] constant to his reservedness, for notwithstanding the order he had from his majesty to communicate to me some resolutions upon this last dispatch out of France...If some

---

<sup>74</sup> Kevin Sharpe sees Coke's exclusion as a return to the Jacobean concept of divide and rule. Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 155-6.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 204.

<sup>75</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from --Clarendon. p. 42.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 2.

<sup>76</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 28, 56, 162, 196-8.; Havran, Cottington. pp. 77, 132, 152.; Coke, Servility and Service. p. 253.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 157.

<sup>77</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 42-43,; Young, Servility and Service. pp. 62-63, 210, 230.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 154-5, 177.; Alexander, Weston. p. 209.

of my friends did not give me a little light, I should, for him, live in a great blindness...".<sup>78</sup> Increasingly perceived by impatient courtiers eager to replace him as the cause of Charles's lack of direction in affairs and consequently given the disparaging sobriquet of " old noddie ", it was almost inevitable that there would be occasional rumours such as that reported by Edmund Rossingham in 1634 that Coke was about to be replaced by Jerome Weston (the second son and heir of Lord Treasurer Weston), but by the winter of 1635/6 they appear to have taken on a more serious tone.<sup>79</sup> As the rumours began early that winter, well before his illness in February 1636, it would appear that there was something more to them than just Court gossip; and either Charles had wondered whether Coke was now becoming " too old and unequal to the fatigue " and had therefore set about sounding him out over terms for his retirement soon after the issue of the writs for the coming year's ship money fleet, or Coke himself had been interested in seeing what terms he could get and had therefore allowed certain rumours to escape; but through whatever means news of this had somehow leaked to the Court and been picked up by the newsletter writers, one of which, George Garrard, reported to Lord Deputy Wentworth in

---

<sup>78</sup>

CSPD, 1637. p. 216. 15 June 1637. Earl of Northumberland - Secretary Windebank. Northumberland's criticisms may have been tempered by bad feelings which already existed between them over the navy. De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 65. November 16-26 1636. William --Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 45. 4 January 1637. Viscount Conway - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>79</sup>

HMC, Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry Manuscripts. (1926). Vol. III. p. 80. 16 January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.; PRO. C115/M36/8436. October 3 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 502. 23 December 1635. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Viscount Conway.; Ibid., p. 506. 8 January 1636. George Garrard - Wentworth.; Ibid., Vol. II. p. 2. 5 April 1636. George Garrard - Wentworth.; CSPV, 1632-1636. p. 524. 29 February 1636. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 253.

January 1636 " a report whispered again, which hath been up once or twice this winter, that Sir John Coke should leave his secretary's place...".<sup>80</sup> The main thrust of the rumour may have been true, but contrary to the report of the Venetian Ambassador which had been made at the same time being otherwise happy with Coke's work and aware of the long and loyal service which he had given to the Crown Charles had no intention of forcing him to resign at this point; and having perhaps previously given him a hint with the grant of the Irish estate of Vartree earlier that year, had at most merely offered him the chance to do so (probably with another position, possibly the Lord Presidency of the Council, in compensation) if he so wished.<sup>81</sup> However, still having full confidence in his own abilities and perhaps unsatisfied with the terms of the compensation which he had been offered Coke had evidently decided against retiring at this time. With Charles after all having no real grounds for removing him upon this he appears to have been willing to let the matter rest for the time being, albeit with the caveat that it was only " so long as he continues to discharge it in good health."<sup>82</sup> However, it was less readily accepted by those who had an interest in reporting his replacement, who being unaware of the exact details were spurred on by the incidental occurrence of Coke's subsequent illness. This explains how a good number of people came to be linked with the secretary's position

---

<sup>80</sup> CSPV,1632-1636. p. 515.  
15 February 1636. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 502. 23 December 1635. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Lord Viscount Conway.; Ibid., p. 506. 8 January 1636. George Garrard - --Wentworth.

<sup>81</sup> The Venetian Ambassador reported that Coke would receive an office " less useful than honourable ". Probably the position of Lord President of the Council vacant since his death late of Lord -Conway on Sunday 2 January 1631.; Cowper, II. p. 111. Undated, March 1636. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Secretary Coke.; Young, Servility and Service. pp. 218-9, 253-4,; CSPV,1632-1636. p. 515. 15 February 1636. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 105v. 17 December 1628. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8 January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount --Scudamore.

<sup>82</sup> CSPV,1632-1636. p. 527.  
7 March 1636. Venetian Ambaassador - Doge and Senate.

without Charles himself even appearing to have considered the question of a replacement, the likely candidates being mentioned by the newsletter writers appearing because of present political circumstances rather than from any direct evidence that they had been considered by Charles. In December 1635, for example, the Earl of Holland (probably as a front for the queen) had " with a spirit of prophecy confidently foreseen and destined Wat Montagu should be secretary to his majesty...".

<sup>83</sup> But this, like his own quest to become lord admiral, appears to have been more like a clumsy attempt to influence the decision of the king rather than a true reflection of his intent. As no doubt already aware of the fact that " Mr Walter Montagu, as zealously bred as you [Wentworth], is turned Roman Catholic ", and that this would preclude him from any further promotion in the service of the king, Wentworth had gleefully written to Conway stating how that " by what you write, his [Holland's] judgement gives so ill an account towards his friends [Montagu], as gives us his lordship's poor servants cause to wish he prove not mistaken also for himself..." in the admiralty. <sup>84</sup> Reports regarding the nomination of Jerome Weston appear to have rested upon a similar basis. Jerome had been sent on a number of diplomatic missions (to the Elector and Electress Palatine at the Hague in 1629, to Savoy in 1632, and as the king's special envoy to Richelieu in 1633) and been linked with the secretary's position as early as 1632. <sup>85</sup> These rumours were revived in October 1634, and here again upon rumours of Coke's removal; they appear to have been a consequence of

---

<sup>83</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 502. 23 December 1635. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Lord Viscount Conway.

<sup>84</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 233. 23 January 1636. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 502. 23 December 1635. Wentworth - Viscount Conway.

<sup>85</sup> Cowper, I. p. 386. 5 June 1629. Deciphered letter addressed Monsieur Damville a Liege.; CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 304. 9 April 1632. Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 613. 23 April 1632. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 623. 28 May 1632. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 634. 9 July 1632. Same - Same.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 176.

the public perception of Lord Treasurer Portland's influence with the king and the fear that his son would step into his place rather than a true reflection of fact.<sup>86</sup> For although Charles had previously demonstrated great favour to Jerome, such as in allowing him to marry his own cousin (the sister of the Duke of Lennox, which in itself made him a likely contender amongst the newsletter writers for any available office), these had been as much acts of realpolitik in bolstering his lord treasurer as demonstrations of his esteem for Jerome himself; and with his earlier diplomatic missions being by no means great successes and Charles also overlooking his father's attempts to secure his appointment as Master of the Court of Wards he does not appear to have seriously considered him for high office.<sup>87</sup> Similar factors appear to have lain behind the rumours surrounding Lord Viscount Conway, Sir Thomas Roe, and John Selden. Conway was the son and heir of Secretary Conway who had died late on Sunday 2 January 1631); Sir Thomas Roe had been leading a high profile but largely undirected and ultimately fruitless campaign for high office since his return from acting as ambassador to Constantinople in the late 1620s; whilst Selden (the respected lawyer who had put up such a fight against Attorney General Heath on behalf of the Five Knights, and himself been implicated in the attempt to prevent the dissolution of the 1629 parliament) had only recently been restored to favour through the intervention of his old friends Archbishop Laud and Solicitor General Littleton and by the usefulness of his work *Mare Clausum* - which in making a case for English sovereignty of the seas had provided Charles with an ideological justification not just for the levying of ship money but his whole naval policy.<sup>88</sup> With Laud perceived to

---

<sup>86</sup>

PRO. C115/M36/8436. 3  
October 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.;  
Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. Vol. I. p. 506. 8  
January 1636. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>87</sup>

Ibid., p. 389. 17 March 1635.  
George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth. Works of William  
Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. 18 June 1632.; Ibid.,  
Vol. VII. p. 157. 3 August 1635. Croydon. Archbishop  
Laud - Wentworth.

<sup>88</sup>

PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8  
January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.;  
CSPD,1627-1628. p. 541. 2nd February 1628. Secretary  
Conway - Leigh.; CSPV,1629-1632. p. 57. 14 May 1629.  
Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Kopperman,

be particularly influential at this time and Selden able to replace Coke's practical administration of the navy with that of the ideological basis upon which its policies rested, he was felt to be particularly likely to be appointed. But like all the others he had only been named in relation to this position because he was seen to possess the king's favour and enjoy strong support at a time when Coke was widely felt to be about to retire. In reality, though, the matter had already been settled for the time being some time before the leak of the first rumours; so whilst Coke's illness had subsequently given them a new lease of life, with there being very little additional evidence to hand, by March speculation had died down, with it now being reported that " very little more is said about the disposal of his office, and it is thought that so long as he continues to discharge it in good health, it will not be taken away from him ".<sup>89</sup> By 1637, then, Charles had been making guarded moves to persuade Secretary Coke to retire for a number of years. But Coke was a loyal servant and by no means incompetent; and Charles himself was becoming increasingly and characteristically reluctant to change his ministers, for replacements were hard to find. He was thus not keen to go one step further and order Coke to retire. But others, driven by self-interest, did not have so many scruples, where the queen played the key role.

Like James before him, Charles had developed an over-heightened perception of the ability of Spain to influence the actions of the Emperor. This tended to lead him to support such ministers as Weston and Cottington, when it suited his purpose. He was not however averse to working with those looking for an alliance with France, who

---

Heath. pp. 162, 165, 175, 177, 181, 183.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 518. 29 May 1631. Earl of Clare - Secretary Dorchester.; CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 193. Undated November 1631. Unsigned newsletter.; BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 320-321. 14 December 1631. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/M36/8449. 13 February 1635. Edmund Rossingham - Scudamore.; Roper, Archbishop Laud. pp. 334-5.; T.W. Fulton, The Sovereignty of the Sea. An Historical Account of the Claims of England to the Dominion of the British Seas, and of the Evolution of the Territorial Waters: with special reference to the Rights of Fishing and the Naval Salute. (London, 1911). pp. 367-375.

<sup>89</sup> CSPV, 1632-1636. p. 527. 7 March 1636. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

historically speaking tended to be of an anti-Catholic persuasion. This was the case in the diplomatic dealings of the latter half of the 1630s. The Spanish were again more interested in maintaining English neutrality than engaging them in a meaningful alliance (neither trusting Charles nor believing that he had the resources to carry out his side of the bargain). This meant that Charles's objective of restoring the Palatinate through a naval-based Anglo-Spanish alliance was subject to the same problem of political weakness as that of his father's based on a Spanish marriage, with negotiations continuing fruitlessly throughout the spring and early summer of 1635.<sup>90</sup>

However, the outbreak of war between France and Spain in May of that year had increased Charles's bargaining position, and with the Spaniards' duplicity being revealed through the separate peace which they signed at Prague and the subsequent marriage of the Emperor's daughter to the Duke of Bavaria, in 1636 Charles had begun simultaneous negotiations with France and Spain.<sup>91</sup> To the Emperor at Vienna he sent Earl Marshal Arundel, who was to try and determine the likelihood of an absolute restitution of the Palatinate to Charles's nephew, whilst to Paris he sent, as a reinforcement to Scudamore the Earl of Leicester, whose task was both tactical and constructive - serving to put increased pressure upon the Spanish to make concessions while at the same time laying down plans for a possible alliance if they did not.<sup>92</sup> Known as something of a puritan, and having commanded a regiment in the service of the States of the United Provinces, Leicester was the ideal choice for the task of concluding an alliance whose principal object would be to secure war against Spain.<sup>93</sup> He enjoyed considerable backing amongst the followers of the queen, being on close terms to the Earl of Holland and brother-in-law to her courtiers Henry, Lord Percy and the Countess of Carlisle. It is highly likely that she had played

---

<sup>90</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule, pp. 509-519.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., pp. 509-519.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., pp. 519-535.; M.A. Ogle and W.H. Bliss, eds., Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library. (Oxford, 1882). Vol. I. p. 92. 31 March 1636. Secretary Windebank - John Taylor.

<sup>93</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon, p. 133.



some part in his appointment through the influence which came to her as a consequence of her superior knowledge of the French Court. Whether this was actually the case or no, Leicester (and especially his wife, who had assured her husband that " this employment may prove advantageous to you in great proportion...") was hoping that this post would prove a stepping-stone to high office, and was evidently expecting to secure it through the means of the queen, who was in frequent contact with him whilst in France through such intermediaries as Walter Montagu; and who seeing the advantages to her affairs of his appointment to high office, had by April 1637 assured him through his wife that " she was much obliged to you [Leicester], not only in what concerned the public but in her particular affairs...and twice she was pleased to repeat it, that if it lay in her power she would show herself sensible of your respect to her...".<sup>94</sup>

With the king disliking direct interference in his affairs and Henrietta Maria's ability to intervene directly in the distribution of the major offices of his gift was limited, and in order to influence it in any way she was like Buckingham before her forced to mould her actions to those of the king. And always being on the lookout for possible avenues of opportunity through which she could advance her influence, in this case appears to have noticed both that Charles was not averse to Coke's retirement, and that Leicester was a likely candidate to replace him, the king being " to her knowledge...very well satisfied with..." him .<sup>95</sup> Realising the likely parties in any change in office, though, was the easy part, as it was far more difficult to see these plans put into execution. What arrangements had actually been made at this time are not clear. But as in her earlier attempt to replace Secretary Carleton with Cottington it would appear that they centered around an attempt to persuade Secretary Coke to retire whilst simultaneously getting Leicester to the attention of the king by spreading rumours or dropping hints that he should be appointed in his place rather than

---

<sup>94</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 74. 28 December 1636. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 100. 13 April 1637. Leicester House. Same - Same.; Sharpe, Personal Rule, p. 538.

<sup>95</sup> De l'Isle, p. 100. 13 April 1637. Leicester House, Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.

through the direct engagement of any influence which the queen possessed. For as Henry Percy reported to Leicester " upon discovering the queen's intention concerning Rossinus's [Coke's] place...", " to my knowledge there can nothing destroy the design so much as that; for it will not only give a great distaste to the king to hear how they order those things without his knowledge, but also give time to all them who shall dislike of it to prepare everything that may prejudice Leicester...".<sup>96</sup>

There was therefore clearly some kind of plan hatched by the queen on behalf of Leicester based around the removal of Secretary Coke in 1637, but for some reason it was then subsequently discontinued. As asserted by M.B. Young, it is possible that it had been discovered by the king, which in forcing a hasty retreat would be revealing enough in itself.<sup>97</sup> But as there is no mention of this in any sources and the queen used exactly the same procedure a year or so later, this would appear unlikely. If her plan is looked at in two separate parts, the removal of Secretary Coke and the campaign to appoint Leicester in his place, it is possible to demonstrate that in 1637 the plan failed because of Coke's unwillingness to resign his position (thereby precluding a test of the queen's influence or Leicester's standing with the king), and then with Coke eventually coming round to the queen's way of seeing things, in the period 1638-1640 because of the king's desire to maintain patronage in his own hands. In order for the campaign being waged by the queen on behalf of Leicester in August 1637 to have worked her period of 'marketing' on behalf of Leicester had to run alongside Charles's deliberations over Coke's replacement. The problem here was that there was no vacancy until Charles overcame his reluctance to dismiss him or Coke himself agreed to concede or even accept the offers of the queen, or, least likely, retired voluntarily. So Henry Percy's warning to the Earl of Leicester of the dangers of his campaign to replace Coke coming to the king's ears may have caused it to falter; but the probable reason was Coke's refusal to join the plan.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 75. 24  
August 1634. [Misdated, should be 1637]. Oatlands. Henry Percy - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>97</sup> Young, Servility and Service. p.  
254.

<sup>98</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 75. 24  
August 1634. [Misdated. Should be 1637]. Oatlands. Henry

However, perhaps reflecting upon the present political difficulties and the repeated offers made to him by the queen and her allies, Coke subsequently appears to have had a significant change of heart. Late in 1638 and early 1639 the queen's plan to replace him with Leicester appears to have been resurrected. In conceding that time was at last catching up with him in 1638, Coke for the first time yielded to the use of a secretary to pen his letters; and as Charles prepared to go to Scotland in person soon after he gave the first real indication that he would be willing to part with his position. The Countess of Leicester told her husband that " Sir John Temple is inclined to conceive that [Secretary Coke] would be content to leave his place upon easy conditions to [you]..."<sup>99</sup> At the same time the queen, the Earl of Holland and Henry Percy hoped to persuade Charles to allow Leicester to return to England; and again there seemed to be a concerted attempt to synchronise Leicester's return with Coke's retirement as a means of increasing the chances of getting him appointed in his place.<sup>100</sup> By January 1639, Sir John Temple (one of Leicester's agents) was able to report that George Rudolph Weckherlin (Coke's secretary) was " very desirous that you [Leicester] should succeed his master [Coke] ", suggesting he had given him an assurance that he would be able to hold on to his position.<sup>101</sup> How Coke himself stood in relation to this plan at this time is not completely clear, but with Leicester hoping to return to England in March it would appear that a decision to go ahead with it had already been made, and this is confirmed in a letter dated 7/17 February 1639 from Weckherlin to Leicester in which he refers to " Secretary Coke, who your lordship, I believe, nameth as one of the good party ", indicating that even if all points had yet to be settled, attempts at reconciliation in the interest of wider objectives were at least underway, with further confirmation being provided in another letter a week or so later, when on 22 February 1639 the Earl of Northumberland reported to Leicester

---

Percy - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>99</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 156. 29 December 1638. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., p. 156. 29 December 1638. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., p. 158. 8 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.

that Secretary Coke had been " brought to promise his assistance " with the king to secure leave " for Leicester to come home on private affairs...", something which is inconceivable if Leicester's attempts at replacing him were contrary to his own objectives.<sup>102</sup> Given Temple's assertion late in 1638 that he believed Secretary Coke was willing to part with his office it appears probable that it was at this point that negotiations between him and Leicester first began. Coke made it plain he was looking for financial compensation; and reports in January 1639 noted that he had been offered 4,000 for his position by Sir Henry Vane.<sup>103</sup> The Countess of Leicester had already enquired of her husband whether she, too, should offer terms to Coke; and whilst there is no firm evidence that she ever did, it would nevertheless appear likely that some kind of approach had been made between them before Leicester himself returned to England late in March. With Coke leaving for Scotland along with the king on 26 March 1639, however, any negotiations between them at this juncture evidently failed to reach a conclusion.<sup>104</sup> Leicester still had cause to be confident, though. He continued to enjoy the support of the queen and Coke was now apparently willing to resign upon the right terms; in May he also received a clear indication of the favour of the king through his appointment as a privy councillor, which must have left him, as well as the queen confident of his appointment as secretary as soon as matters could be finalised with Coke.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Ogle and Bliss, ed., Calendar of --Clarendon State Papers. Vol. I. p. 176. 8 May 1639. Secretary Windebank - Arthur Hopton.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 163. 7-17. February 1639. Whitehall. G.R. Weckherlin - Earl of Leicester.; HMC, Third Report. p. 76. 22 February 1639. London. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>103</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 158. 8 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.; HMC, Third Report. p. 258. 13 January 1639. Ludlow Castle. E. Martyn - Lieutenant Colonel Davies, at Bridgwater House, Barbican.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p. 76. 22 February 1639. London. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>105</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 164. 8 May 1639. Newcastle. Sir John Temple - Earl of Leicester.

On his return to England in the late summer of 1639 Charles had announced a vacation, with ministers and officers not being required to attend Court until Michaelmas.<sup>106</sup> Charles travelled on to London, arriving on 28 July 1639, leaving Secretary Coke to rest at his Melbourne estate in Derbyshire, not only to recover from what had been an exhausting expedition (especially for someone who was approaching eighty years of age), but also to sort out a number of personal affairs which had arisen during his absence.<sup>107</sup> Unlike Charles's other ministers and officers, Coke was not to be allowed to take his vacation unhindered. From the 8th of August, he was being pressed to return, Weckherlin writing to him on the fifteenth how that " your honour's presence is much desired by the Earl of Holland, whom I see daily, as also his majesty ", a plea which was again repeated in much stronger terms on the nineteenth.<sup>108</sup> Much is usually made of these episodes as indicating " that Charles wanted Coke at Court so that he could dismiss him in person from his office ".<sup>109</sup> But M.B. Young (who makes this assertion) concedes that when Coke did return " what was plausible did not happen ", raising doubts whether this had ever been Charles's actual intention.<sup>110</sup> It seems more likely that as Weckherlin informed him on the fifteenth, at a time of war the king merely wished " to talk news " which might effect their plans; and if it did have anything to do with his office, it was only because he suspected that his duties were becoming too much for him or he had heard a rumour in relation to the deal with Leicester that he wished to resign, not because he wished to dismiss him.<sup>111</sup> This is confirmed by doubts which can be cast upon another piece of evidence often used to indicate Coke's imminent dismissal. This

---

<sup>106</sup> Young, Servility and Service. p. 260.

<sup>107</sup> CSPD, 1639. p. 421. 29 July 1639. Earl of Salisbury - Secretary Windebank.; Ibid., p. 454. 5 August 1639. Thomas Smith - Sir John Penington.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 260.

<sup>108</sup> Cowper, II. p. 239. 8 August 1639. G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.; Ibid., p. 240. 15 August 1639. Weckherlin - Coke.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 261.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., p. 261.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 261.

<sup>111</sup> Cowper, II. Vol. VI. p. 240. 15 August 1639. G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.

concerns his removal from his Court lodgings. In April 1639, when Coke was away with the king in Scotland, his assistant, Weckherlin, had received an order from Michael Oldisworth (Lord Chamberlain Pembroke's secretary) to hand over the keys to the secretary's lodgings so that they could be cleared to make room for Lord Admiral Northumberland. <sup>112</sup> This has been interpreted as " a final sign of Coke's impending fall so blatant, so bold and unequivocal, as to be ludicrous..."; but such a view tends to ignore a number of other important considerations, and places too much emphasis upon the knowledge that Coke was shortly after replaced. <sup>113</sup> It is apparent from a number of letters between Secretary Coke and Lord Admiral Northumberland that, while Coke was concerned that state papers should not be moved in his absence, this change of lodgings had already been agreed upon some time before, and for Coke was an alteration rather than an expulsion prior to his dismissal. Otherwise there would have been no need for him to be assigned those of Sir Thomas Edmondes, who had recently died. <sup>114</sup> And given Coke's connections with Buckingham and the navy it would at least seem feasible that after the latter's death and in the absence of a permanent lord admiral he had been assigned his lodgings; but that with the appointment of Northumberland in 1638, followed by the onset of war and Coke's absence from Court, the pressure for some alteration had increased. Coke was eventually assigned the Earl of Ancrum's quarters, which although perhaps " too little for your use and especially for your table and diet " in comparison to his previous ones, were not meant as some quiet backwater for a person about to be relieved from office. <sup>115</sup> His new premises were " far better and more convenient for your going to his Majesty than that of Sir Thomas Edmondes..." which he had originally been assigned. <sup>116</sup> It is therefore by no means clear that Charles had any

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 220. 10 April 1639.  
Richmond. --G R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.

<sup>113</sup> Young, Servility and Service. p.  
260.

<sup>114</sup> Cowper, II. p. 231. 6 June 1639.  
Earl of Northumberland - Secretary Coke.; Ibid., p. 234.  
Undated, June 1639. Coke - Northumberland.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., p. 241. 25 August 1639. Whitehall.  
G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., p. 241. 25 August 1639. Whitehall.

intention of imminently dismissing Coke, and if he had indeed stayed on in Derbyshire as a means of holding on to office it was not to avoid the king (with whom he had after all been with all that summer) but because he had begun to have second thoughts over accepting the deal with Leicester, which he and his allies were now desperate to conclude.

The queen's previous campaign on behalf of Leicester had failed because of Coke's refusal to relinquish his office. Perhaps in the expectation of being able to settle matters with him face to face once and for all, after having returned to England earlier that year in March and waited upon the king at York in April (where he may or may not have met up with Coke) Leicester had remained in London until early August, only returning to France when it became apparent that Coke had retired to Melbourne.<sup>117</sup> It is interesting to note that the Earl of Holland and George, Lord Goring who were most eagerly pressing for Coke's hasty return both possessed strong connections with the queen (who was the main force behind Leicester's drive for office).<sup>118</sup> Holland had also previously acted on behalf of Leicester, and had a difficult relationship with Secretary Coke when he had tried to secure Leicester's fees as ambassador; now, in sharp contrast, Holland radiated concern for his return to Court, and for the arrangements for his lodgings.<sup>119</sup> This cordiality towards Coke would appear to be confirmed in a letter dated the 23 August/2 September 1639 sent by the Earl of Leicester (via William Hawkins and Weckherlin) to " Mr Secretary Coke, not as he is secretary of state but my noble friend, nor as a despatch but a private letter, and so not to come into the hands of any but particular persons...".<sup>120</sup> What its contents were is unclear, but given Leicester's orders to Hawkins and the

---

G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.

<sup>117</sup> C.V. Wedgwood, The King's Peace. 1637-1641.; CSPD, 1639. p. 434. 5 August 1639. Thomas Smith - Sir John Penington.

<sup>118</sup> Cowper, II. p. 239. 8 August 1639. Westminster. G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.; Ibid., p. 241. 19 August 1639. Westminster. Same - Same.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., p. 239. 8 August 1639. Westminster. G.R. Weckherlin - Secretary Coke.; Ibid., p. 241. 19 August 1639. Westminster. Same - Same.

<sup>120</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 178. 23 Aug/2 Sept 1639. Earl of Leicester - William Hawkins.

prevailing circumstances it would appear likely to have been linked to discussions over his office as secretary, either a direct offer of compensation, or more likely an invitation for him to return to Court and deal with Holland and his other allies.<sup>121</sup> After getting his own affairs in order Coke returned to Court about the second week of September 1639, where he presumably began negotiations with Holland.<sup>122</sup> However, Hawkins wrote to Leicester at about this of "speech here that Mr Secretary Coke is to leave that place, and that Sir William Boswell shall succeed..." him, indicating that Coke had not restricted himself to treating with just one party.<sup>123</sup> With Coke being determined to get the best deal he could over his decision to resign negotiations necessarily took some time, but he appears to have settled with Leicester at some point around November 1639, thereby at last allowing the queen's plan to go to into its second and most delicate stage.

In this, both Coke and Leicester were entirely dependent upon the influence of the queen. If Coke himself unilaterally announced his retirement to the king there was no guarantee that the position would go to Leicester, and he would lose any of the benefits of the deal which he had negotiated with him. Leicester himself depended on the influence of the queen and her ability to get in first and announce Coke's willingness to resign in order to have the earl appointed in his place. With the Countess of Leicester believing that the queen "was never so well with the king" all the parties involved were hopeful of success.<sup>124</sup> Charles, however, remained as reluctant "to hear other people give, what is only fit for him" as he had in 1637, and when the queen went to him with this arrangement at some point in November to the surprise of all (who had as with Buckingham assumed rather than actually seen the

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p. 178. 23 Aug/2 Sept 1639.  
Earl of Leicester - William Hawkins.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., p. 183. 5/15 September 1639.  
Whitehall. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., p. 183. 5/15 September 1639.  
Whitehall. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., p. 204. 21 November 1639.  
Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.



influence of the queen) he peremptorily " refused the queen to make Leicester secretary...".<sup>125</sup>

The queen herself was unlikely to be chastened by the king, being able to argue that she was only acting as a front for the desires of others, whilst Leicester's willingness to serve the king in such circumstances was likely to win him his praise rather than his censure. The case with Coke (whose co-operation had made the whole plan possible), however, was totally different; for the king's refusal to appoint Leicester had not only put an end to the compensatory arrangement which had existed between them, but had also informed the king of his wish to retire, thereby removing the one bargaining chip which he had still held and made it only a matter of time before he was replaced. Just how soon Charles became aware of the details of this scheme hatched by the queen is not clear, but by the beginning of December there had been a definite change in his relationship with Coke; and with the secretary " now very little acquainted with the affairs of this Court..." it appears that Charles had at last decided to remove him from office and to appoint Sir Henry Vane in his place and was only waiting for the right moment to do so.<sup>126</sup> It also seems that the queen had abandoned Leicester and followed suit.

Leicester's failure to secure the position of secretary is usually explained as a consequence of the opposition of Archbishop Laud, who was supposedly averse to his appointment on account of his religious position and the disagreements he had had with the resident ambassador in France, Laud's old friend Viscount Scudamore.<sup>127</sup> However, Laud's influence over Charles in non-religious matters was never great, whilst the Countess of Leicester believed that the talk of a dispute between him and her husband over the latter's treatment of Scudamore to be much exaggerated,

---

<sup>125</sup> Young, Servility and Service. p. 254.; HMC, Third Report. p. 25. 24 August 1634. [Misdated, 1637]. Oatlands. Henry Percy - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 78. 21 November 1639. Earl of Northumberland - Leicester.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., p. 79. 5 December 1639. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>127</sup> Carlton, Archbishop Laud. p. 183.; HMC, Third Report. p. 80. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

arguing that she " could never hear of anything he said to your prejudice, though I have been inquisitive enough...".<sup>128</sup> That this has been the case is characterised by historians' general tendency to exaggerate the influence of courtiers at the expense of the king. The true grounds for Leicester's failure lay not with the influence of particular courtiers but the personal preferences of the king. As with Charles taking great care over his appointments and making sure that he selected men for offices rather than offices for men he not only believed that Leicester was of too high a social status to hold such a position, but also preferred to stick with people with whom he was thoroughly acquainted. And whilst Leicester was by no means unknown to him, being trusted sufficiently to act as an extraordinary ambassador on his behalf and to be appointed as a privy councillor, he had gained a much clearer picture of Sir Henry Vane, who had continually been in his service since 1617.

As a consequence by January 1639 Sir Henry Vane was already firmly in the king's favour and trust, reportedly able with the Earl of Northumberland, " to do many things as they please without the assistance of any...".<sup>129</sup> This favour was noticed and emulated by the queen.<sup>130</sup> By early 1639 Vane was therefore already well placed when any Court office became available, and his chances were improved by subsequent events later that same year. Unlike Leicester, who was for a good proportion of the time absent from the person of the king, Vane, as a senior member of Charles's household staff, was one of those who accompanied him on his second expedition to Scotland. He not only feasted the king at his castle at Raby, but remained in constant attendance upon him throughout that summer; by July 1639 he

---

<sup>128</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 74. 28 December 1636. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 82. 7 February 1637. Penshurst. Same - Same.

<sup>129</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 158. 8 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid. p. 158. 15 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., p. 158. 8 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 158. 15 January 1639. Penshurst. Countess - Earl of Leicester.

and the Earl of Lindsey were the only English Privy Councillors attendant upon him.  
<sup>131</sup> This not only increased the affection of the king but also gained the attention of others, leading Sir Edward Nicholas to assure him that he never did himself " more right in the opinion of the discreetest and best affected here than now by your constant abiding with the king...". <sup>132</sup> Archbishop Laud declared that " if the Church had had no worse friends than he, when the king was at Berwick, I think things had gone better than they did...". <sup>133</sup>

Sir Henry Vane and Lord Deputy Wentworth had previously enjoyed fairly amicable relations, but the latter's return to England towards the end of 1639 and the weight which his counsels now began to carry with the king led to a belief that Vane was " much less powerful than she [cipher] was believed...", something which was apparently confirmed shortly afterwards. <sup>134</sup> On 12 January 1640 Charles had not only granted Wentworth the earldom of Strafford (the name of the Wapentake in which Wentworth Woodhouse was situated), but also the title of Baron of Raby in the county and bishopric of Durham, even though the estates and castle of the Barony belonged to Sir Henry Vane, who had hoped to receive this title himself. <sup>135</sup> Wentworth meant to provoke Vane, who was deeply angered by this move. This was at much the same time as Charles had first become aware of Coke's involvement in the scheme to see Leicester appointed secretary in his place; but his support for the counsels of Wentworth had not extended to allowing him any influence over appointments and had not affected his trust in the judgment of Vane, who he had immediately selected as Coke's successor. This, of course, was not immediately apparent to Court observers, but does appear to have been picked up by the queen,

---

<sup>131</sup> CSPD, 1639. p. 383. 10 July 1639. Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., p. 400. 17 July 1639. Sir Edward Nicholas - Sir Henry Vane.;

<sup>133</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. Appendix II. p. 571. 26 October 1639. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Bishop of Durham.

<sup>134</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 207. 5 December 1639. Countess of Leicester - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>135</sup> C.V. Wedgwood, Thomas Wentworth. First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641: A Re-evaluation. (London, 1964). pp. 272-273.

who rather than persisting with her initial plan of getting Leicester appointed, switched her support to Sir Henry Vane.<sup>136</sup>

Charles had previously held back from dismissing Coke because of his long service and the dislocation of government caused by the Scottish troubles, but the revelation late in 1639 that he had been seeking terms upon which to leave his office removed any qualms which he may have had over removing him. So whilst the great pressure of affairs remained, with the Court now resident in one place and with a parliament and new expedition to Scotland being imminent this now presented an opportunity to appoint a new secretary rather than retain the old one; and, indicating that it was king's work alone, on 10 January 1639 the whole Court was "surprised with the news that the king had employed the lord treasurer to Secretary Coke to let him know that by reason of his age he found him not able to discharge as he ought the business incident to the place he held, but if he would willingly resign, his Majesty should take it well at his hand, and be ready in some other occasion to show him favour...with neither the archbishop, Hamilton, the Lieutenant of Ireland, or any other minister in the Court" having any previous knowledge of it.<sup>137</sup> After the failure of the earlier plan of the queen, speculation about Coke's removal had subsided and Charles's actions appear to have come like a bolt out of the blue, surprising Coke as much as anyone else. He had hoped that when he left office it would be upon those terms that would be most suitable to him. So he had no option but to go "and immediately submitted" to the king's will; but worried that it would be without some form of compensation, he went the very next day to consult with the now Lord Lieutenant of Ireland Wentworth, hoping that he would be able to bring about some alternative arrangement.<sup>138</sup> Charles had as yet made no mention of a successor, not even to

---

<sup>136</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 6  
February 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of  
Leicester.

<sup>137</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 226. 23  
Jan/3 Feb. 1640. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of  
Leicester.; HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 16 January 1640.  
Earl of Northumberland - Leicester.

<sup>138</sup> HMC. De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 80. 16  
January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of  
Leicester.

Lord Treasurer Juxon.<sup>139</sup> Court observers speculated that Charles had yet to make up his mind, and that he was therefore still open to influence; in the absence of the queen, Wentworth, Laud (who had previously favoured the appointment of Sir Thomas Roe) and the Earl of Northumberland (amongst others) continued to press the case of Leicester.<sup>140</sup> However, it soon became common knowledge (most likely through the queen) that Charles favoured the appointment of Sir Henry Vane. This effectively deprived Leicester's allies of sufficient time to launch an effective campaign upon his behalf; and since his supporters believed (whether for personal or political reasons) that Vane was an unsuitable candidate, they turned to pressing for the continuation of Sir John Coke, at first to buy time, and then as a means of keeping Vane out.<sup>141</sup> As Henrietta Maria had realised some time before, though, Charles had already made up his mind; so despite the prominence of those backing the appointment of Vane, Northumberland was soon reporting that he believed the king "so far engaged that I doubt he will not be wrought off".<sup>142</sup> For when he had sent Lord Treasurer Juxon to Secretary Coke on 10 January 1640 to inform him of his wish for him to retire he appears (just as he had with Lord Keeper Williams in November 1625) to have given him a period of notice until the end of the month before he was expected to relinquish the seals of office.<sup>143</sup> It was this intervening

---

<sup>139</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 16 January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., p. 80. 9 January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 80. 16 January 1640. Same - Same.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 225. 23 January 1640. London. Same - Same. --

<sup>141</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 16 January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 225. 23 January 1640. London. Same - Same.

<sup>142</sup> HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 16 January 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>143</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 224. 16/26 January 1640. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 225. 23 January 1640. London. Earl of Northumberland - Leicester.; Ibid., p. 226. 23 Jan/3 Feb. 1640. Westminster. Hawkins - Leicester.; Ibid., p. 228. 30 Jan/9 Feb. 1640. Westminster. Same - Same.; HMC,

period which appears to have been the cause of confusion at Court as to whether Charles had actually dismissed him or not, and therefore of the success or otherwise of the campaign to keep him in office. Coke's continuing presence at Court had continued to give hope to the opponents of Vane and the supporters of Leicester. Charles however based his appointments solely upon a personal belief in a candidate's suitability rather than how popular the choice might be. He had no intention of changing his plans in the light of political pressure. Therefore in accordance with the arrangement which he had accepted on 10 January 1640 the secretary relinquished the seals of his office on Friday 31 January 1640, after fifteen years and retired to his estate.<sup>144</sup> Sir Henry Vane was sworn secretary in his place two days later.<sup>145</sup>

Through his actions in relation to these offices Charles can be seen to have played a similarly active role in the distribution of administrative positions in his government as he did in those positions which entailed regular attendance upon his person. He may not have been able to completely eliminate the intervention of his subjects in what he saw to be his own preserve; but by taking patronage back into his own hands and forcing them to act upon his own terms and according to his own preferences he had significantly reduced the effect which they were able to have upon it whilst correspondingly increasing his own. This had been clearly demonstrated in the impact which he had had upon as important a political figure as the Duke of Buckingham.

---

Third Report. p. 80. 16 January 1640. Northumberland - Leicester.

<sup>144</sup> De l'Isle. p. 230. 6/16 February 1640. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., Vol. VI. p. 228. 30 Jan/9 Feb. 1640. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 230. 6/16 February 1640. Westminster. Same - Same.; HMC, Third Report. p. 80. 6 February 1640. Earl of Northumberland - Leicester.

## Section II. Patronage and Politics.

### Chapter 5.

#### Buckingham: the transformation of a favourite.

Whatever their historiographical perspective, historians have agreed that the principal political figure of the closing years of James I.'s reign and the opening years of Charles I.'s was the Duke of Buckingham. He is often said to have ruled in equal degree over the ageing James and the young and inexperienced Charles, and thus to be the true ruler of the country.<sup>1</sup> If this was actually the case, given its central importance to his position as favourite it would be expected that there would also be a similarity between the exercise of patronage during this period. But where James took a generally broad, inclusive and flexible approach, Charles's was narrow, divisive and inflexible. With early modern history having tended to be approached in terms of reigns and according to the assumption that Buckingham was the true ruler of the country this inconsistency has usually been explained as a consequence of either James's senility and love for his favourite or Charles's youth and political inexperience allowing it to take its full effect, the position taken depending upon which reign is being written on. But whilst these arguments appear valid enough when used

---

<sup>1</sup> This belief is equally shared by supporters and critics of Buckingham, the controversy being over the consequences of the policies which he was supposedly advancing rather than whether he was actually responsible for them. And whilst D.H. Willson portrays Buckingham as becoming "master" to a "broken, debauched and repulsive old man" during the last years of his reign, Charles Carlton believes that the "Duke of Buckingham in many ways ruled England", making a case for viewing "the period from Charles's accession to Buckingham's assassination [as] a whole". D.H. Willson, King James VI. and I. (London, 1963). pp. 425, 427.; Carlton, Charles I. p. 60.

independently of each other they are mutually exclusive and cannot be used simultaneously as part of a continuous explanation of events during both reigns. At least one of the explanations must therefore be incorrect, and it is therefore a matter of great importance to our understanding of the reasons as to why patronage failed to fulfil its role under Charles that this discrepancy is resolved or some other explanation offered. At its simplest level the current position comes down to who it was that proved most open to the influence of the Duke of Buckingham; but with the assertions of both sides being formed along the lines of Charles and James's known personal and political weaknesses (James's love of favourites and Charles's youth and lack of political skill) it is a cyclical argument which has the propensity to run and run. There is, however, a potential way out, for whilst the respective characters of James and Charles have clearly been considered in relation to these arguments, due to underlying assumptions as to the role of Buckingham the situation has been viewed back to front and attention has been focussing upon the wrong aspects. For Buckingham was never the true ruler of the country, as the position of favourite carried no intrinsic influence or power in its own right, whatever his critics might think. He possessed no independent power base, and was himself totally dependent upon the person of the king. Thus his approaches to the distribution of patronage under Charles and James illustrated their preferences and character rather than the degree of influence which he was able to hold over them.

Disliking intensely the constant petitioning of suitors and perhaps also aware of the fact that he " had not the power to deny a suit...", instead resorting " to hysteria, trying to play upon the pity of those who urge him to generous actions, pretending to be a sick man, incapable of deciding anything...", James had managed to overcome the burdensome task of distributing patronage through adding another level to its distribution through channelling access through his favourites. <sup>2</sup> This not only

---

<sup>2</sup> Godfrey Goodman, The Court of King James I. pp. 37, 173-4, 197.; Mrs Thomas, The Life and Times of George Villiers. Duke of Buckingham. From Original Sources. (London, 1810). p. 134.; Robert Ashton, ed., James I. By his contemporaries. An account of his career and character as seen by some of his contemporaries. (London, 1969). p.



allowed James to avoid the constant petitioning of suitors which he so detested, but also brought him a number of political benefits; as retaining the ultimate decision over the distribution of patronage in his own hands whilst ensuring that his favourites were totally dependent upon him through advancing them " from a mean estate to overtop all men " enabled them to be "...interposed between him and the subject...", allowing him the luxury of being able to promote any particular policy which he favoured through the appointment of individuals favourable to its cause without himself becoming too closely associated with any one political or religious group, which as well as making the Crown unpopular amongst those who did not favour that course (who seeing the king's mind set might attempt to influence politics other than through the Court), could also make it difficult to change course later on. <sup>3</sup> There were also political problems in such a course, the most common of which being the resentment surrounding the person of the favourite which could arise out of the belief that he was usurping the authority of the Crown and was then using it in order to favour a particular party or policy over another. But as part of the normal political process, and therefore dependent upon James's overall objectives at that particular time, it tended to be made by different groups at different times throughout his reign, and with James himself at least firm in the knowledge that he was in control, it was far better that political discontent was felt to be the result of an aberration and focussed upon a favourite (like the Earl of Somerset) who could easily be removed than upon a king who could not. In encouraging people to look for solutions from within the Court rather than from outside it (such as in the successful attempts of Abbot, Pembroke and Winwood to replace the Earl of Somerset with Buckingham) this system appears to have served him fairly well. <sup>4</sup>

---

6. From Sir Roger --Wilbraham's comparison of Elizabeth and James, 1603.; M. Prestwich, Cranfield: Politics and Profits Under the Early Stuarts. (Oxford,1966). p. 385.

<sup>3</sup> Ashton, ed., James I. By his contemporaries. p. 15. From Sir Anthony Weldon's, " Character of King James I., 1659.; Ibid., p. 113-4. From F. Osborne, " Traditional Memoirs of the Reign of King James the First ".

<sup>4</sup> That James was using his favourites as a political tool is asserted by F.

However, whilst the basic success of the patronage system under James would indicate that the failure occurred under Charles, it still has not resolved the original problem, as its cause could still lie equally with either Buckingham or Charles. With Buckingham's influence over Charles (like that over James) usually being taken as an underlying assumption he would perhaps appear to be the more likely cause of this transformation, supposedly through being able to wield greater influence over the young and inexperienced Charles than he had over the ailing but nevertheless experienced James. Such an explanation, however, does not square easily with the basic unity which exists in the patronage and politics of Charles's reign both before and after the death of Buckingham; and when examined more closely it would appear that an over-estimation of Buckingham's influence at the expense of the character of the monarch has presented as much an obstacle to our understanding as to the true cause of why patronage failed to fulfil its role under Charles as it has in the original argument as to whether the cause lay with James or Charles. While it is commonly assumed that Buckingham held a similarly influential position in the distribution of patronage under Charles as he had with James, Charles, unlike his father, possessed firmly held convictions over the nature of royal authority as devolving to him alone. Unlike James he had resolved the problem of distributing patronage through taking it back into his own hands rather than channelling it through a favourite. As Prince

---

--Osborne, who writes that they were " daily interposed between him and the subject, multiplying the heat of oppressions in the general opinion, though in his own he thought they screened them from reflecting upon the Crown; and this " king-craft as Sir Anthony Weldon termed it is confirmed in his actions, allowing Somerset to be disgraced in 1615, informing the Lords in their investigation of the granting of patents in the 1621 parliament that if Buckingham " prove not himself a white crow, he shall be called a black crow ", and if it had not been for the strong support of the prince, it may well have been that after 1624 he would have gone the same way as Somerset.; Ibid., pp. 113-4. From Osborne, Traditional Memoirs of the Reign of King James the First.; Ibid. p. 122. From Weldon's Court and Character of King James.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 94, 185.; For the removal of Somerset see P. Seddon, ' Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset ', in Renaissance and Modern Studies. Vol. 14. (1970).

Charles grew in years and influence and as James's health deteriorated, Buckingham had to considerably alter his role in order to retain a position of influence at the centre of affairs, in effect turning from a favourite to an administrator, something which is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in relation to his replacement of Thomas Howard, Earl of Nottingham as Lord High Admiral of England in early 1619.

Being favoured to such an excessive degree by James Buckingham felt deeply indebted to him and was eager to find some means of demonstrating his gratitude and re-paying him. Given that all he held had in the first place been received from the king this could not be really obtained through financial means, so he instead looked to achieve it through his affection and service; as a consequence of which he became involved in moves led by Francis Bacon and Lionel Cranfield to reform Crown expenditure as a means of overcoming the long-term financial problems which the Crown had been facing since before the Reformation. It had initially been hoped that this problem could be tackled simply and effortlessly through securing a grant from parliament, but with the failure of the 1614 parliament this avenue was for the moment closed, it being in any case clear to an experienced politician like Bacon or a realist like Cranfield that unless expenditure was reduced claims for parliamentary support would fall upon deaf ears.<sup>5</sup> Although reform was first proposed in 1615, it took some time to gain the necessary momentum to see it implemented; but starting with the household in the autumn of 1617, a period of financial retrenchment was at last entered into through a reforming sub-committee of the Privy Council headed by Lionel Cranfield and strongly supported by Buckingham and Bacon.<sup>6</sup> Buckingham ensured the firm support of the king, and the sub-committee was able to overcome the vested interests upon which previous attempts at reform had foundered. When reform of the household was completed on 1 June 1618 by James's acceptance of the

---

<sup>5</sup> R.H. Tawney, Business and Politics under James I. Lionel Cranfield, as Merchant and Minister. (Cambridge, 1958). p. 142.

<sup>6</sup> Prestwich, Cranfield. pp. 205-6.; Tawney, Business and Politics. p. 154.

new household regulations drawn up by the investigating sub-committee, its attention turned to reform of the navy.<sup>7</sup>

The decision to go ahead with reform of the household had been made in October 1617, and being part of an on-going process rather than a one-off event it would appear likely that reform of the navy had already been earmarked as the next major project. The current lord admiral, Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham (whom James had inherited from his predecessor and continued in office) was not himself hopelessly corrupt, but the system and officers over which he presided were, principally as a consequence of his old age and mild nature.<sup>8</sup> James realised that any commission of enquiry was bound to discover evidence of corruption, and that Nottingham, from his entrenched position was likely to challenge its findings. However, it had never been his intention to deliberately discredit any of his officers, so given Nottingham's age and past service towards the end of 1617 he offered him the chance of retiring from office upon good financial terms without a slur upon his reputation. He appears already to have been considering appointing Buckingham in his place.<sup>9</sup> The line taken by the duke's accusers during his impeachment in 1626 and subsequently by historians has been that Buckingham eagerly pursued this position as a selfish means of increasing his prestige and influence over affairs. But this not only ignores the general beneficence of the king in granting office to those he favoured, but also any political agenda which he may have been working to. For removing Nottingham would greatly ease the work of the naval commission of enquiry through removing a potential obstacle in advance, whilst given the importance of the position of lord

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 159.; A.P. McGowan, ed., The Jacobean Commissions of Enquiry 1608 and 1618. (Navy Records Society, 1971). p. XVII.

<sup>8</sup> Goodman, Court of King James I. p. 53.; R.W. Kenny, 'Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham', in JMH. Vol. 39. 1967. pp. 231-2.

<sup>9</sup> Cooper, ed., Wentworth Papers. Camden Society. Fourth Series. Vol. 12. (London, 1973). p. 105. 8 November 1617. Sir Thomas Wentworth - Sir Henry Wotton.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 55. 15 November 1617. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 567. Lords' Journal. 8 June 1626. Buckingham's speech at his impeachment.

admiral it was crucial that he was replaced by someone upon whom the king could totally rely. Buckingham possessed no local power base and was dependent upon the favour of the king. If the office was not to go to a member of the royal family the duke was the most suitable candidate for what was an influential and important position. It is thus worth asking whether Buckingham was as eager to be appointed lord admiral as is usually held to be the case.

If Buckingham had been deliberately seeking to be appointed lord admiral in the place of Nottingham in 1617 he would have been expected to have immediately accepted James's offer, but he in fact at first appears to have rejected it and ruled himself out on account of his "younger years and want of experience...", for which he had reportedly "been privately created Marquis...".<sup>10</sup> Given the requirements of the office James did not have an alternative candidate to Buckingham, so Nottingham was still lord admiral when in June 1618 the sub-committee of the Privy Council which had investigated the household, joined by Sir Thomas Smythe, the Chairman of the East India Company, and three expert naval witnesses, Sir John Coke, William Burrell and Thomas Norrey, became the 1618 naval commission of enquiry.<sup>11</sup> Throughout the summer and early autumn of 1618 the commissioners investigated both the accounts and the state of the navy, and on the 29 September 1618 presented their report to the king in Council, in which it was reported that the "most horrible abuses are discovered...".<sup>12</sup> Whilst not blaming him directly, this report was deeply embarrassing to Nottingham, who realising that he had "grown much in years and finding that he was not then so able to perform that which appertained to his place as

---

<sup>10</sup> PRO. SP14/95/8. 7  
January 1618. Sir Edward Harwood - Sir Dudley Carleton.;  
Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 567. 8 June 1626.  
Buckingham's speech at his impeachment.; McGowan, ed.,  
Commissions of Enquiry. p. XVIII.

<sup>11</sup> Prestwich, Cranfield.  
p. 212.; Tawney, Business and Politics. pp. 159-60.;  
McGowan, ed., Commissions of Enquiry. pp. XVII-XVIII.;  
Young, Servility and Service. (London, 1986). p. 43.

<sup>12</sup> Prestwich, Cranfield. p.  
214.; PRO. SP14/103/1. 1 October 1618. Thomas Murray -  
Sir Dudley Carleton.; PRO. SP14/103/14. 3 October 1618.  
London. Sir Edward Harwood - Sir Dudley Carleton.;  
McGowan, ed., Commissions of Enquiry. p. XXV.

in former times he had done to his great honour, and fearing lest his Majesty's service and the commonwealth might suffer by this defect, became a humble and earnest petitioner...to admit him to surrender his office ", and in some of them even nominated Buckingham to be his successor, significantly " without the duke's privity or forethought of it...".<sup>13</sup> This, of course, had been James's own intention back in 1617, but as then Buckingham still appears to have been reluctant to take up such an important position because of his lack of experience, and as a means of getting him to accept it James appears to have been proposing a compromise arrangement by which the duties of the admiralty would be shared between Buckingham and Nottingham, Buckingham undertaking most of the duties whilst Nottingham was retained as an adviser.<sup>14</sup> However, having already demonstrated his desire to completely resign from office the year before Nottingham had no great interest in such an arrangement which reduced the honour of his current position whilst itself bringing no corresponding advantages, and this left James with a major problem to resolve; for whilst he ideally wished Buckingham to take the place for himself he was unwilling to do so, and James did not wish to force it on him. Later on that same month, though, an alternative arrangement appears to have been formulated by which Nottingham would completely resign his office to him in return for " a good round sum of money, and [a] 3,000l. yearly pension during his life, and after his decease 1,000l. pension to his lady and 500l. to his eldest son by her, which must be doubled to him when she is gone...", whilst Buckingham was to be assisted not by Nottingham but by members of the Commission of Enquiry, who under Cranfield were to be given a permanent basis

---

13

Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 567. 8 June 1626. Lords' Journal. Buckingham's speech at his impeachment.

14

PRO. SP14/103/1. 1 October 1618. Thomas Murray - Sir Dudley Carleton.; PRO. SP14/103/14. 3 October 1618. London. Sir Edward Harwood - Sir Dudley Carleton.; PRO. SP14/103/39. 16 October 1618. Sir Henry Carey - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. pp. 91-2. 5 October 1618. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Ibid., p. 111. 20 December 1618. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. P. 173. 24 October 1618. London. same - same.

as a board responsible for the administration of a navy.<sup>15</sup> This arrangement was clearly acceptable to Nottingham, who after all had been looking to resign his office since 1617, but contrary to the usual perception of things appears to have been much less palatable to Buckingham; for whilst he had been willing to accept the offer of holding it jointly with Lord Admiral Nottingham, he was still uncertain as to whether he could manage it alone, and again appears to have been on the point of declining it. However, the arguments of Sir Robert Mansell (a former Treasurer of the Navy) that " the best service which could be done for the present was to repair the navy and ships...and to retrench the king's charge and to employ it effectually; and that, before there was personal use of service otherwise, the duke, being young and active, might gain experience and make himself as fit as any other..." appears to have convinced James that Buckingham " was the fittest man at that time and as the state of the navy then stood " to be appointed lord admiral. Mansell was determined to get his own way, and finally " persuaded the duke to take the charge...", being appointed sole admiral on 28 January 1619, shortly before the commission of enquiry which was to assist him was placed on a permanent basis.<sup>16</sup>

So rather than constantly pressing for and ultimately purchasing an office whose duties he was ill-qualified to undertake as asserted by some during his impeachment in 1626, in reality Buckingham appears to have been well aware of his own inadequacies and to have had the office of lord admiral thrust upon him very much against his will; and whilst Nottingham did receive some form of payment, it was not given by Buckingham but by James in " recompence of the long and faithful service of the said

---

<sup>15</sup>

Ibid., p. 173. 24 October 1618. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. pp. 133-4. 9 February 1619. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Tawney, Business and Politics. p. 162.; Prestwich, Cranfield. p. 216.

<sup>16</sup>

Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 567. 8 June 1626. Lords' Journal. Speech of Buckingham at his impeachment.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 210. 6 February 1619. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. pp. 133-4. 9 February 1619. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.

Earl and for an honourable memory of his just deserts to him and the Crown of England...which in all ages has been the royal way of princes wherewith to reward ancient and well-deserving servants in their elder years when, without their own faults, they are become less serviceable to the state...".<sup>17</sup> This contrasts markedly with the usual perception of Buckingham as an avid office-seeker able to manipulate James at will, but its anomalous nature appears to have been a consequence of the consistent mis-interpretation of Buckingham's true position at Court rather than because such events were actually rare. For whilst James clearly enjoyed the company of Buckingham, as demonstrated in his relationship with Somerset this did not necessarily override all other considerations, with the exaggerated contemporary perceptions of the extent of Buckingham's influence appearing (as with Somerset and the Howards before him) to have been a deliberate consequence of James's decision to use them as political shields through taking advantage of the constitutional assumption that the monarch could do no wrong. However, whilst this explains how James was able to appoint Buckingham against his will when he was himself held to be so powerful it does not shed any further light upon the reasoning behind it, something which requires examining separately.

James had doubtless been impressed by Mansell's arguments, as Buckingham maintained during his impeachment, and been reassured by his close dependence upon the Crown. Had Buckingham's reluctance to be appointed lord admiral not been so persistent these arguments may have held good, but James had clearly decided upon Buckingham before Mansell had ever become involved, and as Buckingham well knew this was not only a reward or sign of affection but was also a complete change in direction from being a courtier to an administrator; for unlike the patent which had been granted to Nottingham, Buckingham's made him " responsible for the management of the fleet " during peace-time " as well as for its command in time of war...", meaning that even with the assistance of the commissioners it was still going to be a full and not a part-time job.<sup>18</sup> At one level James's decision to encourage

---

<sup>17</sup>

Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 567. 8 June 1626. Lords' Journal. Speech of Buckingham at his impeachment.

<sup>18</sup>

Neither did Buckingham



Buckingham to become involved in administrative affairs may have represented nothing more than his normal habit of using a favourite as a political tool being applied to different policies, but it also appears likely that he already had one eye upon the future regarding relations between Prince Charles and Buckingham. Before it had been cut short by the death of Prince Henry, bad feelings between him and James's previous favourite Robert, Earl of Somerset, had threatened to become a serious political problem which split the Court rather than provide an alternative outlet for those of differing views. <sup>19</sup> Early relations between Charles and Buckingham appear to have been similarly strained, and given the earlier example of Henry and James's age difference the importance of there being good relations between them cannot have been lost upon him. <sup>20</sup> Later in life Charles was to demonstrate a determined resolution that those about him who were not his friends or relations (such as Wentworth) should receive rewards (as opposed to office) in return for service, and it may be that as prince he had already exhibited a degree of concern over the anomalous position of Buckingham (who was receiving great favour for no obvious return), and that it was this which lay behind James's determination to expand Buckingham's role and see him replace Nottingham as lord admiral. This however,

---

have the same security as Nottingham, as his patent was only during pleasure rather than for life. --G.F. James and J.J. Sutherland Shaw, ' Admiralty Administration and Personnel, 1619-1714 ', in BIHR. Vol. 14. 1936-7. pp. 11, 172.

<sup>19</sup> Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. pp. 55-7.; Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 194-5.

<sup>20</sup> Charles, for example, had turned a water spout on Buckingham and stolen a ring which James had given him, and Bishop Williams had written to Buckingham in July 1623 warning him " to observe his highness with all lowliness, humility and dutiful obedience...", whilst Bishop Goodman reports " affronts which Buckingham " is said to have " Prince Charles, bidding the prince, &c. &c., and then offering to strike the prince...". CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 354. 14 March 1616. London. Edward Sherburn - Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 370. 31 May 1616. London. Same - Same.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 121. 15 July 1623. Westminster College. Lord Keeper Williams - Duke of Buckingham.; Goodman, Court of King James I. p. 388.

would not appear to have been the only factor, for with Charles (largely due to the influence of his brother, Henry) already possessing a keen interest in the navy and a reversion of the admiral's office he was unlikely to have ignored either the progress of the commission of enquiry or the attempts to replace Nottingham, and with it being impossible for anyone else to be appointed admiral whilst he still held the reversion, the decision to appoint Buckingham to this position rather than any other administrative office would appear to have been a deliberate one.<sup>21</sup>

When Charles had been granted the reversion of the lord admiral's position in 1612 Prince Henry had still been alive and was expected by all to become king, and as with Prince James later on in 1638 this appointment had been intended to provide a younger son with an official role at Court. But now being heir to the throne after the death of Henry, he neither needed nor would be able to provide the necessary time and effort to adequately perform the duties of this important office; and through proposing the appointment of Buckingham in his place James appears to have taken advantage of this, Charles's general interest in the navy and his belief that Buckingham should be given some useful role as a means of improving relations between them, something which would appear to be indicated in that Charles had been "graciously pleased to grant his interest in the admiralty to the Marquess of Buckingham" even before the retirement of Nottingham, when it was still proposed that they should hold the position jointly, this indicating the influence which Charles was already wielding (perhaps unconsciously) in turning Buckingham from a favourite to an administrator.<sup>22</sup> That this was indeed the case appears likely because of

---

<sup>21</sup> James had granted Charles the reversion of the lord admiral's position in January 1612 as a means of preventing the pretensions of Prince Henry in this direction. CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 111. Grant to Charles, Duke of York, in reversion after the present lord admiral, of the office of Lord High Admiral for life, with exception of pirates' goods, as the king would not have the conscience of the duke burdened with things of so litigious a nature.; For Charles's lifelong personal interest in the navy see B.W. Quintrell, 'Charles I. and his navy', in The Seventeenth Century. 1988.

<sup>22</sup> PRO. SP14/103/39. 16 October 1618. Sir Henry Carey - Sir Dudley Carleton.

Buckingham's initial reluctance to take on such a position, but the same conclusion is also confirmed by a number of other circumstances. As coming after a period of administrative reform, and with the terms of his patent for the first time mentioning peace-time administrative duties as well operational ones, and only being during pleasure whereas previous grants had been for life, it is clear that this appointment was not a sinecure but a position which even with the aid of the commissioners would involve a great deal of time and effort; and whilst continuing his interest in the wider aspects of naval policy, Prince Charles can be seen to have become increasingly reliant upon Buckingham in administrative matters. This is clearly demonstrated in the preparations for the first operation under the direction of the new lord admiral and commissioners, being that led by Sir Robert Mansell to Algiers in 1620.<sup>23</sup> On the surface this was to be a joint action in conjunction with the Spanish against the Algerine pirates, but an additional and perhaps the real reason for English involvement appears to have been fears over what the Spanish fleet then in preparation was really intended for.<sup>24</sup> This fear was evidently shared by Prince Charles, who now clearly involved in the wider aspects of naval policy promised that " if it once appeared he [the King of Spain], de facto, addressed his face against the State of Venice, or any other Christian state or prince, he knew how nearly it would concern both his Majesty and all other Christian princes to oppose his proceedings, and promised, for his own particular, all possible furtherance, both by way of mediation to the king and otherwise...".<sup>25</sup> These were sentiments which he clearly managed to press home, for a week later despite " a declaration from Mr Cottington [the agent in Spain], in the King of Spain's name, that these preparations of his have no manner of reference to our quarters, with protestation only for Algiers. His majesty, I hear, applauding that design of his, replies, that he will put his navy in a

---

<sup>23</sup> D.B. Quinn and A.N. Ryan, England's Sea Empire. (London,1983). pp. 225-6.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., pp. 225-6.; J.S. Corbett, England in the Mediterranean, 1603-1713. (London,1917). p. 100.

<sup>25</sup> Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. pp. 133-4. 9 February 1619. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.

readiness, likewise to assist and second so brave an enterprise..." as a means of ensuring that this was the case. <sup>26</sup> From this it would appear that Charles was to some extent involved in the decision to send English ships to Algiers; but Buckingham's role, on the other hand, appears to have been restricted to more mundane matters, over the next year playing an active role in seeing the plans of Charles and James put into execution, within a few days going to Chatham &c., to view the navy, and to give order accordingly...". <sup>27</sup>

In providing a means by which Buckingham could make himself useful to Charles in this way James's appointment of him as lord admiral was (probably deliberately) serving to bind together a favourite who had few real allies at Court and a son who possessed firmly held notions over the role of servants and a love of the navy, but its effects appear to have been accelerated and made enduring by a number of incidental factors later on that same year, the first of which being the death of Queen Anne. <sup>28</sup> Since childhood Charles had always been close to his mother, who appears to have exercised a degree of influence over appointments in his household, and under the protection of whose Court he appears to have made most of his early political actions. <sup>29</sup> Anne's death deprived Charles of an intermediary while he was still uncertain of his

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 137. 16 February 1619. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., Vol. I. pp. 133-4. 9 February 1619. Thomas Larkin - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Ibid., p. 137. 16 February 1619. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 183. 31 July 1619. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 76-77.

<sup>28</sup> Queen Anne had died on Tuesday 2 March 1619.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 144. 6 March 1619. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>29</sup> Bishop Goodman reports that "the queen ever did love Charles better than Prince Henry...". Having used Henry's position in her own interest, it also seems likely that Anne was using Charles's lack of confidence as a means of strengthening herself against the king and favourite. In conjunction with him, for example, opposing the appointment of Sir Arthur Ingram as Cofferer of the Household and

ability to face up to his father on his own. James himself was in 1619 also close to death.<sup>30</sup> Together, these circumstances must surely have drawn Charles closer to the next nearest thing which he had to family, which to James if not at first to him, was Buckingham. Similar factors appear to have been working on Buckingham; for where he had previously seen little need to cultivate the good opinion of a prince who moved in a different social and political circle, James's illness had brought into sharp focus his lack of wider support and the need to secure a long-term alternative. For different reasons, then, in trying to find their way at Court both Charles and Buckingham found themselves in very similar positions in 1619, which because of his recent appointment as lord admiral and the prince's love of the navy Buckingham was able to turn to his advantage in the long-term through transforming himself from a favourite to an administrator as a means of continuing in favour under two kings. Contrary to perception, though, this metamorphosis was neither immediate nor easy to achieve. With the constant access which Buckingham enjoyed with James as favourite also allowing him to act as an agent or messenger for Charles, providing that he was able to remain neutral these two roles were not contradictory. However, with the expulsion of Charles's sister and her family first from the Bohemian Crown and then their ancestral lands in the Palatinate, Buckingham was forced to play a more dangerous game; for where Charles favoured military intervention on their behalf, (an opinion which was shared by Buckingham, who had never really

---

supporting Sir Edward Coke. This adds a new element to the improvement in relations between Charles, James and Buckingham in the light of her death.; Goodman, -Court of King James I. p. 251.; Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 16.; CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 373. 14 June 1616. Strand. George Garrard - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 276. 2 March 1615. London. John Chamberlain - Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 404. 5 November 1616. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 376. June 1616. Sir Edward Coke - Queen Anne.; Ibid., p. 413. 14 December 1616. London. Edward Sherburn - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>30</sup>

During March James became so ill that he prepared " to settle things as if he were to leave all...". Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. pp. 244-5. 27 March 1619. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 227. 10 April 1619. London. Same - Same.

abandoned his keenly Protestant roots) James himself favoured diplomacy. Had Charles persisted in pursuing this course Buckingham would have been forced to choose between the two, but fortunately for him Charles was brought round to support a plan by which the restitution of the Palatine family was included as one of the terms of the ongoing negotiations for a marriage between Charles and the Spanish Infanta. In re-establishing unity within the royal family this plan bought Buckingham some time, but with Charles's support of James's plan being based upon the assumption that it would lead to results it had merely delayed the effects rather than caused the underlying problem, and by 1623 with negotiations going nowhere Charles was beginning to lose patience. Luckily for Buckingham, though, Charles was still reluctant to deliberately oppose the wishes of his father, and had therefore decided to settle the matter once and for all within the scope of James's own policy through going to Spain in person, it coming as no surprise given his new dual role that he left it to Buckingham to smooth things with his father.<sup>31</sup> Holding such a prominent position and being perceived as the originator of this as well as the whole pro-Spanish policy, Buckingham (like the Howards before him) by now possessed many enemies at Court who wished to see him removed as a pre-cursor to a change in policy. He had also moved his allegiance sufficiently from James to Charles, for James by 1622-3 to show signs of resenting "this great inward friendship between the prince and duke...".<sup>32</sup> James was becoming disenchanted with Buckingham as with Somerset before him and was considering promoting Arthur Brett (who had been appointed a Groom of James's Bedchamber) as an alternative favourite.<sup>33</sup> Having to leave Court in such circumstances was clearly a great risk for Buckingham. His aims however were compatible with those of both Charles and James, and his dual role was a great deal more preferable than having to face a divergence between them. Being continually in each other's company and away from James, this journey to Spain

---

<sup>31</sup> Goodman writes "For the good Duke of Buckingham, I do easily believe he did but second the prince, and only observe him...". Goodman, Court of King James. I. p. 364.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 388.

<sup>33</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 121-2.

appears to have deepened the understanding which already existed between them before they left; and already sharing similar political ideas in relation to the Palatine problem, and being subject to the same conditions and frustrations in Spain, very soon after their arrival back in England (if not before) they seem to have decided upon a joint plan of action aimed at securing war against Spain. However, like James's original plan to contain the prince, that of Charles to accommodate the views of James had merely delayed the onset of a conflict between them rather than removed it; and with Charles now having the confidence to actively support war against Spain, and James reluctant to abandon a diplomatic solution, this was a particularly difficult period for Buckingham. His continuing relationship with James allowed him to play an important role in conjunction with Charles in persuading him to call parliament and break off relations with Spain. But the abandonment of Buckingham's earlier neutrality in favour of the policies of the prince, produced a definite cooling between them. The Spanish even accused the duke of intending to " shut him [James] away in one of his country houses, and take over the direction of government in person..."; and had it not been for the protection which he received as a consequence of the administrative role which he enjoyed after throwing himself into the hands of the prince there was a real risk that James would have sought a replacement.<sup>34</sup>

However, whilst the balance between them had been shifting considerably in recent years, the fact that neither Charles nor Buckingham could ever take James's wishes for granted ensured that Buckingham remained in a real sense both a favourite and administrator; but with these restrictions finally being removed by the death of James in March 1625, his transformation was able to be carried one stage further. As with Charles having held a clear picture of what he wanted to achieve for some time, and with Buckingham being the one person who was sufficiently trusted by him to be acquainted with them and to receive his delegated authority in order to implement them, he was not only continued in the important office of lord admiral, but with Charles no longer having to account for the preferences of his father and not being as personally dependent upon him as James, was also encouraged to abandon his previous role as a Court-based favourite, a clear indication of this change in emphasis

---

<sup>34</sup>

*Ibid.*, pp. 192.

being given almost immediately in Charles's announcement of his desire that Buckingham should surrender his position as Master of the Horse, an office which carried particular significance in that it was the first major Court office to which he had been appointed by James.<sup>35</sup>

With the duties of the Master of the Horse involving constant attendance upon the monarch wherever he or she happened to be this had been the ideal appointment for Buckingham, whose influence and power always lay with the obvious delight which the king took in his company; so although with his position apparently secure there had been various rumours towards the end of 1617 that he was about to yield it, the Earl of Pembroke, the Marquess of Hamilton, Sir John Villiers (Buckingham's brother) and Viscount Doncaster all being named as possible replacements, he was still in possession of it at the time of James's death.<sup>36</sup> That Buckingham was also eventually continued in this position under Charles has led to the impression that his role with him had the same basis of personal favour as it under had James, but this is to mis-read his relationship with Charles and underestimate the very real problems which he was facing at this time in embracing a new role without sacrificing the appearance of influence which had come with the old one. Charles's initial preference for retaining his Master of the Horse whilst prince might suggest that Buckingham's re-appointment was no foregone conclusion. Moreover, the Mastership of the Horse, which had formed the basis of his role under James, was now in danger of going to an enemy of his. Although Charles subsequently allowed him to retain this office, it was not a sign of personal favour or of Buckingham's power or influence over him, but a

---

<sup>35</sup> Buckingham had held this position since replacing the Earl of Worcester in January 1616. Worcester, who had held this office under Elizabeth, was compensated by his appointment as Lord Privy Seal and a pension of £1,500 a year.; *Ibid.*, p. 25. Buckingham was appointed on the 4 January 1616.

<sup>36</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 158. 8 March 1617. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; *Ibid.*, p. 241. 31 May 1619. Same - Same.; *Ibid.*, p. 249. 26 June 1619. London. Same - Same.; *Ibid.*, p. 281. 8 January 1620. London. Same - Same.; Cooper, ed., Wentworth Papers. p. 105. 8 November 1617. Sir Thomas Wentworth - Marquess of Hamilton, at Venice.



necessary political preferment, influenced by Charles's decision to wage war against Spain. As Buckingham had already proved his usefulness as an administrator under James, his retention of office was intended to ensure that the re-distribution of offices under Charles should not provide any evidence of Buckingham losing favour or influence. Charles thus avoided supplying embarrassing evidence to support rumours that James had been ruled by his favourite, which more importantly might also undermine Buckingham's ability to implement his policies as lord admiral. Any indication that former royal ministers were no longer to be protected might have provoked other attacks and dissuaded officers from speaking up in the interest of the Crown. Prince Henry had held a particular interest in equestrian affairs, and probably had a hand in the appointment of Patrick Ramsey as Charles's Master of Horse.<sup>37</sup> However, when his household was re-settled in April 1613 after Henry's death, Ramsey had been dismissed and Charles assigned a new Master of the Horse whose own stature reflected Charles's new importance as heir to the throne, Thomas Howard, Viscount Andover, the second son of James's lord treasurer, Thomas, Earl of Suffolk.<sup>38</sup> Suffolk had been removed from office in July 1618 as a consequence of the reform programme led by Buckingham in 1619 found guilty of corruption in Star Chamber and fined £30,000 and imprisoned in the Tower.<sup>39</sup> With this reform programme having removed most of the Howard family and their dependents from office Buckingham was the undisputed and acknowledged power at Court, but with Charles as ever secretive and Buckingham's links with him as yet still tenuous this led

---

<sup>37</sup> Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. pp. 64-5.; PRO. LC2/4/6. 1612. Mr Patrick Ramsey, Master of the Horse to Prince Charles.

<sup>38</sup> PRO. SP14/72/108. Undated. April 1613. The names of such as be of the Prince's family. Patrick Ramsey, late Master of the Horse.; BL. Additional 15630. f. 65v. A table to the book of several letters patents, annuities, pensions, commissions &c under the Great Seal of Prince Charles. 11 March 1616. Master of the Horse, Thomas Howard.

<sup>39</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 37, 64.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 251. 15 July 1619. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 277. 4 December 1619. London. Same - Same.

him to overstretch himself; for whilst he had negotiated (perhaps at the intercession of James) that " the Earl of Suffolk and his wife should be removed from the Tower and £10,000 of their fine remitted ", this deal had a sting in the tail for their sons in that " the Lord Walden should resign the Captainship of the Pensioners to Marquess Hamilton, and Sir Thomas Howard his place about the prince " as Master of the Horse, both of which places Buckingham and James undoubtedly had an interest in distributing; and when they did not immediately comply Buckingham attempted a more direct demonstration of his power, for on Christmas day " night Sir Thomas Howard pressing near the king at supper, it was thought somewhat audacious, and the prince had commandment to discharge him his service...".<sup>40</sup> Due to the earlier deal which he thought had been struck this parading of Andover at Court was a direct affront to Buckingham's influence and prestige, but what had enabled him to secure this order for his dismissal was not his own direct power but his ability to play upon the king's anger that their father's earlier refusal to accept his guilt had forced James to an embarrassing trial, and that the actions of his sons in the light of his release from the Tower were demonstrating a similar lack of contrition.<sup>41</sup> However, Prince Charles resented Buckingham's interference with his servant as much as he did parliament's later on in 1626. As Andover was a firm friend of his who at the end of the day had himself done nothing wrong, he was determined to protect him. He must also have won James over, for Andover retained his position under the prince and was one of those servants who Charles specifically requested to attend him whilst in Spain in 1623.<sup>42</sup> In direct contrast to the usual perception of Charles as

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 278. 1 January 1620. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 202. 16 January 1619. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 206. 30 January 1619. London. Same - Same.

<sup>42</sup> Charles also appears to have protected Robert Carr (the keeper of his privy purse and a gentleman of his bedchamber) after getting into a duel for words spoken against the duke.; APC, 1621-1623. p. 472. 26 February 1623. A pass for the Lord Viscount Andover, master of the horse to the prince...; Ibid., p. 432. 4th March 1623. A pass for Sir Robert Carr, kt., one of the gentlemen of the bedchamber to the prince his highness...; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p.

Buckingham's puppet, he was here clearly putting his servant's welfare before any consideration of his own. This was to have an important bearing upon the allocation of the office of Master of the Horse after James's death, where the prince's master and the late king's were in direct competition. The resulting accommodation provides an interesting insight into the relationship between Charles and Buckingham.

The earlier differences between Buckingham and Andover were evidently as keenly felt in 1625 as they had been before, for immediately after James's death the Venetian Ambassador reported that a dispute had " broke[en] out between the duke and Viscount Andover about the office of Master of the Horse ".<sup>43</sup> But with Charles's relations with Buckingham having improved in recent years and with both of them now being his servants Charles's own position in this was a good deal more ambiguous; for whilst in preparing for a war he had no wish to undermine the reputation of his lord admiral through forcing him to surrender an important office, and had therefore " declared that he would not take from the duke anything granted by his father ", " as a great favourite, and owing to his beautiful wife, who his Majesty admires ", Charles " was [also] thought to have encouraged " Andover to press for the post, telling Buckingham " that if he would he might hold all his places, but if he did part with some of them he would think the better of him, whereupon it is thought the duke will of himself resign up his office of Master of the Horse, because he knoweth the king doth so much desire it...".<sup>44</sup> Had Buckingham possessed that degree of influence over Charles to which he is often attributed then he should have been able to make a decision there and then, but given the essential weakness of his

---

483. 8 March 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley --Carleton.; Ibid., p. 288. 12 February 1620. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 483. 8 March 1623. London. Same - Same.

<sup>43</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 21. 15 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>44</sup> With the Mastership of the Horse theoretically entailing constant attendance upon the king it is particularly significant that Charles should have preferred Andover over Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 19. 15 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.

position it had placed him in something of a dilemma as to the best means of maintaining his wider political influence. For whilst he realised that the loss of face involved in yielding this office to Andover would make it political suicide, at the same time he was also uncertain of the true strength of his relationship with Charles, and therefore of the wisdom of ignoring his wishes, this being reflected in the various rumours prevalent around the Court during 1625 as to how this situation was to be resolved; for whilst on 6 May John Chamberlain assured Sir Dudley Carleton that " the Lord Andover is to have 20,000l. in lieu of his Mastership of the Horse, besides being made an earl and a Privy Councillor as the voice goes ", he was informed by Thomas Locke ten days later that Andover had been made a Knight of the Garter, and " will be Master of the Horse ".<sup>45</sup> With Buckingham still undecided, by August 1625 there was still " as yet no master of the horse sworn, nor any officer of the stable inferior to him "; but with there having been a number of complaints about his actions as admiral in the 1625 parliament, and with the expedition to Cadiz having limped back to various English and Irish ports during the second week of December 1625, Buckingham appears to have had a suspicion or been warned that he would be a principal target in the meeting planned for the new year, and realising that to successfully combat them he would need all the support that he could get, he was finally forced to take the calculated risk of accepting the position of Master of the Horse, which would be taken as a clear sign of royal favour.<sup>46</sup> Buckingham was sworn in as Master of the Horse in February 1626, and confirming that Charles had still been hoping to appoint Andover, it was no coincidence that later that same month he was compensated through being created Earl of Berkshire and was later that year paid the first installment a £20,000 pay-off.<sup>47</sup> Unaware of the circumstances

---

<sup>45</sup> CSPD, Addenda, 1625-1649. p. 14. 16 May 1625. Thomas Locke - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>46</sup> In the interim Buckingham appears to have been acting master of the horse. HMC, Twelfth Report. (1888). Appendix IV. p. 473. 7 August 1625.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 281-285.; HMC, Fourth Report. Pt. I. p. 289. 27 February 1626. Thomas Catchmay - Earl of Middlesex.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 289. 27 February 1626. Thomas Catchmay - Earl of Middlesex.; PRO.S03/8. 4

which lay behind it, this appointment has led some commentators to declare that (with others created at the same time) they were "so many cardinals to carry the consistory, if there be occasion" in parliament.<sup>48</sup> Such statements, though, greatly oversimplify the situation, as whilst it is true that Buckingham had procured the creation of Viscount Andover as Earl of Berkshire at the Signet office, this had merely been an errand on behalf of the king as part of the agreement which he had formed with Andover back in May before he could have known of the opposition in the 1625 parliament, and which owing nothing to Buckingham, must rather have been something more akin to a punishment.<sup>49</sup> Lockyer describes Andover as "Buckingham's friend", but may be confusing him with his elder brother Theophilus Howard, Lord Walden (who became Earl of Suffolk after the death of his father on 28 May 1626), as Joseph Mead wrote to Sir Martin Stuteville on 26 May 1626 that "some say my Lord of Suffolk having given his proxy to my Lord of Walden his eldest son and now finding him ducal hath revoked it, and given it to the Earl of Berkshire his younger son, being the duke's professed opposite...".<sup>50</sup>

---

February 1626. Creation of Thomas Viscount Andover, conferring upon him, and his heirs male, the honour and dignity of Earl of Berkshire. Subscribed attorney general. Procured Buckingham. By immediate warrant.; --CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 366. 2 July 1626. Warrant to pay the Earl of Berkshire 5,000l., part of 20,000l., the king's gift for long services rendered to him whilst prince.; HMC, Twelfth Report. Appendix IV. p. 476. Undated. February 1626. Henry Manners - Sir George Manners.

<sup>48</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 304.

<sup>49</sup> PRO. SO3/8. 4 February 1626.

Creation of Thomas Viscount Andover, conferring upon him...the honour and dignity of Earl of Berkshire. Subscribed attorney general. Procured Buckingham.

<sup>50</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 304.;

BL. Harleian 390. f. 65v. Friday 26 May 1626. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; The political nature of Buckingham's acceptance of this position can be seen in that soon after the dissolution of the 1626 parliament there were renewed rumours that "the duke parts with two of his places, whereof one being Warden of the Cinque Ports is conferred upon the Earl of Bridgwater, the other being Master of the Horse upon the Earl of Salisbury...". Rushworth, Historical Collections. Vol.

Although in the end never implemented due to wider political considerations, it is nevertheless clear from Charles's intentions over the Mastership of the Horse that he was determined to emphasise the duke's subordination and dependence by transforming him from a favourite attendant upon his own person overseeing the distribution of patronage into an administrator. Buckingham's expanded involvement in such affairs is usually taken as sign of his increased influence under a young and inexperienced king, but in being adopted merely as a means of holding on to power it was in fact a sign of weakness, with its detrimental effects upon his position at Court even being noticed by a number of contemporaries. Lord Keeper Williams, for example, unaware of the reasoning behind Buckingham's acceptance of the position of admiral, was in 1624 trying to persuade him to resign it in favour of the position of lord steward (which had then recently become vacant by the death of the Duke of Richmond and Lennox), arguing in the light of his previous role as king's favourite that " the lord steward serves only the king's household...".<sup>51</sup> Had Buckingham still been safely dependent upon James this would have been an intelligent move, but by this point in time he was already to some extent estranged from him and dependent upon the administrative role which he had established under the prince, and this was even more the case after the death of James than it had been before. As John Hacket rightly lamented on Buckingham's behalf, " but for the name of lord admiral he had never withdrawn himself from Court..." to be involved with administrative affairs which would cause him nothing but criticism or envy; but he got it wrong when he attributed it to a lack of counsel, for with his position now depending entirely upon Charles he had little choice - he either had to adapt to this new role to which he had been assigned, or retire from office and accept a lesser role.<sup>52</sup> Owing everything he possessed to the favour of the Crown and being a man of great pride, Buckingham had no intention of accepting a lesser role or disappearing from the political scene, and under Charles therefore continued to exert the same degree of energy to the

---

I. p. 357.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1430. 2 August 1626.  
London. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>51</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p.  
16.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 16.

administrative role to which he had been assigned by him as he had the personal role which had held under James. For during the opening years of Charles's reign, in addition to his duties in parliament obtaining the funds necessary to finance his war policy Buckingham had also undertaken extraordinary embassies to France and Holland, willingly submitted to the king's peremptory order to assist the Earl of Warwick in shoring up the defences at Harwich, and managed " to attend nearly half the 400 or so routine meetings of the Caroline Privy Council to July 1628 ".<sup>53</sup> All of which was in addition to the administrative and military obligations which he held as lord admiral, in which he concerned himself not only with a broad overview of the preparations for the various fleets which were being sent out, but also in the lesser details, in July 1626, for example, even sending out orders to the commissioners at Portsmouth instructing them to " view, survey and search all provisions of beer, beverage, biscuit, beef and peas, pork, butter, cheese [&] oil...".<sup>54</sup> Neither is it possible to doubt Buckingham's personal conduct or motives in any of this, as he not only expended a great deal of his own money in them and held a genuine interest in the welfare of his sailors, having personally secured them an increase in wages and taken a number of measures to provide medical support, but when he himself went in person on the expedition to the Isle de Rhe in 1627 appears to have fought bravely and to have been genuine in his wish to succeed, all indicating the great personal interest which he had in making a success of this role now that with James dead his position at Court was entirely dependent upon it.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Buckingham had escorted Henrietta Maria back from France in 1625, was sent the Hague in November to sign an offensive and defensive alliance against Spain, and (if they had not subsequently refused him entry) was to have returned to France again. Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 236-242, 277-281.; B.W. Quintrell, Charles I. 1625-1640. (London, 1993). p. 45.; BL. Harleian 6988. f. 7. I. Charles - Duke of Buckingham. c.14 October 1625.

<sup>54</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 197, 340, 419-20.

<sup>55</sup> Since Charles's accession Buckingham had engaged his personal credit with such financiers as Philip Burlamachi and Sir Paul Bayning to borrow nearly £70,000, all of which had been expended on

Unfortunately, though, with the views of most contemporaries having been formed along political perceptions which had been established by Buckingham's position under James, and with most historians following them (therefore having a pre-conceived idea of Buckingham's power), this new position has been consistently overlooked and his relationship with Charles viewed back to front. There are, however, a number of examples which do help to prove that it was indeed Charles and not Buckingham who was in control. In October 1625, for example, hearing of dissatisfaction from Essex at the lack of Court interest in its preparations against a possible invasion of the Essex coast by raiders of the Spanish Netherlands - rumoured in August - Charles had had no hesitation in bluntly informing him that "...such is the necessity of this occasion, that you must needs with all speed make your repair to Harwich where your stay will not be longer than two or three days to give some countenance to my Lord of Warwick's endeavours...", revealingly adding "...afterwards I give you leave to make your return to Kate without coming to give me an account...".<sup>56</sup> Whilst Charles's own conviction that Buckingham was his servant and not his master can be seen in the anger which he demonstrated when anybody suggested otherwise, such as in the 1626 parliament, where when after having assured them on 15 of March that Buckingham had "not meddled or done anything concerning the public or commonwealth but by special directions and appointment, and as my servant..." they had continued drafting accusations against him, he had declared through Lord Coventry that he could not "believe that the aim

---

the navy. Even S.R. Gardiner has to concede that whilst "nothing can be asserted positively...there is every reason to believe that the real accounts, if they were ever to be recovered, would tell more in Buckingham's favour than against him...".; -Rymer, *Foedera*. Vol. VIII. Pt. III. p. 43. 18 May 1629. Westminster. De warranto speciali Richardo Weston domino Treasario and allis pro solutione diversarum pecuniae summarum debitarum Duci Bucks.; Lockyer, *Buckingham*. pp. 193, 211-2, 298, 340-1, 374, 382, 402-3, 404, 446-7.

<sup>56</sup> BL. Harleian 6988. f. 7. c.14  
October 1625. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.



is at the Duke of Buckingham, but findeth that these proceedings do directly wound the honour and judgement of himself...".<sup>57</sup> Whilst the same underlying assumption can be seen in Sir John Eliot's comparison of Buckingham with Sejanus, the corrupt chief minister of the Emperor Tiberius; for rather than taking this opportunity as a means of using Buckingham as a political screen as James had earlier done with Middlesex, in a way which Eliot himself cannot have meant (and which therefore demonstrates the strength of the public belief in Buckingham's power as well as Charles's own disbelief and lack of political insight), he instantly upped the political stakes through interpreting himself as Tiberius.<sup>58</sup> Neither were these isolated examples formulated during the heat of parliamentary debate as a means of deflecting opposition from Buckingham, for there are a number of others which lead to a similar conclusion in relation to the navy itself, where Buckingham (as lord admiral) would be expected to have exerted the greatest influence - not so much in its day to day running, which Charles, understandably, left to him (this being the whole purpose of appointing officers), but in the occasions where he intervened above his head and contrary to his own personal interests, a clear example of this being Charles's granting of a royal commission authorising privateering activity to the Earl of Warwick.

Under Elizabeth most of the action against Spain had been undertaken not by the royal navy but by privateers, financing their expeditions through goods seized from the enemy.<sup>59</sup> This had a double advantage in that it allowed the state to wage war at a much reduced cost, whilst in offering a means of becoming rich also provided an inherent incentive for people to support the measures of the Crown. With James primarily interested in a diplomatic alliance with Spain as a means of establishing a

---

<sup>57</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 313, 315-6.

<sup>58</sup> Carlton, Charles I. p. 81.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. pp. 461-2. 8/10 May, but reported 15 May 1626. Lords's report of Sir John Eliot's speech at Buckingham's impeachment.; Ibid., Vol. III. p. 288. 20 May 1626. Commons's Journal. Sir Dudley Carleton's response to Eliot's speech.

<sup>59</sup> John Guy, Tudor England. (Oxford, 1991). pp. 348-351.

new non-confessional European order rather than war both the ideological and financial basis upon which privateering had rested was to a large extent lost. Charles's interest in war against Spain had raised hopes in the 1624 parliament of a renewed period of privateering, but unfortunately for them he saw it more as a means of avenging Stuart family honour than a religious crusade; and unlike Elizabeth, who had a keen sense of the weakness of the financial position of the Crown, Charles naively believed that the popularity of a war against Spain would automatically transfer into grants of parliamentary supply, and had therefore decided to initiate attacks against Spain through forces under the king's own name and authority. This was no doubt something which was strongly favoured by Buckingham. For ever since he had realised that his position under Charles would depend more upon his administrative skills than his personal charm he had been attempting to strengthen his position as lord admiral, this lying, for example, behind his decision to purchase the position of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports from Edward, Lord Zouch in 1624, whose jurisdiction had previously been independent of that of the lord admiral; and with every privateering commission granted by the Crown eroding his authority as lord admiral (and therefore his position with the king), despite the fact that he would still receive a proportion of such money as was gained it is likely that this was a development which Buckingham and his servants were determined to resist.<sup>60</sup> Charles's preference for a royal fleet, though, was not out of any wish to protect Buckingham's position or because he was the one who was actually in charge, but because with his keen personal interest in the navy and firm notions of honour he preferred it that way, and was willing to make exceptions when it suited his purpose.

As a keen Protestant and naval adventurer the Earl of Warwick had been a consistent advocate of war against Spain, but whilst the kind of war which he and his allies had been calling for in 1624 had been a self-financing blue-water policy consisting of a number of self-led fleets sent out under the ideological umbrella of Protestantism, what they had got was a parliamentary funded royal fleet organised by Buckingham sent out to avenge Stuart honour. With Warwick being looked upon as a defender of the constitution and the public's rights at the same time as Charles was

---

<sup>60</sup>

Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 216.

using conformity to the extraordinary measures required to fund his war policy as a test for loyalty, maintaining a balance between these two divergent elements upon which his political power was based was not going to be easy; but with him interesting himself in his naval and trading concerns at much the same time as Charles was enforcing the collection of the Forced Loan, he saw a possible way out as well as getting one up on Buckingham by in effect paying in kind through an offer to carry war to Spain through a fleet to be sent out at his own expence and under his direction. As having spent the autumn and winter of 1626/7 in preparing a fleet of his own ships for foreign service, four of which had "...letters of marque and six months' provisions...", on the 12th of February 1627 he wrote to Secretary Coke asking " to be suffered to go to sea against his Majesties enemies, on a West Indian voyage, or a service on the French in the straits, or for the coast of Spain or the Islands..", declaring "...If I had commission I should have many more join with me...".<sup>61</sup> With Sir John Coke enjoying frequent access to the king as secretary, and possessing a keen interest in the navy which may have led him to see it as a project worthy of mention to the king, it is possible that Warwick had entrusted the task of achieving this commission to him alone.<sup>62</sup> But by the time that Warwick was writing to Coke his preparations were already fairly well advanced, which together with the opposition which would obviously be expected from the lord admiral makes it unlikely that he did not have some additional form of support; and it appears that Warwick was in fact following the classic Court procedure of formally submitting a request to the king via his officials (whose support was vital in order to keep the wheels of the administration oiled) whilst simultaneously exerting direct pressure upon him through influential allies, in this case Warwick's brother, the Earl of Holland, and the queen. Unlike Warwick, Holland had expressed few qualms about working with Buckingham or advancing the king's war policies, and through this had been able to work himself into a trusted and favoured position at Court, in recognition of which he had been appointed in August 1626 a Gentleman of Charles's

---

<sup>61</sup> Cowper, I. p. 296. 12 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 296. 12 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

Bedchamber and (upon the dismissal of her French servants) high steward of the queen's revenues.<sup>63</sup> Giving him the scope for continued attendance at Court these offices left Holland in a strong position to forward his interests, and at this time negotiating his own appointment as "sole exchanger of all manner of gold bullion", it is likely that despite his good working relationship with Buckingham that he was also using his position on behalf of his brother.<sup>64</sup> This may have involved his direct intervention with the king, but with Charles notoriously fickle over people intervening in matters of patronage, and with relations between him and his wife having markedly improved since the expulsion of her French attendants, it appears more likely to have involved the influence of the queen, with whom Holland had been on good terms ever since he had began negotiating her marriage to Charles; as later that same year in June, with Charles and Buckingham at Portsmouth finalising preparations for the fleet about to leave for La Rochelle, and with the commission now passed, Warwick not only dined Henrietta Maria on board one of the ships (the Neptune) which he had prepared as part of his commission at Blackwall, but accompanied her back to Somerset House, this being a firm indication that she had at least had some interest in securing it.<sup>65</sup> Enjoying better access and favour with the king than Buckingham now

---

<sup>63</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 101. 28 July 1626. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid., ff. 113-4. 17 August 1626. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ballinger, ed., Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 230. Unsigned newsletter.; PRO. SP16/33/30. 3 August 1626. Whitehall. Sir Benjamin ----Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.; NLW Wynn of Gwydir 1433. 6 August 1626. London. Henry Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>64</sup> Rumours of Holland's imminent appointment as sole exchanger surfaced at the beginning of March 1627, although he was not formally appointed until May. CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 76. 1 March 1627. Exceptions taken by the officers of the Mint against the letters patent whereby the Earl of Holland was constituted sole exchanger...; Ibid., p. 76. 2 March 1627. Sir Robert Harley - Secretary Conway.; Ibid., p. 168. 8 May 1627. Charles I. - Attorney General Heath.

<sup>65</sup> Holland was likely to have become acquainted with the queen through his part in the negotiations for her marriage with Charles, and was already sufficiently high in her favour to obtain a promise that his wife should be appointed to her

that he had turned administrator the queen was playing a similar role under Charles to that which he had under James; in which whilst she did not possess any direct role in the distribution of patronage, through being able to observe the direction in which the king's mind was going and anticipate his intentions she was able to align her actions with his and drop hints or advance petitions at the best possible time - and the winter of 1626-7 was just such a time for the advancement of Warwick's commission, for Charles's war policy had not been going well. First came news in September 1626 that his uncle, Christian IV. of Denmark had been defeated at the Battle of Lutter on the 17 August, and then a couple of months later in October the fleet sent out under the direction of Robert, Lord Willoughby to blockade the Port of Cadiz had been forced to turn back without achieving any of its objectives because of storms in the Bay of Biscay.<sup>66</sup> News of Christian's defeat had affected Charles deeply and left him determined to make some gesture on his behalf, and was one of the principal reasons that he had decided to press ahead with the Forced Loan. The dispatch of Willoughby's fleet (which had been sent out unseasonably late because of a lack of funds) had been another aspect of this policy, and its failure therefore represented a particularly cruel blow. Realising that England would not be able to defeat the Spanish alone, Charles and Buckingham had placed great hopes upon the military alliance they had negotiated with France alongside Charles's marriage to Henrietta Maria. But with the French refusing to honour their side of the bargain whilst they faced problems of internal order at home by this point in time he was deeply frustrated and was beginning to think himself betrayed; and also concerned of the implications of the continued expansion of the French navy for his policy of sovereignty of the seas, in the light of these most recent setback Charles entered into the similarly rash enterprise of testing the true intentions of the French once and for all through taking military action in the support of the French Huguenots in the hope that this would induce them to abandon their reservations and join his fight against

---

bedchamber. Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. pp. 33-6, 85-6.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 612. 23 April 1625. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley - Carleton.; Cowper, I. p. 296. 12 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

<sup>66</sup>

Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 344, 348.

Spain as he had with the Spanish in his journey there in 1623. However, with Charles lacking sufficient funds to be able to send out two fleets simultaneously this would obviously mean a cessation of action against Spain, and it was probably because it offered a means of overcoming this and maintaining the pressure on Spain that he decided to give a favourable response to the proposals of Warwick.<sup>67</sup> Gaining Charles's interest was a good start, but with the financing of Warwick's fleet depending upon private subscriptions it was the actual terms of the commission which would be all important to its success; but after dealing with the attorney and judge of the Court of Admiralty, by the end of February 1627 he believed that he had agreed acceptable terms which would allow him to secure the necessary financial support.<sup>68</sup> However, the warm reception which had been given to this idea by the king was not shared by his lord admiral; for whilst Charles had not given any indication that he was in any way displeased with anything which Buckingham had done, and had on the contrary consistently gone out of his way in parliament to protect him, with government law officers at this time making plans for an examination of his actions in Star Chamber, and there being reports that Charles was "secretly inquisitive of late concerning the duke's actions and the state of affairs of this kingdom", he could not be sure to what extent this had merely been a means of preserving his own authority, and remained deeply concerned about his position.<sup>69</sup> So with a shortage of funds having been the principal factor which had prevented Charles from achieving his foreign policy objectives, Buckingham realised at once that if in the light of the failure of Willoughby's fleet that sent out under Warwick at no cost to the Crown met with a measure of success there was a distinct possibility not only that its scope would be widened (which would diminish his authority as lord admiral), but with it perhaps being part of a wider plot orchestrated through the queen that it would lead to Warwick being appointed admiral in his place, thereby removing the principal plank

---

<sup>67</sup> Cowper, I. p. 297. 28 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., p. 297. 28 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

<sup>69</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 359.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 230. 31 March 1627. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

upon which his new administrative role with the king was dependent. Later that same year Buckingham's naval secretary, Sir Edward Nicholas, asserted that " Warwick's commission would never have passed, had it not been in the puzzle of the great preparations then in hand...".<sup>70</sup> But Charles routinely referred all such proposals to the relevant officers for their opinion before granting them, and with Buckingham remaining at Court and attending council meetings throughout the period during which this grant so detrimental to his position was being considered this hardly seems likely, and if he was in as strong a position as is usually held then it should not have been beyond his grasp to have overturned it.<sup>71</sup> However, whilst Buckingham's influence over the distribution of patronage (as opposed to the perception of it) had been steadily declining since Charles had taken a greater role in the direction of affairs under James, Henrietta Maria's had correspondingly improved. This meant that the appointment to her household of other key supporters of the Crown usually seen as his allies such as George, Lord Goring, the Earl of Holland and the Earl of Dorset was more likely to have been interpreted by Buckingham as a transfer of allegiance than a sign of his own influence; and with him having so far not been unable to establish a close relationship with the queen, and with there having been attacks upon him from within her household as early as 1625, this was likely to have made him reluctant to cross something in which she was so deeply involved; and with the fact that things had already proceeded this far also indicating at least a degree of interest on the part of the king, Buckingham had decided against opposing it outright, and was through his naval secretary Edward Nicholas instead attempting to undermine its scope through reducing the number of ships which it was to embrace.<sup>72</sup> In the end,

---

<sup>70</sup> CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 407. 25 October 1627. Sir Edward Nicholas - Sir Henry Marten.

<sup>71</sup> Throughout the spring of 1627 Buckingham was in and around the Court making preparations for that year's fleet, and during February regularly attended meetings of the Privy Council. Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 359-368.; APC, 1627. p. 49. 5 February 1627. Whitehall.; Ibid., p. 52. 6 February 1627. Whitehall.; Ibid., p. 59. 12 February 1627. Whitehall.; Ibid., p. 70. 21 February 1627. Whitehall.

<sup>72</sup> Cowper, I. p. 297. 28 February 1627. Earl of Warwick - Secretary Coke.

however, Buckingham did not even manage to meet this limited objective, for not only did he have to face the indignity of attending a meeting of the Privy Council at Whitehall the very day that Warwick received his commission on the 18 March 1627, but also of actually seeing " an enlargement...[of it] as would authorise him to invade and possess any of the dominions of the King of Spain ", and of receiving an order from the Privy Council " to give order to release the eight ships of the Earl of Warwick, stayed by the present embargo...". <sup>73</sup>

With this only being of advantage to the Crown and the holder of the commission, and with Buckingham being present at Court throughout the period when it was being discussed, no clearer indication could be given either of the fact that Charles retained a right to intervene in naval affairs over the head of Buckingham, or that he and not Buckingham was in control, and this inability to control the distribution of patronage was to be the major problem which Buckingham had to face in the light of his transition from a favourite to an administrator. <sup>74</sup>

As favourite under James Buckingham's position had been based upon his favour and constant attendance upon the king, where providing that he worked within the political parameters set by James, he had a certain freedom of action in deciding who

---

<sup>73</sup> CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 98. 18 March 1627. Charles I. - Earl of Warwick. Commission authorising him to undertake a voyage tending to the service of the king and realm...; Ibid., p. 129. 7 April 1627. Council - Duke of Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 138. 17 April 1627. King - Attorney General Heath.

<sup>74</sup> A similar commission was soon after granted to Sir Kenelm Digby, despite Buckingham having thought so much of Warwick's commission that Nicholas believed " he would take it as [a] great -remisness in those he trusts when he shall hear of such a grant to Sir Kenelm..." and had immediately " moved the king that Sir Kenelm might not have a commission at all, but only letters of marque ", using " all the power of the duke's friends totally to dash that commission ". Ibid., p. 377. 9 October 1627. Edward Nicholas - Sir Henry Marten.; Ibid., p. 407. 25 October 1627. Sir Edward Nicholas - Sir Henry Marten.; Ibid., p. 433. 14 November 1627. Commission to Sir Kenelm Digby, to make a voyage to sea, and take prizes from any prince or potentate not in league or amity with the king.



should receive Crown patronage, through this being able to establish a network of clients of varying outlook which he could call upon in order to back a particular policy.

This had proved to be an effective means of dealing with the competing objectives of various groups within a Court environment, and had Buckingham been as powerful as is usually believed he should have been able to emulate this system under Charles. But his position under James had been based upon nothing more than the close personal relationship which he had enjoyed with him, and with his relationship with Charles being very different, this was something which he was unable to do. As whilst his role as an administrator enabled him to continue utilising many of the political connections which he had developed under James, with Charles having taken patronage back into his own hands he was no longer able to control the means of continuing or renewing them, the adverse consequences of which were compounded by a combination of contemporary political ideologies and Charles's complete lack of political skill - this being clearly demonstrated in the effects of Charles's decision to select eight prominent MPs as sheriffs as a means of preventing them from sitting in the parliament planned for the new year. This episode is usually taken as a move on the part of Buckingham to punish enemies and former clients alike for having opposed his policies in the 1625 parliament, but a comparison of the probable date of their selection in the second week of November alongside Buckingham's movements at this time count against him having played a major part in it, with it appearing much more likely to have been the work of Charles, who through personalizing politics and tightening political conformity was actually working directly counter to Buckingham's own preferred course of accommodation.

After having been with the king at Plymouth overseeing the preparation of the fleet, by the 7 of October 1625 it had been decided to " send the Duke of Buckingham to the United Provinces ", who having " already taken leave of his Majesty ", returned to London the next day.<sup>75</sup> On the 11 he set out to see his wife at Burley on the Hill,

---

<sup>75</sup> Secretary Morton was to have gone to the Hague, but died at Southampton on the 5 September 1625.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 175. 7 October 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 17th September

earlier than planned so as to " break off unpleasant negotiations with the French Ambassador " and avoid being associated with the removal of Lord Keeper Williams. <sup>76</sup> Towards the end of October, however, he received the letter from the king which ordered him to Harwich to assist the Earl of Warwick's defence work. <sup>77</sup> This inevitably delayed Buckingham's departure for the Hague, and he does not appear to have returned to Court before finally leaving for the Hague c.4 November. Thus he had been away from the king since the 7 of October, and did not return until the second week of December, and it is unlikely that he had a direct role in the selection of sheriffs. <sup>78</sup> This defence was evidently used by Buckingham himself, as in a letter to Sir Richard Weston in 1626 Wentworth relates how that " the Duke a little before

---

1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate. De l'Isle. Vol. V. p. 440. 17 October 1625. Salisbury. Sir John North - Earl Leicester.; --Cowper, I. p. 211. 5 September 1625. Isle of Wight. Edward Reed - Sir John Coke.; Young, Servility and Service. p. 149.; PRO. SP16/6. 8 September 1625. Hampton Court. George, Lord Goring - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 219. 13 September 1625. Unsigned newsletter.

<sup>76</sup> Buckingham seems to have played little part in this. As on the 12 of October 1625 the Countess of Buckingham wrote to Williams saying that " I have had large conference with my son about you. And he tells me that the king is determined to put another into your place...", whilst the Venetian Ambassador had reported of Williams that "...through not being an ally of the duke has become suspect to the king ", inferring that the decision over this had also been Charles's. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. .II. p. 25. 12 October 1625 Countess Buckingham - Lord Keeper Williams; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 197. 3 November 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>77</sup> BL. Harleian 6988. f. 7. c.14  
October 1625. Charles I. - Duke of Buckingham.

<sup>78</sup> Buckingham returned around the second week of December. As he had not set sail for England by the 1 December, but by the 13 Laud was hoping to meet him at Windsor. CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 197. 3 November. 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 234. 1 December 1625. Venetian Ambassador in Netherlands - Doge and Senate.; De l'Isle. Vol. V. p. 441. 4 November. 1625. Sir John North - Earl Leicester.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VI. p. 247. 13 December 1625. Windsor. Bishop Laud - Duke of Buckingham.

Whitsuntide last, at Whitehall in your presence, said, it [his selection as sheriff] was done without his Grace's knowledge, that he was then in Holland ".<sup>79</sup> This, however, is insufficient to prove Charles's role on its own, for as asserted by Sir Arthur Ingram, it is possible that it had been " set and resolved what should be done before the great duke's going over ".<sup>80</sup> It is, however, supported by other evidence. As on the 24 October, some three weeks after Buckingham had left, Sir George Paul (an un official adviser to the Crown) had written to Secretary Conway recommending that " those who have been the chief cause of this so general a discontent " in the last parliament should be selected sheriff, seeing this as the only means of achieving a meeting of parliament which would be mutually beneficial to Crown and people. At this point there could have been no intention of selecting sheriffs in this way, for had Paul already suggested such a policy to Buckingham it is highly unlikely that he would have done so again nearly three weeks after he had left; and even if there had been some earlier connection, the existence of this letter means that Buckingham must have ignored it.<sup>81</sup> As Buckingham was absent between the date on which the letter was sent and the actual selection, the initiative must have lain with Charles himself. Further evidence that Buckingham was not aware of what had occurred comes in the form of a letter sent to him by Secretary Conway on the 30 November, in which he gives a detailed account of Richard Knightley's selection, as well as sending a list of all the names of those " which by extraordinary recommendation were pricked for sheriffs "; which being unnecessary if Buckingham had actually been a party to it, and with Conway being so close to him, again suggests the decision to have been Charles's alone.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 35. Undated, 1626. Sir Thomas Wentworth - Sir Richard Weston.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., November 1625. Sir Arthur Ingram - Sir Thomas Wentworth.

<sup>81</sup> M. C. Noonkester, ' Charles I. and Shrieval Selection, 1625/6 ', in BIHR. Vol. 64. October 1991. p. 305., quoting 24 October 1625. Sir George Paul - Secretary Conway.

<sup>82</sup> BL Harleian 1580. f. 342. 30 November 1625. Hampton Court. Sir Edward Conway - Duke of Buckingham.

With James having always been willing to sacrifice his ministers and favourites when their continuance in office threatened the Crown, and with Charles firmly defending those who received his delegated authority, his retrieval of patronage back into his own hands need not necessarily have made Buckingham's position any less certain than it had been before, but it did nevertheless bring a number of changes. For whilst Buckingham no longer had the same influence over the direction politics and the distribution of patronage as he had done under James, with Charles's closed style of rule in which he preferred working with a few select ministers bolstering ongoing contemporary perceptions over the role of favourite he was still perceived as wielding the same degree of influence, and was therefore seen to be the author of the unorthodox and unpopular policies, and highly personal and vindictive patronage decisions of Charles; which not only fuelled suspicions that he was taking advantage of a young king in order to increase his own influence, but equally serious undermined the successful patronage system which he had established under James

Most of the MPs selected sheriffs in 1625, and especially Phelips, Knightley, Seymour and Wentworth possessed close connections with Buckingham and had been holding out hopes of obtaining patronage through his means, and their obvious refusal to believe that he was therefore responsible for such an act combined with a reluctance to face up to the consequences of it being the work of the king to produce widespread confusion. This is clearly demonstrated in Conway's letter to Buckingham dated the 30 November, in which he not only explains how that Richard Knightley had " protested the continual and sole dependence he had upon your Grace ", declaring his " speeches, and the endeavours he had used in the parliament for the service of the king and honour of you ", but also that he himself had " enquired of Sir John Coke and some others of him, who all justified his good behaviour "; which together with the fact that Knightley still seemed " to promise himself that your Grace will justify him with the king ", shows clearly the different degrees of loyalty expected between Charles and Buckingham.<sup>83</sup> Wentworth and Phelips were equally confused

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., fol. 343. 30 November 1625. Secretary Conway - Duke of Buckingham. That people as closely connected to Buckingham as Coke and Conway (who must surely have known his criteria for support) should

at this point in time; as whilst neither were particularly happy with their selection as sheriff or subsequent removal from the Commission of the Peace, Wentworth complaining to Buckingham through Sir Richard Weston that having promised to "serve him in the quality of an honest man and a gentleman" in the 1625 parliament, "...I performed what I professed", uncertain as to whether it had been the work of Buckingham or Charles, they do not as yet appear to have believed that they had broken all ties with the Court, both still holding out hopes of returning to favour; Wentworth writing to the King for the position of Lord President of Council in the North upon rumours of the impending resignation of Emmanuell Scrope, and Phelips making means to re-enter royal service just after the end of his year as sheriff through the means of the Earl of Holland.<sup>84</sup>

There was clearly no political reason as to why the successes of Buckingham's broad-based and accommodating patronage system should not have been repeated under Charles, providing that Buckingham was given the degree of freedom in appointments required in order to make it work. But with Charles having taken patronage back into his own hands and removed him from that constant attendance

---

have supported --Knightley suggests that he had no argument with Buckingham.; Knightley had worked with Charles and Buckingham in the 1624 parliament in the hope of being appointed an ambassador. S.R. Gardiner, ed., The Fortescue Papers. Consisting chiefly of letters relating to state affairs, collected by John Packer, secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Camden Society New Series. (London, 1891). pp. 196-7. Undated, 1624. Sir Richard Knightley - Buckingham.

<sup>84</sup> Noonkester, 'Charles I. and Shrieval Selection', in BIHR. p. 308. ; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 34. 1626. Sir Thomas Wentworth - Sir Richard Weston.; CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 228. 19 January 1626. Sir Thomas Wentworth - Secretary Conway. Evidence of Phelips's previous dealings with Buckingham and hopes of future preferment (chiefly through intermediaries) can be seen in Somerset Record Office SRO. DD/Ph/216/32. 23 March 1624. Sir Robert Harley - Sir Robert Phelips; SRO. DD/Ph/210/33. Undated March 1625. Westminster. El Hombre Fiel [Nathaniel Tomkins] - Sir Robert Phelips.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. 27 November 1626. Westminster. Ho. Fiel [Nathaniel Tomkins] - Sir Robert Phelips.

upon his person upon which his previous role as favourite had been based through turning him into an administrator, it was just this freedom of action on the part of Buckingham which he had removed. Although in line with contemporary perceptions Buckingham is still perceived as having had a major impact upon appointments under Charles, when examined in the light of this new role it can be seen that his influence has been much exaggerated. He may still have enjoyed some connections, for example, with Sir John Coke and Sir Dudley Carleton, who were both eventually appointed Secretaries of State, but in neither case was this connection likely to have been the only or most important factor in their appointment.<sup>85</sup> In both instances Charles clearly already knew the candidates; Coke through a shared interest in the navy and his membership of the 1618 Naval Commission of Enquiry, and Carleton had had frequent contacts with the prince. In both cases the appointment came not when Buckingham, but when Charles chose.<sup>86</sup> Buckingham's attempt to secure the

---

<sup>5</sup> Buckingham became acquainted with Sir John Coke through their work in the 1618 Naval Commission of Enquiry. As lord admiral he came to rely on him quite heavily, even offering to take him into his own service, which, interestingly enough, he declined. Young, Servility and Service. pp. 39-40, 42-3, 98.; M.B. Young, ' Illusions of Grandeur and Reform at the Jacobean Court: Cranfield and the Ordnance ', pp. 53-73. HJ. Vol. 22. 1979. p. 57.; Carleton contacted Buckingham through George, Lord Goring (who had recently stayed with at the Hague) in 1624 as part of an attempt to become Provost of Eton. J.H. Barcroft, ' Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office ', in R.W. Reinmuth, ed., Early Stuart Studies. (Minneapolis, 1970). p. 128.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. P. 528. 6 December 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>86</sup> With Charles then holding a reversion of the position of the office of lord admiral he was likely to have taken as much if not greater interest in the details of the commission of enquiry than Buckingham.; Although Carleton had apparently ignored advice that he should get the Queen of Bohemia to intercede with the prince on his behalf as Ambassador to the Hague he already had connections with him, both personally and through his previous secretary, Sir Thomas Murray. Having regularly sent back items required by the prince, who had in turn recommended people to his care. CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 417. 30 December 1616.

appointment of Sir John Coke as a means of bolstering his position as lord admiral in 1624 failing because James's refusal to consider military action other than as part of a non-religious alliance and Charles's determination to secure action of any kind led them to support the appointment of Sir Albertus Morton (who essentially being a diplomat rather than an administrator was ideally suited to this purpose), and only coming after Charles was free to act alone after the death of James; and Sir Dudley Carleton's appointment only coming some months after Buckingham's own death in December 1628.<sup>87</sup>

With Buckingham similarly unable to prevent the removal of Lord Keeper Williams or the replacement as lord treasurer of his relation James, Earl of Marlborough by Sir

---

Whitehall. Thomas --Murray - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 492. 2 November 1617. St. James's. Same - Same .; PRO. SP14/103/1. 1 October 1618. Same - Same.

<sup>87</sup> With the Crypto-Catholic Secretary Calvert suffering from ill-health and not relishing the prospect of war with Spain, by May 1624 there were rumours that he was seeking to sell his office. In October Coke was informed by Sir Guilford Slingsby " that the king purposeth to advance you [Coke] to the place of Secretary of State...", a move which would have bolstered Buckingham's position as lord admiral and improved the efficiency of the navy. However, Charles's immediate concern was to persuade James to sanction military action, with Sir Albertus Morton being appointed Secretary of State towards the end of January 1625. Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. pp. 541-2. 31 January 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 600. 12 February 1625. London. Same - Same.; CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 231. 3 May 1624. Dudley Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton. Ibid., p. 269. 7 June 1624. London. Same - Same.; Cowper, I. pp. 172-3. 4 October 1624. Sir Guilford Slingsby - Sir John Coke.; Court and Times of James I. p. 491. 21 January 1625. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid., p. 492. 28 January 1625. London. Same - Same.; Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 207. 23 January 1625. London. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.; PRO. SO3/9. December 1628. The office of one of his Majesty's Secretary's of State to Dudley, Viscount Dorchester during his majesty's pleasure. Procured by the said Viscount Dorchester.

Richard Weston (whose impetuous nature and advocacy of a policy of peace and retrenchment posed direct threats to the role of war administrator upon which his position at Court now depended), and with Sir Thomas Coventry subsequently informing him upon being taunted that he held " the lord keepership by his favour " that " did I conceive I held my place by your favour, I would presently unmake myself by rendering the seal to his Majesty ", it would appear that this loss of influence on the part of Buckingham as a consequence of his change in role was general.<sup>88</sup> And when examined in the light of this, the marriage alliances which he formed between his family and the Earl of Pembroke upon the latter's appointment as Lord Steward of the Household in 1626, and between one of his aunts (Lady Ashburnham) and Sir Thomas Richardson upon his appointment as Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and the new friendships which he made upon the death of James, such as with Sir Henry Vane, who whilst being " long well rooted in the king's favour, and of his fast friends at Court " in 1625 (having been a cofferer in his household since March 1617), had only been " lately received into the duke's favour ", are not signs of strength, but in fact signs of weakness as he was forced to find alternative

---

<sup>88</sup> Already frustrated at Marlborough's inefficiency, Charles had been unable to replace him earlier because of his insistence upon another office in recompence; with the appointment of Weston in his place reflecting his concern of the effects of war at home and a renewed interest in a diplomatic solution with Spain.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 197. 25 February 1627. Charles I. - Lord Treasurer Marlborough.; CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 272. 27 July 1627. Easton. Same - Same.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 391.; Marlborough was appointed Lord President of the Council and Weston treasurer in his place at a meeting of the Privy Council on the 15 July 1628. APC, 1628-1629., p. 30.; Coventry had refused to pass a grant for Buckingham's appointment as High Constable of England. The king's acceptance of his decision here where it concerned Buckingham alone contrasts sharply with that at Coventry's refusal to seal a pardon for the forfeitures of papists in 1633, where if had not been for the intervention of the Earl of Dorset he would have " took away the Great Seal...". DNB, sub Coventry.; D.L. Smith, ' The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I. ', pp. 257-287, in JBS. Vol. 30. 1991. p. 283.



means of bolstering his position now that he had lost his ability to influence the distribution of patronage.<sup>89</sup>

Charles's control of the distribution patronage was clearly undermining the network of clients which had been the main strength of the system which Buckingham had established under James, and whilst Buckingham was evidently attempting to explain himself to former clients such as Wentworth and Williams as a means of distancing himself from it, being so dependent upon the support of Charles he was unable to do this generally without threatening his position with the king, leaving him with no other option than to accept the new role to which he had been assigned and go along with things as best he could, which with perceptions of his actions being interpreted alongside established threats to the Church and constitution left him " as the cause of of these evils and mischiefs which this kingdom of England now grievously suffereth " at the same time as he was unable to mould politics in a way which would allow him

---

<sup>89</sup> Charles had announced his intention of promoting Pembroke in 1625. This marriage provided a means by which Pembroke could demonstrate his willingness to overcome faction, and Buckingham could strengthen his position. NLW Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 333.; Similar factors apply to Richardson. The marriage did not take place until after his appointment. And with Richardson having been Queen Anne's chancellor (whose servants Charles had promised to support), and assigned to Buckingham's defence along with serjeants Crewe and Davenport (who initially declined on account of being " tied by their oath not to be of counsel against the king..."), it appears more likely that Charles had introduced Richardson to Buckingham than the other way round. Roberts, ed., Diary of Walter Yonge. pp. 97-8.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 157. 11 November 1626. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville; PRO. C115/N3/8540. 25 November 1626. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; BL. King's 136. f. 506v. Undated, c.1624. List of Queen Anne's servants and officers.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. p. 545. 24 May 1626. Lords' Journal.; Ibid., p. 547. 22 May 1626.; Vane had purchased the position of Cofferer in March 1617. CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 443. 11 March 1617. Sir William Lovelace - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 10. 16 April 1625.

to save himself.<sup>90</sup> Universally hated by the people whilst effectively undermining Charles's war policy through the reluctance of parliament to grant supply whilst he remained in office, Buckingham's partial transition from a favourite to an administrator had placed him under tremendous pressure during the first three years of Charles's reign, and immediately prior to his assassination in 1628 there are signs that this had prompted him to take measures which in acknowledging his lack of influence and therefore allowing it to be publicly devalued would (if implemented) not only have effectively completed his transformation from favourite to administrator, but in providing a means of distancing himself from the political actions of the time would have allowed blame to be rightly attributed to the king.

Becoming increasingly concerned at the way in which the government of the navy by commission was trenching upon his authority and honour as lord admiral and causing delays in the preparation of the fleet destined for the Ile de Rhe, in May 1627 Buckingham had considered returning the government of the navy to its officers; and with further delays in sending out reinforcements later that year undermining the success of the whole expedition, it was something to which he returned in early 1628, when in the rush of preparing for the new fleet to Rhe he managed to persuade the Council to advise the king to abolish it, who on the 20 February 1628 sent out order " that such commission or commissioners heretofore granted by us to any such commissioners touching our navy be from henceforth revoked and utterly void, and that by virtue of those commissions or any of them the commissioners therein named, or any of them do not intermeddle in that service...".<sup>91</sup> The previous year Buckingham's wife had already perceived the great " danger to the duke in letting fall the Commission of Enquiry ", realising that with Buckingham already unpopular this would merely serve to place greater attention upon him and make matters worse, in that " abuses brought to light and unremedied, may hereafter be laid on the duke...".

---

<sup>90</sup> This assertion was made by Sir Dudley Digges. Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 321.

<sup>91</sup> CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 160. 1 May 1627. Sir Guilford Slingsby - Secretary Conway.; Cowper, I. p. 339. 20 February 1628. Order of Charles I. countersigned by Attorney General Heath.

<sup>92</sup> Buckingham was no doubt aware of this, but with his position with Charles (like other ministers later on) depending upon his skills as an administrator not public popularity it was a risk which he was willing to take, firmly believing that because the " said government by commissioners was established in times of peace, when the despatch of business might go a slower pace than the activeness of these times of war and danger (which require quicker motions and expedition) will safely permit ", that their removal would bring his policies that degree of success of which he believed would be the springboard to adequate parliamentary supply. <sup>93</sup> However, it did not take long to see that the gamble had failed to pay off as it became apparent that the principal officers of the navy were no more able to overcome inadequate levels of funding than the commissioners had been; and with further military operations planned for early that year, Charles (as ever his own man) unexpectedly announced his intention of re-summoning parliament. <sup>94</sup> Although Charles had continually assured Buckingham that parliamentary attacks and criticisms were really directed against him, this had done nothing to alter the perceptions of MPs, whose opposition must surely have left Buckingham with the suspicion that it was the opposition to him which in preventing parliamentary supply was not only forcing Charles to such unparliamentary means of raising revenue as the Forced Loan, but also undermining the war policy which he himself was doing so much to forward; and when he saw the 1628 parliament against all expectations getting off to a good start, announcing as early as the 4 of April its intention of granting five subsidies, and believing that it was perhaps " the opening of a mine of subsidies that lieth in their hearts...", Buckingham

---

<sup>92</sup> CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 160. 1 May 1627. Sir Guilford Slingsby - Secretary Conway.

<sup>93</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 423.

<sup>94</sup> Ralph Starkey reported that although Buckingham had pressed for a parliament " 'tis thought his importunity was the greater in regard he was persuaded the king would never yield unto it; yet in his absence, upon others' motion, the king yeilded and signed the warrant and sent it away without acquainting the Duke therewith. That when it came to the duke's knowledge, he would not believe it. ".; PRO. C115/N4/8579. 2 February 1628. London. Ralph Starkey - Sir John Scudamore.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 424-7.

was determined to ensure that the same did not happen again, according to John Pory at a meeting of the Privy Council held immediately afterwards desiring " his Majesty to withdraw his favour from him, saying he was willing to sacrifice himself, his honours and all that he had for the good of his country. And whereas he understood, that his plurality of offices was excepted against; he was contented to give up the Master of the Horse to the Marquess of Hamilton, and the Warden of the Cinque Ports to the Earl of Carlisle when he returned from his ambassage. And for the admiralty he desired only to be admiral in time of peace and at home, and that the Council and houses of parliament might appoint another admiral for all services at sea...".<sup>95</sup> Given Charles's firm notions on authority it is extremely unlikely that he would even have allowed Buckingham himself to re-distribute his offices, let alone allow parliament or his council to decide upon the allocation of such an important office as that of lord admiral, whilst there is also the possibility that this had merely been a bit of play-acting between them aimed at hastening the supply of money. But with the energy with which Buckingham had earlier advocated the re-summoning of parliament having merely been " in regard he was persuaded the king would never yield unto it ", and that when news of it actually " came to the duke's knowledge, he would not believe it ", this would appear unlikely, and given the essential weakness of his position at this time Pory's account may perhaps contain an element of truth - for both Lord Keeper Williams in 1625, and James Howell with an eye on the 1628 parliament had already advised him to relinquish the admiralty and, as under James, concentrate on ways by which he could " give more content to the world...".<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> However, despite Charles and Buckingham's optimism parliament's decision to grant five subsidies was more a means of preventing an early dissolution than an endorsement of Charles's policies. Ibid., p. 429.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 379. 12 April 1628. Christ Church, Cambridge. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>96</sup> PRO. C115/N4/8579. 2 February 1628. London. Ralph Starkey - Sir John Scudamore.; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 16.; James Howell, Familiar Letters on Important Subjects, wrote from the year 1618 to 1650. (Aberdeen, 1753). p. 198. 18 February 1627[8]. James Howell - Duke of Buckingham.

In 1625 Charles had reluctantly agreed to Buckingham retaining all the positions which he had held under James as a means of maintaining his position and reputation at Court so that he was better equipped to implement his war policy. But with much of Charles's earlier optimism having by now evaporated, and with reactions to Buckingham having convinced him of the need to take things onto himself, three years later the force of these arguments had been removed. Charles therefore immediately took up Buckingham's offer in relation to the Mastership of the Horse and the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, there being speculation towards the end of July that the Mastership was to be granted to either the Earl of Montgomery or Buckingham's brother-in-law the Earl of Denbigh, whilst the position of Warden of the Cinque Ports had by this time already been granted to the Earl of Suffolk; and with a number of other changes in the personell of the Church and State being proposed at this time as part of a general response to the strains of recent years an alteration in Buckingham's role as lord admiral would also appear to have been a realistic prospect.<sup>97</sup> With Charles having supported Buckingham so consistently and perceived attacks against him as directed against himself he was unlikely to have believed that he was incompetent, but he does appear to have become concerned at the consequences for his policies of one person being subject to such a degree of criticism through being in receipt of so much of his delegated authority. A newsletter from London reported that he intended downgrading the importance of the lord admiral through altering his duties and re-introducing the government of the navy by commission, which backed by the king's own authority would be able to carry the

---

<sup>97</sup> Halliwell, ed., Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Vol. I. p. 204. 25 July 1628. London. Robert Gell - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 383. f. 65. 9 August 1628. Christ College, Cambridge. Same - Same.; PRO. SO3/9. July 1628. Grant to the Earl of Suffolk during life of the office and place of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports and Constable of the Castle of Dover... By order under his majesty's sign manual. Procured Duke of Buckingham. Passed the Great Seal at Westminster the 21 July 1628. CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 224.; Ibid., p. 218. 18 July 1628. Denmark House. Sir Robert Aiton - James, Earl of Carlisle.

burden of responsibility much easier than Buckingham could alone.<sup>98</sup> Under this new arrangement Buckingham would continue undertaking his individual administrative responsibilities such as head of the Court of Admiralty whilst major decisions (especially at a time of war) were to be made jointly by him and the Commissioners of the Navy, which together with the loss of his main Court office involving attendance upon the king (which demonstrates that Charles saw no other interest in him beyond the extent to which he was useful to him) would have finally seen the completion of his transformation under Charles from a favourite to an administrator, a role which with the ending of war may eventually have seen him appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland, a country in which he already held a large number of connections.<sup>99</sup>

A more politically minded king would have made much more of such moves as these in order to gain political capital in parliament as a means of forwarding his policies, but due to his autocratic perceptions of royal rule Charles was only ever interested in authority and obedience and not public perceptions or popularity; and fearing (as with the other alterations planned at this time but not yet implemented, such as the replacement of Lord Treasurer Marlborough and Secretary Conway) that any alteration before or during parliament would be taken as a sign of weakness and as a response to their opposition, he decided to postpone it until after it had been prorogued. The pressures of preparing another fleet for Rhe engendered further delays. As a result, this alteration which might have enlightened contemporaries as to Buckingham's true role in affairs, had still not been made before the opportunity was lost forever by his assassination on the 23 of August 1628.<sup>100</sup> It led to the confusing

---

<sup>98</sup> Halliwell, ed., Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Vol. II. p. 204. 25 July 1628. London. Robert Gell - Sir Martin Stuteville.

<sup>99</sup> There were consistent rumours that Buckingham was looking towards some kind of appointment in Ireland. With these first coming in November 1624 and being repeated after the death of James Buckingham perhaps saw this as a means of overcoming the threat Charles posed to his position. Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 356.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 379. 12 April 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>100</sup> It soon became clear that the abolition of government by commission had been a mistake, and by the summer of 1628 there appears to have been a definite

situation in which the political unity of the reign caused by the central role of Charles has been consistently overlooked because of the perception that the anomalies of the 1620s had been caused by the influence of Buckingham - the truth of which can be seen when the effects of Charles's attitude to politics and the distribution of patronage during this period are examined in more detail.

---

intention of -re-introducing it as soon as circumstances allowed. BL. Harleian 390. f. 379. 12 April 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Halliwell, ed., Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Vol. II. p. 204. 25 July 1628. London. Robert Gell - Sir Martin Stuteville.

## Chapter 6.

### The War Years, 1625-1629.

Charles's decision to shun the use of a favourite and take patronage back into his own hands had removed the political screen which had shielded James from the effects of the discontent caused by the way he had dispensed it; but whilst this had raised the consequences of any political division or dispute, it did not in itself cause problems or make them inevitable, this depending upon the skill with which he used it in the pursuit of his objectives. Unfortunately, though, Charles had never been encouraged, unlike Henry, to play a wider role, and although he assured the 1621 parliament how he intended "to sit often there with the lords...", he was not a natural politician.<sup>1</sup> Instead he viewed the world purely in personal terms, as it related to him. This had a significant impact upon his ability to use patronage as a political tool. He assumed that all subjects were naturally obedient to the authority of the Crown, and selected candidates for appointment to high office primarily from amongst his acquaintances. He also selected on the basis of his own preferences and observations as to their ability to carry out duties rather than their political or religious persuasion. In this way Charles effectively closed down half of the traditional role which the distribution of patronage had played in the implementation of policy under James. James had carefully nurtured support for his policies through promoting people of a particular persuasion and encouraging them to obtain their own objectives through working with the Crown. This meant that there was an inherent risk that he would proceed in a policy without sufficient political support to ensure that it was adequately implemented. It might also mean that he would fall back upon the inherent strength of the monarchy and cause serious political damage.

Expecting absolute obedience to his commands and dispensing his patronage in this way Charles was never going to be a popular monarch. This problem was aggravated by his failure to avoid major political undertakings in which he was dependent upon

---

<sup>1</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 343. 10 February 1621. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.



outside support. For ever since the exile of his sister, Elizabeth, and her husband in 1619 the major political and religious issue of the day had been how they were going to be reinstated. In this Charles, emerging from the shadows of Henry and Buckingham, was to take a keen interest and play a major part, his actions causing as many problems to James now as it was to the country as a whole later on.

Deeply attached to his sister and in correspondence with the Princes of the Protestant Union, he resolved " no longer to be abused with treaties...", and had initially favoured armed intervention, even offering to go to the Palatinate himself at the head of an army. <sup>2</sup> But Frederick's acceptance of the Bohemian Crown had been against the advice of James, who possessing an inherent aversion to war and distrusting parliament's willingness to provide the necessary money to finance such action, after an initial period of sabre rattling in the 1621 parliament merely added the restitution of the Palatinate to the terms of the proposed marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta which had already been underway for some time; a policy which in offering a means of solving a complex question without provoking an open conflict with his father, was reluctantly accepted by Prince Charles. The objectives of the Spanish, though, were rather different from James's, for they had merely entered into negotiations as a means of preventing England from taking any independent military action or joining any hostile alliance, which in part due to the attitude of England's ambassador to Spain, John Digby, Earl of Bristol (who saw his task merely as a relayer of what that the Spanish said they intended rather than what he thought their real intentions were), and in part due to James's aversion to war (which meant that he was all too eager to believe them), meant that whilst they were willing to conduct negotiations upon the assumption that it would lead to the restitution of the Palatinate, they never allowed them to reach any conclusions. To James, who never appears to have doubted their sincerity (and if he did, was at least happy to be seen to be doing something on behalf of his daughter and son-in-law whilst avoiding war),

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 331. 22 December 1620. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 394. 28 July 1621. Same - Same.; Court and Times of James I. Vol. II. p. 344. 19 October 1622. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

this situation was perfectly acceptable, but not so to Charles, who had only ever agreed to it as a second best to military action, and who was becoming increasingly frustrated not only at the lack of progress over the Palatinate, but also delays in his own marriage. By 1623 Charles was therefore determined to take some further action as a means of breaking the deadlock which had developed in his father's policies, which with him as yet still being reluctant to oppose James directly took the form of hastening things within the scope of his own policy through proposing to go to Spain in person. With this proposal James was put on the back foot, for if (as he argued) the intentions of the Spanish were sincere, then the arrival of the prince could only speed up what was already intended and provide a demonstration of English sincerity, and if they were not, with this being the assumption upon which his whole policy was based, it was better to find out about it earlier rather than later. James possessed many concerns over such a dangerous course of action, but with him, too, being concerned to put an end to a problem which cast a shadow over his entire government and aware of the need to keep his son and favourite on board he had little alternative but to agree, with Charles (together with Buckingham) leaving for Spain on 19 February 1623.<sup>3</sup> Realising the political objective of Charles's intention to go to Spain in person and desperate to obtain a Catholic marriage for his son in order to balance the earlier Protestant one of his daughter, one of the conditions of James's acceptance of his plan was that he should only discuss the marriage itself. With Charles genuinely desirous to secure a wife he was initially willing to believe earlier Spanish assurances that the Palatinate would be settled in due course. But when the marriage itself was apparently settled and James finally gave permission for negotiations to turn to this issue the degree of Spanish intransigence and duplicity which was revealed in their denial of any promise to provide troops to help restore Frederick and their proposal of a future rather than a present settlement based upon condition of Charles's nephew being brought up a Catholic at the Imperial Court confirmed the impression which he and Buckingham had gained over the last couple

---

<sup>3</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 136. James was unlikely to have allowed Charles to have gone without Buckingham.

of years back in England. Charles was determined that this marriage should only take place as part of a package which also included a permanent settlement of the Palatinate for his sister and her family, and therefore left Spain and took measures which delayed the completion of the marriage to which he had in theory already agreed.<sup>4</sup> With Charles and James having both proceeded in these marriage negotiations upon the assumption that it would include a settlement for the Palatinate their relative positions at this point only differed rather than diverged, in that where James perceived it as merely another minor setback in a long chain of events and was therefore still disposed to believe that Spanish intentions were sincere and only needed confirming, armed with personal knowledge of their duplicity and feeling that his personal honour had been slighted, to Charles it represented a potential turning point. What happened in relation to this potential split between Charles and James therefore depended to a great extent upon the true intentions of the Spanish; and as a means of settling this issue towards the middle of November 1623 James ordered the Earl of Bristol to press for an unequivocal answer from Philip IV. as to what action they were prepared to take in securing the restitution of the Palatinate, which provoking no positive response finally persuaded Charles to call for an end to all negotiations as a precursor to military action, in the process effectively forging a role for himself as leader of a war party.<sup>5</sup> However, with James having no intention of rushing into war, let alone of handing over power, it was no easy task for Charles to

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles had informed Sir Walter Aston how that " I do really intend and desire this match, and...so that we may have satisfaction concerning the Palatinate, I will be content to forget all ill usage and be hearty friends. But if not, I can never match where I have had so dry entertainment...". Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 161/2, 164, 169.

<sup>5</sup> On the 15 November 1623 Charles had ordered Bristol to inform the Spanish " that except that King will promise some way underhand to help my father with his arms (in case mediation fail) to restore my brother-in-law to his honours and inheritances, there can neither be marriage nor friendship...". Sir Charles Petrie, ed., Letters of Charles I. pp. 32-3. 15 November 1623. Whitehall. Prince Charles - Earl of Bristol.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 174.

put these ideas into action; for whilst the unpopularity of the Spanish match ensured that he and Buckingham enjoyed a good deal of support amongst those who had hitherto opposed them, he really needed to persuade those ministers who were still advising James to continue advancing them in the hope of securing improved conditions or avoiding war. James's known preferences and the likelihood such ministers would provide advice unwelcome to Charles made it probable that king and prince would soon be at odds.

Given the extent to which he was to later emphasise the strength of royal authority in his own reign it is somewhat surprising that Charles did not realise this and accept things as they stood. Further he demonstrates that what was later shielded behind an emphasis upon authority was in reality merely a stubborn determination to get his own way. When ministers failed to comply with his policy Charles attempted to replace them with others better disposed to his ends. This was shown by his role in the removal of Lord Treasurer Middlesex and the appointment of Sir James Ley and Sir Robert Naunton as lord treasurer and Master of the Court of Wards in his place.

James's reluctance to break off negotiations with Spain depended to a great extent upon his fear that parliament would be unwilling to finance the war which would be necessary in order to restore the Palatinate in its place. The advice given to him by his lord treasurer, Lionel, Earl of Middlesex was thus very important. Middlesex was aware of the huge demands which war would place upon royal finances (both in terms of increased expenditure and disruption to trade) and the extent to which this would cripple his plans for retrenchment. He had also been a consistent advocate of the Spanish Match. <sup>6</sup> As a trusted councillor whose opinion James respected it was vital that Charles and Buckingham managed to gain Middlesex's support; but with the financial position of the Crown having worsened (to a large extent due to the expense of their trip to Spain) rather than improved, Middlesex saw no reason to alter his advice of continuing negotiations with Spain, especially when he knew that James himself was opposed to war and was reluctant to abandon diplomacy. <sup>7</sup> His refusal to

---

<sup>6</sup>  
366.

Prestwich, Cranfield. p.

<sup>7</sup>  
At a meeting of the  
Privy Council on Tuesday 27 January 1624 despite the

alter his position represented a major obstacle to Charles and Buckingham, and left them with the alternatives of accepting defeat or attempting to replace him with somebody more sympathetic to their ends. Charles was convinced of the righteousness of his cause and there was no question of him accepting defeat. Yet with James still very much in control of all major political decisions there was very little chance of him agreeing to any exchange of officers which might severely weaken his own position, Charles consequently gambling upon the use of force in conjunction with parliament as a means of getting his own way.

Although James still sincerely hoped for a diplomatic solution to the Palatinate, he had at least learnt from his mistakes that in order to succeed he would have to negotiate from a position of strength. This was in part provided by the pro-war policies advocated by Charles and Buckingham, but James was realistic enough to realise that these would be viewed as nothing but empty gestures unless supported by firm financial backing, and had therefore agreed to the calling of a parliament, which being likely to take a similar line, would allow him to maintain a number of avenues of action; for if it prompted Spain to make new concessions, then he could achieve what he had always wanted, and if it did not, then he would be in a strong position to reluctantly press ahead with plans for a war. However, the success of this policy depended entirely upon James's ability to play the various groups off against each other without giving the impression that they were being duped, and it was upon this factor that Charles and Buckingham based their plan for removing Middlesex; for knowing that he had created many enemies at Court through his policy of

---

prince having " showed himself very averse from the match as well in regard of matter of state as of religion..." Middlesex had not only advocated continued negotiations, but had bluntly informed Charles that he " ought to submit his private distaste therein to the general good and honour of the kingdom ". This not only challenged Charles's objectives, but (with an element of truth) also inferred that his motives were entirely personal -Letters John Chamberlain. Vol. II. 10 April 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 541. 31 January 1624. London. Same - Same.; Prestwich, Cranfield. p. 426.; Tawney, Business and Politics. p. 235.

retrenchment, was unpopular in parliament because of his pro-Spanish policies, and above all that James would be unable to protect him without losing the support of parliament and discrediting them, they resorted to the old parliamentary procedure of impeachment.<sup>8</sup> More experienced than either his son or favourite, and not focussed like them merely upon short-term objectives, James realised that the only true winner of this situation would be the institution of parliament, which would hereafter be able to claim legitimately the right to question the king's ministers; but as Charles and Buckingham had correctly assumed, given the united front against Middlesex it was impossible for James to take sides, and all that he could do was " make a speech to the Lords in favour of the lord treasurer " which was " so ambiguous that it might receive a contrary construction, for it began with mercy and ended with judgement...", and concede in their sentence of his removal from office and imprisonment.<sup>9</sup>

However, with this only ever being intended as a means of persuading James to break with Spain, this meant nothing unless Buckingham and Charles were able to replace him with someone more conducive to his ends, and achieving this was to be much more difficult; for whilst James had concurred in the removal of Middlesex, this was only because not to have done so would have threatened the pursuit of his wider

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 238.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 193.; Prestwich, Cranfield. p. 434.; L.L. Peck, Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England. (London,1990). pp. 189-90.; For the underlying resentment against Middlesex which Charles and Buckingham tapped into see M.B. Young, ' Illusions of Grandeur ', pp. 53-73, in HJ.

<sup>9</sup> Sir Edward Coke (along with Sir Edwin Sandys) was Middlesex's sternest pursuer in this impeachment. It is interesting to note that he had long-standing connections with Prince Charles, who in 1624 had personally intervened to prevent him from being sent on a commission into Ireland as James had wished. Hirst, Authority and Conflict. (London,1992). p. 135.; CSPD,1611-1618. p. 413. 14 December 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPD,1623-1625. p. 144. 3 January 1624. London. Same Same.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 559. 13 May 1624. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 561. 5 June 1624. London. Same - Same.

objectives, not because there had been a shift in the real balance of power.<sup>10</sup> James was therefore as keenly aware as Charles of the fact that the appointment of a treasurer would have an important bearing upon which diplomatic options were open to him; and determined to keep them as wide as possible, he attempted to keep Charles and Buckingham on board by delaying the appointment of a new treasurer whilst favouring his own immediate plans through handing over its duties in the mean time to Sir Richard Weston, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The patent for this arrangement was ready to pass the Seal by 24 May 1624, but had been formed without the knowledge of the prince, who (with Weston having previously enjoyed close connections with Middlesex and supported a continuation of the Spanish Match) as soon as he found out immediately set about opposing it, informing Lord Keeper Williams that he "...gave no approbation of the course, and (although he durst not speak to cross it) he hoped I [Williams] should have directions from the king to pull of the seals again...", hoping to " effectuate all that he spake...".<sup>11</sup> However, Charles found it impossible to get James to change his mind, and with the passing of Weston's commission "...during the vacancy of the lord treasurer's office...", his attention now turned to influencing the selection of permanent replacements to Middlesex's two main offices of lord treasurer and Master of the Court of Wards, his

---

<sup>10</sup> The political nature of Charles's dispute with Middlesex can be seen in that once he had been removed from office he had intervened to prevent him from being sent to the Tower before sentencing, John Chamberlain marvelling that they " proceeded no further to degrade him upon so many and so just reasons...". Two weeks later James gave him a clear sign of his favour through ordering his release from the Tower.; Ibid., p. 559. 13 May 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 264. 1 June 1624. Patrick Maule - Duke of Buckingham.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 198.

<sup>11</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 541. 31 January 1624. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 153. 24 May 1624. Westminster College. Lord Keeper Williams - Duke of Buckingham.

choice eventually falling upon Sir James Ley as lord treasurer, and Sir Robert Naunton as Master of the Court of Wards.<sup>12</sup>

Both of these candidates enjoyed close relations with the Duke of Buckingham, Sir James Ley having married Buckingham's niece, Jane Boteler, in June 1621, and Sir Robert Naunton being a cousin of Buckingham's mother; but whilst this meant that he was almost certainly backing their appointment, and may even have recommended them to the prince, this is not to say that it was either not in keeping with Charles's objectives or contrary to his usual insistence of personal knowledge and observation.

<sup>13</sup> As Sir James Ley was an established and respected puritan lawyer who after losing out on promotion to the position of attorney general to Sir Henry Yelverton in 1617 had in 1621 been appointed Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench in the place of Henry, Viscount Mandeville (upon his promotion as lord treasurer), and who later that same year had only narrowly missed out upon appointment to the position of lord keeper upon the impeachment of Sir Francis Bacon, and was in any case personally known to the prince through being a member of the council which managed his estates and revenues.<sup>14</sup> Whilst Sir Robert Naunton would have been equally well

---

<sup>12</sup> PRO.S03/8. May 1624. A commission to Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, to execute by himself, (during the vacancy of the lord treasurer's office) all such things as by commission, privy seals, or warrants, are appointed to be done by the lord treasurer, and Chancellor of the Exchequer jointly together. Subscribed Attorney General upon signification of his majesty's pleasure, and by him procured.; Alexander, -Weston. p. 65.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 568. 3 July 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.

<sup>13</sup> Halliwell, ed., Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Vol. I. pp. 160, 174.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 337. 3 February 1621. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 68.; R.E. Schreiber, The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635. (London, 1981). p. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Ley's advancement was clearly already well established before his marriage to Buckingham's niece.; Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. p. 339.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 40-1.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 59. 8 March 1617. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 337. 3



known to Charles for the part which he had played as Secretary of State in conjunction with Charles's own secretary (Sir Thomas Murray) in advancing a scheme to secure him a French rather than a Spanish marriage, as a consequence of which of which he had been at first suspended and then remove from office.<sup>15</sup> However, whilst Sir James Ley deferred his departure on the Assize circuit in expectation of his appointment, and Sir Robert Naunton was widely linked to the mastership of the wards, there were to be no immediate appointments; as with James's policies apparently paying off in new propositions brought over from Spain by Padre Maestro, and with him still not being completely recovered from the shock of the suggestion by the Spanish Ambassador that Buckingham through Charles was planning to retire him him " to his sports " and take over the government in person, he saw no need to make further moves in this direction at this time; James himself apparently favouring the

---

February 1621. London. Same - Same.; --Ibid., p. 382. 9 June 1621. London. Same - Same.; Court and Times of James I. p. 244. 31 March 1621. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 1718. f. 19. 29 December 1619. Warrants of Charles, Prince of Wales 1617-1625. Whitehall. Prince Charles - various, including Ley, constituting them a council to regulate his estate and revenues.

<sup>15</sup> Naunton and Murray were suspended from office in January 1621, in which state despite constant rumours of their impending removal or re-appointment they remained until the winter of 1622-3, when Naunton was replaced by Sir Edward Conway, and Murray as secretary to the prince by Sir Francis Cottington. Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 37-8.; Schreiber, Naunton. pp. 68, 89-90.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 339. 3 February 1621. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 399. 13 October 1621. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 455. 5 October 1622. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 463. 16 November 1622. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 471. 4 January 1623. London. Same - Same. p. 474. 25 January 1623. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 401. 20 October 1621. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 455. 5 October 1622. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 160. 26 October 1622. London. Same - Same.; BL. Egerton 2594. f. 83. 24 August 1621. St. Martin's Lane. George Calvert - Viscount Dorchester.; HMC, Fourth Report. Appendix IV. p. 22. 22 October. Undated, but almost certainly 1621. Nicholas Bacon - his uncle, Sir Nathaniel Bacon.; Havran, Cottington. p. 65.

permanent appointment of Sir Richard Weston, so much so that by the end of August 1624 it was being reported how that he "...hath brought or hired Winchester House in Broad Street, and is busy in tricking and trimming it up, whereupon, the voice goes strongly that he shall be lord treasurer...".<sup>16</sup> With these rumours being accompanied by reports that Sir Robert Pye (the Writer of the Tallies in the Exchequer who also acted as Buckingham's financial adviser) was to be appointed as Chancellor of the Exchequer and his brother Sir Walter (the attorney of the Court of Wards, "...a great man about the Lord of Buckingham " and a member of the council regulating the prince's revenue) appointed as Master of the Court of Wards, this may have been part of a compromise package devised by James in order to secure Charles and Buckingham's support for the appointment of Weston; but if it was then it clearly failed, for whilst it acknowledged their interest in these positions, it completely ignored the political objectives which lay behind them, and they therefore persevered in advocating the appointment of Ley and Naunton.<sup>17</sup> There was no way in which James's original intention of securing a new diplomatic deal with Spain could have been reconciled with the appointment of Ley or Naunton, but with new Spanish offers proving as illusory as the old ones, he gradually came to see the need for some kind

---

<sup>16</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 568. 3 July 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley - Carleton.; Ibid., p. 572. 24 July 1624. London. Same - Same.; Ibid. p. 556. 30 April 1624. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 577. 21 August 1624. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 577. 21 August 1624. London. Same - Same.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 126-7, 184-187, 192-198.; CSPD, 1623-1625. p. 225. 25 April 1624. Note by Secretary Conway of the Spanish Ambassador's statement against Buckingham.; Schreiber, Naunton. p. 96.

<sup>17</sup> J.C. Sainty, ed., Officers of the Exchequer. List and Index Society. Special Series. Vol. 18. (London, 1983). p. 207.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 121, 212.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 204. 23 January 1619. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 577. 21 August 1624. London. Same - Same.; PRO. LC2/6. 1625. Sir Walter Pye, Attorney of the Court of Wards, one of the councillors and commissioners of the prince's revenue.

of military action, although only upon the best possible terms for the Crown; for unlike Charles and Buckingham he realised that it was as important to bargain with parliament from a position of strength as it was the Spanish, and therefore rather than making a clear demonstration of his change in emphasis and then asking for the money required to implement it he instead concealed it, thereby not only avoiding committing himself to a war without the funds necessary to implement it, but also maintaining control of the type of war which evolved. For with James seemingly reluctant to enter into any kind of war, Charles and Buckingham had had no option but to proceed along the path set by him and focus their attention upon securing armed intervention in the Palatinate through the formulation of a non-confessional alliance based upon a French marriage.<sup>18</sup> With James reluctant to burn any political bridges whilst this policy remained up in the air, that summer he consistently opposed the appointment of Ley, Naunton or any other in the knowledge that this would be taken as an indication of his wider intentions; but as they gradually came to fruition through the efforts of Charles and Buckingham that autumn it became increasingly important that he ensured the success of what he had already secured through a definite sign of support rather than standing out for better terms.

With James having promised Sir Robert Naunton upon his removal from office that " he should have a better place than that he left, both for preferment and profit...", the repeated reports over his reluctance to see " the re-appearance of a disgraced minister in his government " that summer could only have been a politically motivated response to the signal which his re-appointment would send out at a time when he was still attempting to induce improved offers from parliament and perhaps still even Spain; which being removed towards the end of September 1624 through the virtual completion of the French marriage negotiations, and with James now wishing to send out another message, finally paved the way for Naunton's return to the government, being informed of his appointment as Master of the Court of Wards on Thursday 30 September and formally sworn in office the following Monday.<sup>19</sup> Similar factors

---

<sup>18</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 182-3.

<sup>19</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 572. 24 July 1624. London. John

appear to have lain behind the appointment of Sir James Ley, as with the military alliance with France proceeding at a similar pace as that of Charles's marriage, the lack of a permanent lord treasurer with the necessary authority to deal with the increased expenditure and accounting which war would inevitably bring could not be delayed much longer; and whilst James himself had nothing against Sir Richard Weston, with his earlier pro-Spanish views making him unacceptable to Charles and Buckingham and unlikely to be able to gain the support of parliament in the session which was planned for once the marriage had been settled and which was to pave the way for future action, towards the end of the summer recess he had been persuaded to offer it to Sir James Ley.<sup>20</sup> But with Ley apparently finding some difficulty in raising the fine of entry before the start of the Michaelmas law term, he was promised the treasury but forced to sit for the rest of the term as Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench; and with the financial problems by then being resolved, either through an arrangement by which he paid an annual rent rather than a lump sum as security or through that term's dues, he was sworn of the Privy Council and began sitting there as lord treasurer on Saturday 18 December 1624, although not formally appointed until the following Monday.<sup>21</sup> With Charles having gone against the wishes of his own

---

Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 580. 4 September 1624. London. Same - Same.; --Ibid., p. 582. 9 October 1624. London. Same - Same.; Schreiber, Naunton. pp. 95-6.; PRO. SO3/8. August 1624. The office of Master of the Court of Wards and --Liveries...granted to Sir Robert Naunton, kt., during his life... Subscribed by order from the lord keeper. Procured Secretary Conway.; Cowper, I. p. 172. 1 October 1624. John Coke - Lord Brooke.; PRO. C115/N3/8536. 15 October 1624. Whitehall. Henry Herbert - Sir John Scudamore.; Court and Times of James I. p. 491. 21 January 1625. London. To the Reverend Joseph Mead.

<sup>20</sup>

Alexander, Weston. p.

73.

<sup>21</sup>

John Chamberlain

informed Sir Dudley Carleton that Sir Ranulphe Crewe's appointment as Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench had been "deferred so long that the lord treasurer might have the dividend and benefit of this term...". Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. pp. 582-3. 9 October 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 585. 23 October 1624. London. Same

father in using force to remove one of his ministers and pressing for his replacement by those favourable to his own cause this clearly demonstrates the self-centered and divisive nature of his attitude to politics and the use of patronage even at this early stage. And whilst in delaying these appointments until after such time as he had set down his preconditions for taking military action James had ultimately ensured that they had served his purpose rather than Charles's, in the process Charles's actions had nevertheless posed as many if not more problems to him than Henry ever had, and it had only been through using all of his vast political experience that he had managed to maintain control.

In direct contrast to the sharp divisions which they had caused within the royal family, though, Charles's political assumptions had caused remarkably few problems in his relations with parliament at this time; for whilst he had (perhaps deliberately after Henry) never been promoted as a popular figure, his return from Spain unmarried in 1623 had been met with widespread rejoicing, and his subsequent attempts to put an end to the treaties with Spain received widespread support.<sup>22</sup> However, this was neither a consequence of careful planning and the use of patronage on the part of Charles, nor of unquestioning obedience on the part of parliament, but of particular political circumstances in which their immediate objectives had happened to coincide. For although Buckingham had been able to make the best of the situation

---

- Same.; Ibid., p. 568. 3 July 1624. London. Same -  
Same.; Ibid., p. 572. 24 July 1624. London. Same -  
Same.; Ibid., p. 587. 6 November 1624. London. Same -  
Same.; --Ibid., pp. 591-2. 18 December 1624. Same -  
Same; Ibid., p. 599. 12 February 1625. Same - Same.;  
Ibid., p. 595. 8 January 1625. London. Same - Same.;  
PRO. C115/N3/8536. 15 October 1624. Whitehall. Henry  
Herbert - Sir John Scudamore.; Ornsby, ed.,  
Correspondence of John Cosin. Pt. I. p. 30. 28 November  
1624. Petworth. Richard Montagu - John Cosin.;  
Alexander, Weston. p. 65.; APC, 1623-1625. pp. 399, 401.  
18 December 1624.; Ibid., p. 404. 20 December 1624. "  
this day Sir James Ley, kt. and bt., was sworn Lord High  
Treasurer of England by express order from his Majesty.

<sup>22</sup>

Thomas Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match', pp. 107-133, in Conflict in Early Stuart England. pp. 107-9.

through forming alliances with such leading parliamentary figures as Sir Robert Phelips, Sir Dudley Digges and Sir Edwin Sandys, Charles himself had only worked with parliament because it provided the sole means by which he could overcome his lack of influence in the face of James's opposition to his plans of securing war against Spain and secure the funds required in order to finance them, whilst acting under the political umbrella provided by him had offered them their best hope of ending the unpopular negotiations with Spain, it only being James's reluctance to break with Spain which ensured that discussions focussed upon basic issues which Charles and the majority of those present in parliament could agree.<sup>23</sup> This apparent harmony therefore masked deep-seated divisions which would come to light once discussions moved from the probable repercussions of a break with Spain to a more detailed consideration of the policies and levels of funding required in order to replace them. This was originally intended to have taken place in a second session of the 1624 parliament later that year, but postponed three times because of delays in the marriage negotiations with France and the arrival of Henrietta Maria, it did not take place until 18 June 1625, by which time Charles himself had become king.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Buckingham appears to have used the prospect of future preferment as a means of gaining the support of these important figures. Phelips was seeking a Court office to replace the position of extraordinary gentleman of Prince Henry's privy chamber which he had lost in 1612, Digges expected to become Lieutenant of Dover when Buckingham purchased the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports from Lord Zouch, whilst Sandys appears to have held out hopes of being appointed secretary or at least a privy councillor.; Birch, Life of Henry. p. 347.; SRO. DD/Ph/216. f. 32. 23 March 1624. Whitehall. Sir Robert Harley - Sir Robt. Phelips.; SRO.DD/Ph/219. f. 33. Undated, March 1625. Westminster. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 582. 9 October 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; p. 613. 23 April 1625. London. Same - Same.

<sup>24</sup> Hacket states that the 1624 parliament had been " prorogued to another against that spring ". After the death of James another was summoned for the 17 May, but this was delayed the 18..; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. pp. 3-4.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 241.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. p. 28. Commons Journal. 18 June 1625 and footnote.

Although James had eventually come round to breaking ties with Spain and sanctioning formal military action in the despatch of an expedition to the Palatinate under the mercenary Count von Mansfeld, this and the restrictions which he had placed upon it had fallen so far short of the assistance which Charles had been pressing for over the best part of six years that although he must have been personally affected by it, given the extensive plans which he had formulated by this time in political terms he must nevertheless have experienced a great sense of liberation upon his father's death at the prospect of being able to implement them. However, political freedom had only been the most immediate rather than the only problem which Charles would have to overcome before he could see his policies implemented; for with his commitments of preparing a fleet against Spain and subsidising the actions of his uncle Christian IV. of Denmark and Mansfeld on mainland Europe already costing in the region of a million pounds a year, he also had to find a means of financing them; which with the Crown only being able to meet half such a sum from its own income, meant that he was deeply dependent upon the willingness of his people to support his policies in parliament.<sup>25</sup> His initial intention had been to re-convene his father's last parliament and his subsequent haste to issue writs from Chancery to summon a new one upon being informed by Lord Keeper Williams that such a move would be illegal, suggests that Charles had convinced himself that the co-operation of the 1624 parliament had been an endorsement of his entire policy rather than just one specific element of it.<sup>26</sup> He could only hope that of 1625 would prove to be similarly co-operative. For by then the political scene had altered considerably; for whilst a majority of those in parliament in 1624 had been willing to consider war as the price to pay for breaking off relations with Spain, with this secured and the Spaniards having offered no response this earlier sense of military

---

<sup>25</sup> Barry Coward, The Stuart Age. A History of England 1603-1714. (London, 1980). p. 137.; Quintrell, Charles I. p. 16.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 247.

<sup>26</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. p. 3.; STC. 9246. " A declaration of the true causes which moved his Majesty to assemble and...dissolve the last two meetings of parliament ".

enthusiasm had by now disappeared. James, Charles and Buckingham had already ignored the terms of preparation and defence upon which parliament had granted funds in the 1624 Subsidy Act in order to finance the expensive yet disastrous expedition to the Palatinate under Mansfeld; since then Charles had married a Catholic princess, and as part of the marriage treaty he and James had agreed to a de facto toleration of Catholics at home and to lend a fleet of English ships to the French without specifying or restricting its use. Moreover, the opening parliament of a reign was traditionally used as a means of taking general stock of country grievances. When it met in 1625 it was more concerned with settling problems at home and improving defences than taking on new ones abroad.<sup>27</sup> This was especially so as parliament was uncertain about war aims and lacked confidence in Buckingham's direction. Given Charles's dependence upon parliament for financial support this divergence in outlook meant that it was always going to be a difficult task for him to secure his objective of war against Spain; but whilst the situation was serious it was not necessarily desperate, provided that he was able to use his influence over the formulation of policy and the distribution of patronage as a means of overcoming it. The reception of Charles's policies in the 1624 parliament had depended to a great extent upon his political stance in opposition to his father providing an official outlet through which a majority of those in parliament could secure their objectives. In order to enjoy similar success in 1625 he would have to prove equally adept at providing outlets through which he could harness the support of others in his aims, which in practical terms given his objective of securing war against Spain meant courting the inherent anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish militarism of the godly through a confessional self-financing blue-water policy against the Spanish treasure-fleet which had been preceded or was at least accompanied by a tightening of the laws against Recusants at home and a reduction in the role played by Buckingham.<sup>28</sup> However, because of the assumptions of obedience upon which he based his actions, this was something which Charles was unable to do.

---

<sup>27</sup> Thompson, ' Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625 ', pp. 168-192, in Conflict in Early Stuart England. p. 170.

<sup>28</sup> Quintrell, Charles I. p. 17.



Under James it had been normal practice to make preparations in advance of the calling of a parliament, not only in terms of policy through ensuring that the government had an agenda which it could follow or by anticipating likely grievances, but more importantly in terms of direct patronage through ensuring that the Crown enjoyed sufficient proponents of its policies by a consideration of " what persons in particular, in respect of their gravity, discretion, temper, and ability to persuade, are fit to be brought in to be of the house..." through the " boroughs of the Cinque Ports, and of the Duchy, and other boroughs at the devotion of diverse the king's councillors...", this process being implemented under the direction of Lord Chancellor Bacon in both 1614 and 1621. <sup>29</sup> This same course was also attempted by Lord Keeper Williams in 1625, who upon discovering Charles's intention of calling parliament the day after James's death informed him, according to Hacket, how " that it was usual in times before, that the king's servants, and trustiest friends did deal with the countries, cities, and boroughs where they were known, to procure a promise for their elections...before the precise time of an infrequent parliament be published...". <sup>30</sup> But with Charles believing that he had already secured their support in 1624, and in any case assuming that given the circumstances he had an inherent right to expect their support, he ignored this advice and displaying his determination after so many years delay to set about implementing his policies merely reminded him how that " it was high time to have subsidies granted for the maintaining of a war with the King of Spain, and the fleet [to]..go forth for that purpose in the summer...", this attitude resulting in a marked decline in the number of MPs returned by the Crown from a

---

<sup>29</sup> James Spedding, ed., Bacon. Vol. IV. pp. 366-7. Undated. c.June 1613 - January 1614. Bacon's incidents upon the calling of a parliament.; Ibid., pp. 368-73. Undated. c.June 1613 - January 1614. Lord Chancellor Bacon - James I.; Ibid., Vol. VII. pp. 114-5. 2 October 1620. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 115-117. 7 October 1620. Bacon - Marquess of Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 117. 9 October 1620. Royston. Buckingham Bacon.; Ibid., p. 155. 23 December 1620. Bacon - Buckingham.; J.K. Gruenfelder, Influence in Early Stuart Elections. (Ohio,1981). pp. 60-1.

<sup>30</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 3.

high of forty-two in 1624, to twenty-two in 1625 and just seventeen in 1628.<sup>31</sup> Over the reign as a whole there was no doubt an ideological element in this reduction as the electorate deliberately shunned candidates associated with the unpopular policies of the Crown, but when taken together with such events as the late arrival of Buckingham's letters of recommendation as lord admiral to the boroughs of the Cinque Ports (previously the mainstay of royal influence), the significant reduction of just under half between 1624 and 1625 (when the full scope of Charles's policies had yet to be revealed) would appear solely to have been a consequence of Charles's cavalier attitude to the need of securing political support.<sup>32</sup> This can be confirmed not only by his failure to build upon the connections which Buckingham had established with influential members of the commons, but in his actions throughout the whole range of his patronage.

In securing the replacement of Lord Treasurer Middlesex with candidates more conducive to his ends and attempting to remove the the Earl of Bristol from his position of vice-chamberlain as a means of persuading James to enter into a war against Spain Charles had shown himself both willing and able to use the distribution

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 34.; Gruenfelder, Influence.  
p. 71.

<sup>32</sup> Charles's influence over patronage undermined the basis upon which Buckingham had manipulated the 1624 parliament through using Phelips, Sandys and Digges as undertakers, as none of them had received the appointments which they had expected. With this leading them to suspect that Buckingham either lacked the influence to secure preferments or had betrayed them they saw little reason to support the line which he was advancing in 1625.; Derek Hirst, The Representative of the People ? Voters and Voting in England under the Early Stuarts. (Cambridge, 1975). p. 9.; J.K. Gruenfelder, ' The Lord Wardens and Elections 1604-1628 ', pp. 1-23, in JBS. Vol. 16. 1976.; Gruenfelder, Influence. pp. 147-151.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. p. 693. 8 April 1625. Whitehall. Duke of Buckingham - Officials of Mitchell.; Ibid., p. 606.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 582. 9 October 1624. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 613. 23 April 1625. London. Same - Same.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. f. 33. Undated, March 1625. Westminster. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robt. Phelips.

of patronage as a political tool.<sup>33</sup> But that he had acted in this way was not because he had believed that it was necessary to secure the support of parliament but because it had been the only way which he could hope to get James to change his policies; and with James dead and Charles himself now king his natural stubbornness and determination to get his own way had found a natural expression in the inherent authority of the Crown, and he therefore no longer felt the need to secure wider political support. So rather than using the opportunity of James's death to promote a number of people favourable to his cause, believing all would be equally obedient he essentially re-appointed his own household servants and the ministers of his father as a means of providing the least possible disruption to his objective of securing war against Spain; and then when any vacancies subsequently occurred took patronage back into his own hands through personally selecting candidates for appointment primarily on the basis of his own observations and preferences as a means of bringing his household and government more into line with his personal preferences rather than a means of strengthening a particular religious or political group who supported his policies, this meaning that even such "popular" appointments as he considered were a consequence of purely personal factors, made without any intention of increasing the support of the Crown, this being clearly demonstrated, for example, in his decision upon the removal of Lord Keeper Williams to offer the position to Dr. John Preston.

After Lord Keeper Williams's removal from office in October 1625 Charles's first choice as replacement appears to have been Lord Chief Justice Hobart, in whose character and ability to hold such a position he would have been confident through his having been his chancellor and Keeper of his Great Seal as prince since 1615.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> With Bristol continuing to support a Spanish match in May 1624 Charles and Buckingham had sent Edward Clark to try and persuade him to resign his position at Court. Bristol refused, and remained in office until his patent was made void by the death of James. Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. Lords' Journal. p. 366.

<sup>34</sup> Foss reports that Buckingham "endeavoured to induce Chief Justice Hobart to complain of his [Williams's] unfitness for his place on account

However, Hobart was by this time an old man, who only living for another two months was perhaps already suffering from ill-health, and therefore turned the offer down, upon which it was offered to Dr. John Preston, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. <sup>35</sup> Preston's popularity as a preacher had gained him the reputation as "the leader of the puritan party", which having also given him a great deal of political influence amongst those of that persuasion, made him just the sort of person Charles needed to be courting in order to increase support for his policy of war against Spain. <sup>36</sup> But whilst at first sight this appears to have been an example of Charles using patronage as a political tool, when it is looked at more closely it can in fact be seen to have merely been due to Charles's marked preference for promoting known faces, any political factors being purely coincidental. The offer of this post to Preston is usually attributed to Buckingham, which Irvonwy Morgan asserts was an attempt "to separate Preston from the [Puritan] party, and tie him more closely to himself". <sup>37</sup> But while Buckingham's position depended to a great extent upon his success in administering Charles's war policy, and he would obviously have welcomed such a supportive appointment, it is worth remembering that Preston was already well known to the king. For Preston had been one of Charles's chaplains when prince, who being with him at Theobalds when James had died in March 1625, had in a clear sign

---

of his ignorance and inability", and had offered Hobart his place if he did. Charles's, though, was likely to have been aware that Williams had only been appointed for a term of three years, and that therefore that no excuse was required to remove him. Either Buckingham was unaware of this and had been attempting to secure Williams's removal through -Hobart in the knowledge that Charles usually appointed old servants, or more likely that his role as mediator for the king and the reasons which he had given for his actions had been misinterpreted as his.; Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. p. 335.; BL. Additional 15630. f. 66v. Commissions under the Great Seal of Charles, Prince of Wales. 3rd April 1616. The office of Chancellor to the prince granted to Sir Henry Hobart.

<sup>35</sup> Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. pp. 220, 385.; Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 276-7.

<sup>36</sup> Morgan, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain. p. 11.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 83.

of personal favour " accompanied him and Buckingham back to London in a closed coach administering spiritual consolation ", something which evidently continued, for not only was he reported in 1625 as " a man of special favour with the king " and re-appointed as a chaplain in ordinary, but was still preaching at Court in this capacity in 1627, by which time he had clearly broken all ties with Buckingham.<sup>38</sup> So whilst Preston may have enjoyed some connections with Buckingham, he also enjoyed a personal relationship with the king himself through being one of his chaplains, it being possible to demonstrate that this alone formed the basis of Charles's offer to appoint him lord keeper.

With Sir Henry Hobart being encouraged to complain of Williams, the offer of the position to him must have come between Williams first being informed of the king's displeasure with him around 20 September and Secretary Conway's receipt of Charles's order to inform him that he should relinquish the seal on 11 October.<sup>39</sup> By 17 October, though, it was being reported with some confidence that Sir Thomas Coventry was to replace him, which places the decision to offer the position to Preston at some point during the early part of October; the significance of this being that it was the same month in which Preston waited as a chaplain in ordinary before the king, something which would have been settled some months before.<sup>40</sup> The large part which Charles's chaplains played in his Church patronage was because it gave him an opportunity of personal contact and selection; and with this desire to draw patronage back into his own hands applying as much in relation to the position of lord keeper as any Church preferment, it would appear that rather than being based upon any political considerations, Charles had been prompted to offer the position to

---

<sup>38</sup> PRO. LC2/6. f. 70v. 1625. List of Prince Charles's chaplains.; Morgan, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain. pp. 82-3.

<sup>39</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 19.

<sup>40</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. V. p. 443. 17 October 1625. Salisbury. Sir John North - Earl of Leicester.; Preston's month of waiting as a chaplain is noted in Peter White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic. (Cambridge, 1992). p. 248.

Preston because of his long acquaintance with him and the fact that he had been preaching before him when he had been considering Williams's replacement.

Since Williams was himself a Churchman there was no reason why Preston should not have been offered the post or accepted it. But throughout his career Preston had "rejected the more administrative posts in favour of those where personal influence and persuasion could win men to the Puritan cause"; and realising that the personal nature of Charles's selection meant that his appointment would not be accompanied by any political or religious change which would provide any scope for this, like Hobart he declined, leaving Charles to look for a replacement for a second time, by Monday 17 October 1625 it being common knowledge that it was to be Attorney General Coventry, the current attorney general, who was formally appointed on the Sunday 30 October 1625.<sup>41</sup>

With such people as Preston and Coventry being considered or appointed to high office Charles's patronage was by no means narrow at this time, but in order for it to have formed the basis of a successful policy aimed at increasing support for his policies it would have had to have been consistently implemented and accompanied by a corresponding alteration in his policies; but in being based upon personal and not political considerations, and with Charles therefore expecting everyone to act in accordance with his objectives, this was not the case, not only meaning that Charles gained very little political advantage from making them, but that they actually began to work against him in that those nearest to him were the most aware of the gap

---

<sup>41</sup> Coventry was another popular choice. He was possibly recommended by Preston, who would have known him through his being counsel for Emmanuel College). If so his advice was likely to have gained added resonance in that Charles already knew Coventry and it was normal for the attorney general to be promoted lord keeper; Morgan, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain, pp. 145-147.; De l'Isle, Vol. V. p. 443. 17 October 1625. Salisbury. Sir John North - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 441. 4 November 1625. Same - Same.; Cowper, I. p. 218. 18 October 1625. Sir John Coke - Fulke, Lord Brooke.; Works of William Laud, Vol. III. p. 174. Sunday 30 October 1625.; CSPD, 1625-1626. 24 October 1625. Sir John Suckling - Duke of Buckingham.; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, Pt. II. p. 18.; Kopperman, Heath. (Bury, 1989). p. 224.

which had opened up between him and his people and of the fact that there was no hope of an alteration from within the Court, Sir Thomas Coventry, for example, despite possessing " a clear conception of the whole policy of the government both of Church and State..." seldom speaking " in matters of State, which, he well knew, were for the most part concluded, before they were brought to that public agitation; never in foreign affairs, which the vigour of his judgment could well comprehend, nor indeed freely in anything but what immediately and plainly concerned the justice of the kingdom " .<sup>42</sup>

In using patronage in this way Charles was in effect pursuing what amounted to a dual policy of establishing the type of government he desired at home whilst pursuing war abroad, which given their differences in emphasis not only allowed a gap to open up between the policies which he was advancing and the support necessary in order to successfully implement them, but also meant that they were often working against one another. This being nowhere more clearly illustrated than in relation to the Church. During the early 1620s James had shown himself to be particularly adept at using the patronage and powers at his disposal as a means of increasing support for his foreign policy through using it as a means of bringing the outlook of the Church more into line with his objectives of securing a diplomatic solution to the Palatine crisis through a combination of tuning the pulpits, protecting high-Church clerics and a de facto toleration of his Catholic subjects so as to increase the number of his supporters.<sup>43</sup> Under Charles, however, there was no equivalent effort made in order to achieve this end. Any hope he had of securing his objective of securing funding for a war against Spain depended upon obtaining the support of the puritan gentry in the House of Commons, who were determined to see a tightening of the laws against Catholics, an end to the promotion of high-Church clerics and a general shift of the Church in a

---

<sup>42</sup> Boyle, Selections from Clarendon. p. 20.

<sup>43</sup> Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, ' The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I. and Charles I. ', pp. 23-49. in Kenneth Finch, ed., The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London, 1993). pp. 34-36.; Cogswell, ' England and the Spanish Match ', in Authority and Conflict. pp. 116-119.

more Protestant direction; yet Charles himself saw such matters as a separate issue for his concern alone, since he was intent on bringing the Church more into line with royal preferences on doctrine and ceremony through selecting candidates for its higher preferments predominantly from amongst his household chaplains. In this way, he discriminated against recalcitrants on both sides who dared challenge royal authority through breaking the terms of the 1626 proclamation for the Peace and Quiet of the Church. Nevertheless the enforcement of adherence to prescribed ceremony hit those of a more Protestant persuasion (upon whom Charles's only hope of securing war against Spain rested) particularly hard, and this worked against the success of his foreign policy. For whilst any hope of successfully implementing war against Spain depended upon adequate funding from parliament, this would not be forthcoming without a significant alteration in the objectives which Charles was attempting to achieve through the distribution of his patronage in the Church.<sup>44</sup>

In having consistently failed to use the patronage which was at his disposal as a means of building up a group favourable to his cause or use the influence which he held over the formulation of policy as a means of providing an outlet through which he could harness the natural enmity which many of the English people still felt for all things Spanish as in 1624, Charles had seriously reduced his prospects of being able to secure his objective of securing war against Spain even before his first parliament of 1625 had even met, which together with its pre-occupation with past grievances and domestic concerns and Charles's unwillingness to bargain over his position meant that neither the Westminster nor the Oxford (to where it was adjourned as a means of avoiding the plague and allowing Charles to give a hasty assent to the two subsidies which had been granted to welcome his to the Crown) sessions lived up to the already

---

<sup>44</sup> Charles's lack of consideration of the need for support can also be seen in his appointment of Richard Montagu as a chaplain in ordinary while his views were being questioned by the 1625 parliament, his decision to appoint Buckingham Chancellor of the University of Oxford during his impeachment, and his decision to dismiss the queen's French household in July 1626. He was dependent upon parliament for financial support, whilst the French were the main element in the anti-Habsburg alliance.



unrealistically high expectations which he held of them after 1624, consequently being dissolved on August 12 having granted nothing to directly support his war policy.<sup>45</sup> However, while Charles might in time have forgotten an unsuccessful parliament such as this he revived his failure in the lack of support from powerful voices. He did not use the criticisms of his policies by those who should have been his natural supporters as a guide by which he could move his policies in a direction which they could support, believing that he had a right to expect them to meet what he saw to be his just demands. Viewing politics very much in personal terms, Charles instead felt himself betrayed, and perceived it to have been the work of a few disaffected individuals. This had a politically devastating effect upon the way in which he now attempted to use his patronage in order to overcome it.<sup>46</sup> Rather than abandon his objectives or scale them down so as to reduce his dependence upon parliament, he instead almost immediately decided upon summoning another for early the next year. In his preparations for it he did not attempt to broaden his support or modify his policies so as to make them more acceptable to potential supporters, believing that most had been willing to support them without inducement. He now began to cause serious long-term political damage as in marked contrast to his willingness to use his patronage as a means of purchasing support he effectively began to use the negative patronage of disfavour as a political tool aimed at controlling parliament through the removal or suspension from office of those who he felt had opposed his policies. As in being directed at those who Charles felt had opposed him rather than a particular religious or political group his use of disfavour served little purpose in advancing his policies. Neither did it provide a guide by which people could regulate their actions. More seriously, though, it forced people into opposition and eroded the assumption that political and religious objectives could be obtained by working in conjunction

---

<sup>45</sup> Thompson, ' Court Politics ', in Authority and Conflict. p. 185.; Quintrell, Charles I. p. 18.; --Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 267-8.

<sup>46</sup> Charles appears to have picked up on the idea that his policies were being obstructed in parliament even before its dissolution, this perhaps explaining his later confidence that he had picked out its ringleaders. Thompson, ' Court Politics ', in Authority and Conflict. p. 185.

with the Crown. And with personal allegations of disobedience being hard to withdraw and not easily forgotten the problems which this caused tended to be long-term. Charles's use of patronage in this way is clearly demonstrated in the removal of Lord Keeper Williams and his selection of eight prominent MPs as a means of preventing them from sitting in the next parliament.

With Williams having thwarted a plan by which Charles had intended to secure the appointment of William Laud as Dean of Westminster in 1621 his relations with him had always been strained, and in the words of John Hacket after the death of James his "prosperity, or shall I say his honours, and Court favours, were now in their tropik...", a point clearly expressed in that whilst Williams was pointedly selected to end the last reign through preaching James's funeral sermon, it was his old adversary Laud (already firmly associated with Charles) who was to set off the new one through being selected by Charles "to preach a sermon before himself and the house of peers" in the 1625 parliament.<sup>47</sup> No doubt realising this, Williams had immediately offered to relinquish the seal, but with Charles's eyes firmly fixed upon settled government rather than change as a means of hastening war against Spain, and perhaps also reluctant to dismiss a long-standing and trusted servant of his fathers, he returned it to him again, "saying he knew no one fitter to be the keeper thereof...".<sup>48</sup> However, it was soon clear that Charles was not happy with Williams's approach, and given that James had promised him that whenever he resigned "he would place me [Williams] in as good a bishopric, or archbishopric, as he could", with rumours of the death of Toby Matthew, the Archbishop of York, in April-May 1625 it was widely rumoured

---

<sup>47</sup> In this way Williams was clearly tied to the late king and Laud to the new one. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 207. Pt. II. p. 3. Laud had been appointed Bishop of St. David's in November 1621, and Hacket writes "the prince since the time that by his patent he was styled Prince of Wales, had claimed the bishoprics of that Principality for his own chaplains...".; NLW Wynn of Gwydir. 1335. 29 April 1625. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. p. 159. Friday 1 April 1625.

<sup>48</sup> Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 211. 27th March 1625. Theobalds. Sir Richard Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

that Williams would " have the Archbishopric of York and resign the keepership..."<sup>49</sup> If this had actually come to fruition then Williams might have been treated like any other of James's old servants and avoided the problems which were to dog him throughout the 1620s and 1630s, but Matthews was not above spreading rumours of his own death. He did not however die until the 29 March 1628, and this left Williams to be removed from under less happy circumstances later that autumn.<sup>50</sup> Charles's decision to dissolve the 1625 parliament is quite rightly seen as a consequence of the opening attacks on the Duke of Buckingham by such members as Sir Francis Seymour (who called for an investigation into his actions as lord admiral), although not for the reasons usually expressed.<sup>51</sup> For whilst it had had the consequence of saving Buckingham this had not been its objective, its true cause being that " parliament had wished to touch his own sovereignty ", and that " he did not wish his servants to be molested [and] would employ one or many or nobody in his councils..."<sup>52</sup> With Charles believing that it had been attacks such as this which had been responsible for undermining his attempts to secure funding he was determined to remove those he felt were responsible before re-summoning another, amongst which number was now Lord Keeper Williams. There had been rumours over the summer of 1625 that when parliament re-adjourned at Oxford Williams would be their principal target, " whom they looked upon as a man not only improper for the place [as lord keeper, being a clergyman], but also as not having carried himself in it with such integrity as he should have done..."<sup>53</sup> Williams had one great advantage, though, which was that in being an accomplished courtier he possessed such a wide range of political contacts that whatever the circumstances he never became totally isolated,

---

<sup>49</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 613. 23 April 1625. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 215. 23 May 1625. Owen Wynn - Sir John Wynn.

<sup>50</sup> Le Neve, Fasti...York. p. 2

<sup>51</sup> Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. p. 458. 11 August 1625. Speech of Sir Francis Seymour.

<sup>52</sup> CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 147. 26 August 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>53</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 139. This may have prompted Williams's advice against allowing a second session of the 1625 parliament.

and over the summer was reported to have " so applied himself to some of their leading members, that he diverted them from himself to the Duke of Buckingham, as a more noble prey, and fitter for such mighty hunters than a silly priest...".<sup>54</sup> Whether Williams was responsible for the attack upon Buckingham is unclear, but in speaking to such members as Sir Robert Phelips as a means of organising his defence and then " abusing the king with ill counsel, advising him to veil his absolute sovereignty too much to a social communication with his subjects..." he had at least opened himself up to the suspicion of it.<sup>55</sup> Charles was already suspicious at this time of the propensity of his ministers and councillors to bow to parliamentary pressure in framing their advice, but Williams was not only guilty of this, but could be accused of double dealing, in that whilst it " got him that what was accused [Williams] a strong gust of popular favour, [it] did his Majesty no right and cast the Duke upon a shelf, as no high-tide could bring him off, while he lived...".<sup>56</sup> However, whilst these misdemeanours had been made during the late summer of 1625, Charles was not aware of them for some time. John Hacket reports that this came during Charles's journey to inspect the fleet at Plymouth whilst at " Salisbury in September with a full Court...", which with Charles having been expected to set out for Plymouth on Monday 12 September, and arriving by Wednesday 14 September at the house of John, Lord Poulet at George Hinton, Somerset, must have come at some point around Tuesday 13 September.<sup>57</sup> Although Williams was at this time staying " at a house of the Lord Sandys' in Berkshire ", through his many contacts at Court (both amongst the king and queen's household) he soon became aware of what had occurred and what its likely consequences would be, but despite a letter of defence to the king and attempts to secure the support of Buckingham, with Charles " determined to put another in your [Williams's] place " there was nothing he or anyone

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 139.

<sup>55</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 19.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., Pt. II. p. 19.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., Pt. II. p. 19.; PRO. SP16/6. 8 September 1625. Hampton Court. George, Lord Goring - Sir Dudley Carleton.; G. Roberts, ed., Diary of Walter Yonge. p. 86.

else could do to prevent his dismissal; so whilst Buckingham attempted to distance himself from it by leaving Court earlier than planned and his ally Secretary Conway attempted to delay it for four days out of a hope that " there might be occasion for change of councils ", on 15 October 1625 Williams received an order to " surrender up the seal ", which he subsequently did to Sir John Suckling, the Comptroller of the Household, on Tuesday 25 October.<sup>58</sup> Exactly the same objectives of punishing and preventing the re-appointment of those who he believed were responsible for opposing his efforts in the 1625 parliament can be seen behind Charles's decision a little over a week later to select seven prominent MPs as sheriffs.

Sheriffs were normally selected by the king upon the advice of the judges.<sup>59</sup> But believing that he had been " ill served " by them and that they were too intent upon courting popularity when the bill was placed before him Charles also named a number himself.<sup>60</sup> In addition to Buckingham's former clients of Phelips, Knightley and Wentworth selecting Sir William Fleetwood, Sir Edward Coke, Sir Francis Seymour, Sir Edward Alford and Sir Guy Palmes.<sup>61</sup> Charles had a dual purpose in acting this

---

<sup>58</sup> Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. pp. 19, 23-25, 27.; CSPD,1625-1626. p. 115. 3 October 1625. Lord Keeper Williams -Duke of Buckingham.; CSPV,1625-1626. p. 197. 3 November 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>59</sup> PRO. SP16/401/9. 3 November 1638. The order for making the bill of sheriffs in the Exchequer. In this Sir Edward Nicholas sets out the procedure for selecting sheriffs in full.

<sup>60</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 30. 22 November 1625. Reading. Sir Arthur Ingram - Sir Thomas Wentworth.

<sup>61</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 30. 22 November 1625. Reading. Sir Arthur Ingram - Sir Thomas Wentworth.; PRO. SP16/10/16. 23 November 1625. Reading. Sir Benjamin Rudyard - Sir Francis Nethersole.; PRO. SP16/43/16. 1625. List of Sheriffs, with crosses next to those chosen extraordinarily. None of these were on the original list of sheriffs submitted to the king on the 10 November 1625 as PRO. SP16/9/43.; Sir Henry Blincowe only appears to have been included because of the ineligibility of the others on the list; as in 1624 and 1625 Sir Christopher Dalston was first on the list yet managed to escape selection, as did John Pennington,

way; for not only would it serve to remove "...the rank weeds of the parliament...so that we may expect a plentiful harvest the next..." (sheriffs not being eligible to sit in parliament), but would also send a clear political message to both parliament and his own ministers that he (and through implication they) would not be diverted from his duty by fear of what he saw to be the actions of a factious minority.<sup>62</sup> However, typically of Charles those selected in this way were not a homogeneous political group, and all that appears to have tied them together was his belief that they had been responsible for leading astray an otherwise loyal parliament, and that unless removed their presence would prove equally detrimental in the next. As whilst the problem itself had come to the fore in the 1625 parliament, his suspicions as to who was in fact responsible appear to have been of some duration, something indicated in that one of them, Sir William Fleetwood, had not even been present in the 1625 parliament, and had been chosen rather " ex praescientia operum, for he would have done as ill as the worst if he had been of the last, and will do if he should be of the next parliament...".<sup>63</sup> Of the others, Sir Edward Coke and Sir Robert Phelips had both spent a period in custody due to their actions in the 1621 parliament, whilst Seymour's conduct there had earned him a summons before the Council.<sup>64</sup> And although not to the same extent, Wentworth, Alford and Palmes had also caused disruption of some kind or another there, a parliament in which Charles himself attended as prince, whilst more recently in 1625 Alford had reminded the house that

---

third on the list in 1624 and second in 1625 - a clear indication that they both possessed sufficient influence to keep them out, thus explaining Blincowe's last minute appointment. PRO. SP14/163/79. April 1624. List of names to be pricked as sheriffs.; PRO. SP16/43/9. 1625. Original list of three candidates to be appointed sheriff for each county.

<sup>62</sup> PRO. SP16/10/16. 23 November 1625. Reading. Sir Benjamin -Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 23 November 1625. Reading. Sir Benjamin Rudyerd - Sir Francis Nethersole.

<sup>64</sup> Ballinger, Calendar of Wynn Papers. p. 157. 10 January 1622. Westminster College. William Wynn - Sir John Wynn; R.B. Pugh and E. Crittal, eds., The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A History of Wiltshire. Vol. V. (London, 1957). p. 131.

the recovery of the Palatinate had been struck out of the Subsidy Act in 1624 as a thing unfit to engage the house, Knightley had questioned the failure of the government to implement the laws against recusants and Wentworth, although in a milder manner, had joined Phelips, Seymour and Coke in diverting attention from war-funding to commonwealth grievances.<sup>65</sup> However, whilst Charles genuinely appears to have believed that the failure of the 1625 parliament had been down to the work of a few malcontents rather than a consequence of his failure to establish sufficient political support, and therefore felt that in removing them through such measures as these that he had now solved the problem and was looking forward to the productive meeting which he had hoped would give life to his policies in 1625, he had based his actions upon a false assumption. Thus when Charles re-summoned parliament in February 1626 he was disappointed not to find the co-operative atmosphere which he had expected. With the stakes now even higher than they had been in 1625 he found it more insistent than ever upon dealing with problems at home, especially the role the Duke of Buckingham was believed to be playing in them. With Charles proving unwilling to play the political game and allow Buckingham to be sacrificed as James had with Middlesex in 1624 he eventually chose to dissolve parliament (some believed for good) in order to avoid his impeachment.<sup>66</sup> Which having focussed upon things which Charles knew full well to

---

<sup>65</sup> For Alford, Palmes and Wentworth in the 1621 parliament eg. Christopher Thompson, 'The Reaction of the House of Commons in November and December 1621 to the Confinement of Sir Edwin Sandys', pp. 779-786, in HJ. Vol. 4. September 1997.; For Phelips in 1625 eg. Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. pp. 395-398, 448. Speeches on 5, 10 August 1625.; Coke in 1625 eg. Ibid., p. 398. Speech 5 August; Seymour eg. Ibid., pp. 393, 450. Speeches 5, 10 August.; Alford eg. Ibid., p. 407. Speech 5 August 1625.; Knightley eg. Ibid., 451. Speech 10 August.; DNB, sub Richard Knightley.; Noonkester, "Charles I. and Shrieval Selection", pp. 305-312, in BIHR. Vol. 64. October 1991. p. 309.

<sup>66</sup> Joseph Mead had informed Sir Martin Stuteville on the 13 May 1626 that "...It is generally thought (saith the letter) that the last parliament of King Charles his reign will end within this week. Is it not time to pray?". BL. Harleian 390. f. 57v. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

be untrue only served to increase his suspicion that there was a group present in parliament whose deliberate aim was to challenge his authority. So again, rather than attempting to salvage any potential support for war which still existed or more realistically to heal the political wounds which he had already caused, he in fact opened them still further through once again proceeding in an attempt to hit out at those who he felt had betrayed him, this being demonstrated not only in his decision to secure the removal of the Earl of Warwick (whose influence and naval interests would have made him a useful ally) from his position as Lord Lieutenant of Essex and a group of over thirty of the gentry from the Commission of the Peace, but providing an indication of the depth of the divisions which he had caused even a number of his own household, Sir Francis Stewart, Sir Ralph Clare and David Ramsey on Thursday 27 April 1626 being "commanded from the Court until the king's further pleasure were known...".<sup>67</sup> This task was given to Lord Chamberlain Pembroke, who being a kinsman to Sir Francis Stewart told Charles that he was "a man whom his father loved as well as any in the Court of England...that he was one of his own blood and that he might receive great service from him; and therefore humbly beseeched his Majesty to send him a reason also of his discharge...".<sup>68</sup> Indicating part of the wider problem on which this whole episode was based, however, this was something which Charles refused to do, merely replying that "he would have it so until he sent further

---

<sup>67</sup> Warwick had been appointed to this position in September 1625 upon rumours of an invasion of the Essex Coast. In July 1626 he was replaced by the Earl of Suffolk.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. I. p. 132. 8 September 1625. Robert, Earl of Suffolk and Robert Earl of Warwick are appointed Lieutenants of Essex, the county being threatened with invasion.; Sainty, 'Lieutenants', in BIHR. p. 20.; G. Roberts, ed., Diary of Walter Yonge. p. 94..; BL. Harleian 390. f. 119. 9 September 1626. Christ College. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid., f. 49. 28 April 1626. Same - Same.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. f. 34. Undated July 1626. Thomas Coventry - Clerk of the Crown.; BL. Egerton 2884. f. 16. Undated. This is mistakenly listed in the British Library catalogue as a list of sheriffs.

<sup>68</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 49. 28 April 1626. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.



unto him...".<sup>69</sup> Nor were these four men who were so peremptorily suspended mere newcomers to royal service. As with Clare and Ramsey having both been in the service of Prince Henry, Croftes having served Charles as prince and Stewart having held the same position under James, they represented the core of Charles's privy chamber.<sup>70</sup> At the time Charles had refused to give out any reason for their dismissal, but as with the others removed from office at this time it subsequently appears that it was for the position which they had taken in parliament, the first evidence for this coming in relation to Sir Francis Stewart, who sat for the Cornish seat of Liskeard.<sup>71</sup> Since the first accusations had been levelled against Buckingham in the middle of March a whole number of people had joined the chorus against him, until things came to a head on the 27th when Elliot responded to the question of whether to grant three subsidies and three fifteenths by suggesting that they should withhold supply in an attempt to get Buckingham removed from office.<sup>72</sup> Charles, not to mention Buckingham, was dismayed by this response, for unwilling to sacrifice a servant to blackmail, he realised that it had the potential to undermine his whole policy, and therefore immediately ordered the two houses to attend him at Whitehall, where as well as personally testifying to Buckingham's loyalty and good services, he retaliated

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., f. 49. 28th April 1626. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

<sup>70</sup> Clare had been a gentleman of the privy chamber and Ramsey a groom of the bedchamber to Prince Henry before being appointed as gentlemen of the privy chamber under Charles as prince then king. Birch, Life of Prince Henry. pp. 347-8.; BL. Harleian 1718. f. 71. Warrants of Charles, Prince of Wales. 4th September 1624. St James's. Ralph Clare, esq., one of the gentlemen of our privy chamber...; PRO. LC2/5. f. 43. 1619. David Ramsey, gentleman of the privy chamber to Prince Charles.; PRO.LC2/6. f. 37. 1625. Sir Francis Stewart, gentleman of the privy chamber to the king.; Ibid., f. 69. 1625. Sir William Croftes, gentleman of the privy chamber to the prince.

<sup>71</sup> Return of the names of every member returned to parliament... Pt. I. Parliaments of England, 1213-1702. (London, 1878). p. 468. Stewart was probably appointed to this seat through the influence of his kinsman, the Earl of Pembroke, who was the steward of the Duchy of Cornwall.

<sup>72</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 315.

in kind to Eliot's blackmail by bluntly informing them " that parliament's are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting and dissolution. Therefore, as I find the fruits of them good or evil, they are to continue or not to be ".<sup>73</sup> Stewart had evidently been involved in this, for with Buckingham perhaps being buoyed by this speech, upon leaving the house he took the opportunity of confronting him, declaring " Sir Francis, though you have not spared me this parliament time yet I have spared you ", to which Stewart replied " concerning the first I have been very silent in your affairs ", but added, significantly, " tomorrow in the morning I mean to fall upon you...".<sup>74</sup> How much of this Charles was aware of at the time is unclear, but along with the others just under a month later he was suspended from office. Two of the others, Sir Ralph Clare and Sir William Croftes, had also sat in this parliament, and like Stewart, from later evidence it would appear that this was " for opposing the duke in the second parliament of King Charles ", which given that Clare had been granted Crown lands in Worcestershire (the county where he held his borough seat) must have been particularly galling to Charles.<sup>75</sup> Buckingham may have informed Charles of their actions, but the response to them was not typical of him, for his usual course of action was that of 27 of March, where he had directly confronted Stewart, whilst that which was taken on 28 April, where Pembroke was ordered to command them from the Court with no explanation, was much more typical of Charles, and was intended not like Buckingham's as a warning to induce them back into conformity, but as a clear punishment.<sup>76</sup> There are similarities in this to the removal of Lord Keeper

---

<sup>73</sup> Rushworth, Historical Collections. Vol. I. p. 225.

<sup>74</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 43. 15 April 1626. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.

<sup>75</sup> Clare sat for Bewdley Borough, Worcestershire, and Croftes for Malmesbury Borough, Wiltshire. Return of the names of every member returned to parliament... Vol. I. p. 472.; Ellis, Original Letters. Vol. III. pp. 262-3. September 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

<sup>76</sup> What Ramsey (who had not sat in this parliament) had done is not clear, although it is likely that he had connections with the others which had led Charles to associate him with their actions.

Williams. For just as Williams was felt to have been removed for crossing Buckingham when it was actually because of Charles's belief that he had been uniting with those opposed to his policies, so were these men here. As given the proximity of their office to his person and the fact that Charles had known them for many years he must surely already have been aware of their opposition to Buckingham; and given the tensions which had existed between him and the duke when prince, may even have discussed it with them. So rather than these servants having been removed by Buckingham for attacking him they were in fact removed by Charles because in so doing they had also challenged his authority and undermined his policies, especially in that as royal servants their testimony carried added influence. This is much more consistent with Charles's overall approach of upholding his authority and promoting loyalty to his own person than having merely intervened on the behalf of a favourite. As with them only being suspended from office rather than removed (in the mean time being confined to St. James's) Charles also sent the clear message to Buckingham that he could only expect to be protected to the extent that he was implementing his policies.<sup>77</sup> That this was indeed Charles's motive is confirmed in his actions after Buckingham's death. As with Buckingham's assassination in 1628 all expected that his former enemies would return to favour. But with Charles determined to demonstrate that the decision to remove them had been his alone he took quite a different course of action, not only banishing them from St. James's and finally removing them from office, but in a further demonstration of royal authority replacing Croftes with "...Sir Henry [Hungate], the duke's bosom friend...".<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 437. 20 September 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; The force of this message was likely to have been particularly strong in that Sir Francis Stewart does not appear to have been confined to St. James's, remaining in office until his death around the 20 of July 1635. PRO. LC5/134. 20 July 1635. Warrant to swear Alexander Hamilton a gentleman of the privy chamber in ordinary to wait in the first quarter in the place of Sir Francis Stewart, deceased.

<sup>78</sup> That this was Charles's intention is confirmed in that the Countess of Denbigh (Buckingham's sister) had attempted to secure Hungate's removal, claiming that it had been he who had " continually exasperated the duke against Felton " [Buckingham's

In embarking upon this second and more extensive purge after the 1626 parliament Charles had clearly failed to learn anything from his previous mistakes and was still blaming his inability to gain sufficient political support for his policies upon the opposition of a factious minority rather than his own failures. With these heavy-handed measures only serving to confirm people in their opinion that Buckingham was the true ruler of the country and was attempting to subvert the Church and State, and Charles's refusal to sanction his impeachment leaving them powerless to act in its light this was a bad enough development in itself, but was again to be made far worse by Charles's subsequent responses to them, in that believing by now that parliament was particularly prone to the disruptive actions of a factious minority it led him to fall back onto the inherent strength of the monarchy without realising the significance of what he was doing or the serious political damage which such a move would inevitably cause. For belying the fact that he really did perceive the problems which he had faced since coming to the throne were a consequence not of the unpopularity of his policies but of the unwarranted opposition of a factious minority, in the light of the dissolution of parliament he first proposed issuing a proclamation in which " the sheriffs were to be directed to assemble the freeholders, and take their votes on a proposal that the supply intended to be granted by the House of Commons should now be levied ", which whilst subsequently never issued, formed the ideological basis of the Forced Loan.<sup>79</sup>

---

assassin] ". Had Charles been acting in terms of Buckingham's memory he would have been sympathetic to these claims, but -Hungate was now as much his servant as Buckingham had been. So whilst Pory subsequently reported that Hungate had been " turned out of the Privy Chamber and discounted " he appears to have remained in office, being one of those servants Charles selected to take with him on his journey to Scotland in 1633.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 437. 20 September 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid., f. 448. 1 November 1628. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian. 383. ff. 68-9. 14 November 1628. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; PRO. LC5/132. 21 January 1633. Servants selected for the Scottish journey and included under the king's own hand.

<sup>79</sup> CSPD, 1625-1626. p. 354. 15 June 1626. Westminster. Proclamation suggested to be issued on the

After the disappointments and setbacks of recent years Charles possessed high hopes of this policy as a means of by-passing the opposition of the factious few who he perceived to be opposing his legitimate aims through being able to deal with the people (who he believed to be sympathetic to his aims) direct and thereby obtain the funding for his policies which he had expected in 1625. Given the false assumption upon which this policy was formed and the way in which it fitted into wider domestic political and religious fears as representative institutions were being replaced by absolutist monarchies all over Europe such a move as this was never going to be popular. Yet due to the closed nature of Charles's mind, once set, and the absolute obedience to his commands which he consequently expected from everybody, he succeeded in making its effects far worse. He ignored the reservations of his ministers and still perceived setbacks as a consequence of personal failings rather than political realities, and therefore again resorted to negative patronage in order to remove those he held responsible for it rather than positive patronage in order to increase his popularity. This can be seen not only in his removal of Sir Ranulph Crewe from his place as Lord Chief Justice of King's Bench, but also in his suspension of Archbishop Abbot.

Although the use of a forced loan as a means raising revenue was by no means unprecedented it was definitely unusual, especially when a parliament had so recently sat and when such actions under the prerogative were only meant to be used in extreme urgency when there was insufficient time to summon a new one. Charles's decision to proceed in this way therefore caused a good deal of uncertainty, so with the collection of the loan due to be carried out into the counties during the autumn and winter of 1626-7 it became a matter of some importance for Charles's wider objectives that the legal profession subscribed to its legality as soon as possible; but whilst they were all willing to pay the loan, when they came to consider their opinion on Saturday 28 October at " a general meeting at Serjeants' Inn, " they all refused.<sup>80</sup>

---

dissolution of the parliament. --

<sup>80</sup> Cust, The Forced Loan. (Oxford, 1987). pp. 54, 102.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 153. 4 November 1626. London. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid., f. 156v. 10 October 1626. London. Same - Same.

Given the blow which this inevitably brought to the policy upon which all of his hopes had been based Charles was clearly angry, especially when he believed his and the country's honour was engaged to such an extent and when he had so explicitly promised " that it shall be no bar to the calling of a parliament ".<sup>81</sup> Highly displeased, Charles had at first issued a broad threat to his judges to " sweep all their benches ", but in the end it was only Sir Ranulph Crewe who was removed, on 9 November 1626 receiving his *quietus est* " to sit no more in judicature."<sup>82</sup> Nathaniel Tomkins believed that there were " a concurrence of reasons for which he [rather than another] suffered ", but the one common element amongst them appears to have been that they led Charles to believe that in challenging his authority he was in part responsible for his failure to obtain his objective.

As the senior judge Chief Justice Crewe had been " primarily trusted and employed by the king to incline the judges to subscribe " to the legality of the loan; but given the wider political significance of this policy in that Charles perceived it as an inherent right and would be unhappy if it was not upheld, whilst the public would see it as an alteration in the delicate balance of the constitution if it was, this was not likely to be an easy task.<sup>83</sup> Realising that those involved would have to balance public infamy against hopes of future preferment, and that anything short of a unanimous decision would prove divisive, not only within the legal profession but within the country as a whole, Crewe appears to have decided that the best means of upholding the reputation of the Bench (and perhaps also of changing Charles's mind) was through

---

<sup>81</sup> SRO.DD/Ph/219. 27 November 1626.  
Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.

<sup>82</sup> HMC, Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry MSS. Vol. III. p. 312. John Cayworth - Lord Montagu.; Ibid., p. 313. 14 November 1626. Edward Palmer - Lord Montagu.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. II. p. 112.; Foss, Judges of England. p. 219.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 156v. 10 November 1626. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid., f. 161. 17 November 1626. London. Same - Same.; Ibid., f. 159. 18 November 1626. Christ Church, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. 27 November 1626. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 27 November 1626. Westminster.  
Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.

so handling " the matter that both judges and sergeants combined or rather campaigned to refuse with one consent ".<sup>84</sup> Given his subsequent actions it is extremely unlikely that Crewe had failed to inform Charles of his reservations over the loan, and Charles's insistence in pursuing it placed Crewe in the impossible position of canvassing for a policy which he himself had advised against. However, Charles's firm notions over royal authority meant that whatever Crewe's personal scruples he expected him to have done his best to ensure that his orders were obeyed, and therefore reacted angrily when Crewe took the contrary course, especially when he then managed to draw further attention to himself through the passionate way in which he defended his actions, it subsequently being reported that " his Majesty's quarrel to him is not [so much] for not subscribing but for denying it in ill language. Who says further that the Chief Baron [Sir John Walter] denies the act as peremptorily but more mannerly...".<sup>85</sup> Exactly the same thing can be seen occurring in the Church, where Archbishop Abbot (whose earthy Protestantism and interest in the state of it in Europe were never really utilised by Charles in support of his policies) was suspended from office for having refused to sanction a sermon in support of the loan by Robert Sibthorp.

Perceiving religious disputes within the Church as one of the principal factors which lay behind the discord which had unsettled the kingdom and ruined his first two parliaments, in response to renewed attacks upon Richard Montagu in the 1626 parliament upon its dissolution Charles had issued a general ban on the discussion of disputed doctrine.<sup>86</sup> This, Charles hoped, would help remove some of the disputes which had served to divide the Church in recent years, and in order to gain maximum

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 27 November 1626. Westminster. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.

<sup>85</sup> PRO. C115/N3/8540. 25 November 1626. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 161. 17 November 1626. London. John Pory - Sir Martin Stuteville.

<sup>86</sup> Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. pp. 136, 146-7.; Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. Vol. II. p. 336. 6 March 1626. p. 357. 24 March 1626.; Ibid., Vol. III. pp. 3-5, 30. 17 and 20 April 1626 Pym's reports from the Committee on Religion.

effect was later that same year supplemented by a number of proposed alterations amongst his bishops. In these Richard Neile was to be translated from Durham to the vacant See of Winchester and replaced by George Mountain, the principal objective of which was to enable Laud to become Bishop of London, a See which Charles, according to Heylyn, perceived as " the retreat and receptacle of the grandees of the puritan faction ".<sup>87</sup> In the light of this new emphasis upon tighter government the problems which had arisen within the Church in recent years could but have already reflected badly upon the abilities of Archbishop Abbot and raised Charles's suspicions of him. But what finally persuaded Charles that he was part of the problem rather than the solution of settling the Church was his refusal to licence the printing of a sermon preached at the Northamptonshire Assizes on 22 February 1627 by Robert Sibthorp. With this sermon being aimed at bolstering support for the Forced Loan through maintaining " that the sovereign was absolute master of the property of his subjects, and that he might dispose of it at will, " the fact that it was submitted for licencing to Archbishop Abbot rather than the more usual choice of the Bishop of London may have had no further motive on the part of Charles than to ensure that its message received as strong an endorsement as possible.<sup>88</sup> But the fact that the request had come from the son of Sir Thomas Murray (Charles's former tutor and secretary), together with Abbot's characteristically blunt exclamation that Charles had resolved that it should " go forth to his good or harm ", would suggest that Charles was deliberately using this issue as an opportunity to test Abbot's loyalty.<sup>89</sup> Abbot, disliking the high-Church connotations of the sermon and the way in which it was being used in support of the State refused to licence it, and instead submitted a

---

<sup>87</sup> Winchester had become vacant by the death of Lancelot Andrewes on the 25 September 1626. Heylyn states that Charles perceived Mountain as " a man unactive, and addicted to voluptuousness, and one that loved his ease too well to disturb himself in the concernments of the Church ". Works of William Laud. Vol. III. p. 196. Monday 25 September 1626.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 174.

<sup>88</sup> CSPV, 1626-1628. p. 304. 30 July 1627. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>89</sup> Carlton, Archbishop Laud. p. 64.; Davies, Caroline Captivity. p. 35.



number of reservations which he wished to discuss with Laud.<sup>90</sup> For his disobedience he was subsequently suspended, confined to Canterbury and his duties as archbishop passed on to an ecclesiastical commission consisting of George Mountain, Richard Neile, John Buckeridge, John Howson and William Laud.<sup>91</sup>

Charles firmly believed that he had a right to expect his policies to be supported by his subjects and ministers. As a consequence of this he had pressed ahead with the collection of the loan without first taking into account the degree of political support which he was likely to receive in it, and then responded to setbacks by perceiving them in personal terms as a consequence of the failings of those who had tried to persuade him against taking such a course. As a result Charles's distinctive use of patronage again only served to force his natural supporters into opposition and undermine support for his Crown. For whilst his response of removing those he felt responsible for undermining his policies was prompted by factors which were to a large extent personal to him, as king his actions had clear political implications. In that with the Forced Loan being perceived as a deliberate attempt to undermine parliament and introduce arbitrary government, the removal of Crewe and the suspension of Abbot were seen not as a consequence of them having crossed a king who viewed politics and religion in personal terms and had an excessive notion of his own authority, but as part of a wider plan aimed at subverting the Church and State. This undermined any hope which Charles still had of ever being able to implement his war policies. For it meant that when out of financial necessity Charles had to once again resort to the re-summoning of a parliament in 1628, it was even more concerned with settling the fundamental problems of the Church and State than considering action abroad than it had been in 1625 and 1626. So whilst the 1628 parliament agreed to grant Charles the not inconsiderable sum of five subsidies at a

---

<sup>90</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 204. 24 April 1627.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 205. 4 July 1627.; CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 248. 10 July 1627. Secretary Conway - Archbishop Abbot.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 23v. 25 July 1627. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.

very early stage, this was merely a means of ensuring that it would be kept in session long enough for members to air their grievances and attempt to secure their fundamental liberties rather than an endorsement of the Charles's policies or a promise of future support. So whilst Charles was for a time able to continue implementing his policy of war in the aid of the Palatinate alongside (but independent of) that of bringing the government of Church and State more into line with his own personal preferences in the hope of that military victory which would yet serve to quieten his opponents and enable him to pursue them both in unity, with the sum he actually required being in the region of five times this figure, and the political wounds which he had already opened up in implementing them having cost him all hope of gaining future funding, it was clearly not going to be for long.<sup>92</sup> And beginning with the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham on 23 August 1628 and the failure of the second fleet subsequently sent out in his name to relieve the Huguenots of La Rochelle, the end of Charles's war policy in aid of the Palatinate was effectively completed with the failure of the second session of the 1628 parliament in March 1629 to break with the mould in which it had finished in 1628. This was formalised soon after by peace treaties signed with France (April 1629) and Spain (November 1630), and led to the distinctive policies of the early 1630s in which Charles at last managed to remove the inherent contradictions of his policies and consequent lack of funds through abandoning (for reasons which he never fully understood) hopes of financing a war through the support of his people and combining order at home with negotiations over the restitution of the Palatinate with the Spanish abroad.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 429.

<sup>93</sup> Quintrell, Charles I. p. 45.

## Chapter 7.

### A settled Court. The Objectives of Charles's patronage during the 1630s.

Even though largely a result of Charles's own political actions, responsibility for the unpopular and failed policies of the 1620s has been placed entirely upon Buckingham, for Charles was young and contemporaries were reluctant to face up to the constitutional implications of opposing their king, while the duke was still perceived in accordance to the role of favourite which he had held under James. Such a view ignores the essential cohesion of the reign and the highly personal objectives which lay behind it; as a consequence Charles has been consistently regarded by contemporaries and historians alike as a king especially open to the influence of others. This misconception about his true role has had as significant an effect in shaping our perception of the politics of the 1630s as it has on that of the 1620s. For Charles was in practice highly protective of his royal authority, reluctant to let his ministers get too close to him. Neither the Earls of Holland or Carlisle (who had both been advanced as alternative favourites in the immediate light of Buckingham's death in the hope of bringing politics back to normal), nor Lord Treasurer Weston, Archbishop Laud or the queen (who were ultimately believed to have inherited his influence and were therefore held responsible for the policies of the 1630s) carried as much influence as is commonly supposed. It is also possible to demonstrate that the distinctive silent tone of the politics of the early 1630s with its emphasis upon maintaining order and removing faction was in fact a direct consequence of Charles's use of royal patronage as a means of bringing the country more into line with his own personal preferences now that he had achieved a new unity of purpose through his realisation by 1630 that the recovery of the Palatinate would have to be secured through negotiation and not war. The range of views expressed within the orbit of the Court narrowed to those being actively advanced by the king, removing it from its role as an arena within which political disputes could be carried out in conjunction

with the Crown, and having a devastating effect upon its ability to act as a unifying factor in society.

Buckingham's death in August 1628 had not only made vacant a number of important offices but was also perceived to have left a vacuum amongst those who were advising the king, which given that the country's ills had been seen as a consequence of the influence which he was believed to have wielded over a young and inexperienced king meant that it now seen as a matter of great importance who replaced him in the king's affections. Already well acquainted with Charles as Prince of Wales, in having proved willing to work closely and amicably with Buckingham in the pursuit of his war policies Henry, Earl of Holland had also been able to secure his good opinion, for which in August 1626 he had been appointed a gentleman of his bedchamber, whilst his good looks, personal charm and the part which he had played in the negotiations which had presaged her marriage with Charles had enabled him to secure a similar position of favour with the queen; and in the light of Buckingham's death he was observed to have been using this "...towards the obtaining his trust, and succeeding him in his power...".<sup>1</sup> In pursuit of this objective, the very day after Buckingham's assassination Holland was clearly already attempting to distance himself from the old subservient position which he had held under him and establish an independent one of his own, remarking in his application to Charles for the post of Constable of Windsor that " though he is deprived of the duke's means to the king, he no ways doubts that the king will make it appear that the duke was the instrument, not the author, of the benefits which the king conferred on his servants...".<sup>2</sup> In this

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon reports that Holland had been a gentleman of Charles's bedchamber as prince. But with there being no mention of him amongst the list of Charles's servants in James's funeral precedent, and Holland (unlike Charles's other bedchamber men whilst prince who were re-appointed in 1625) not being appointed to the same position under him as king until August 1626, it would appear that he had been mistaken.; PRO.LC3/31. p. 1. 3 August 1626.; Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. p. 41.; Barbara Donogan, ' A Courtier's Progress: Greed and Consistency in the Life of the Earl of Holland ', pp. 317-353. HJ. Vol. 19. 1976. p. 323.

<sup>2</sup>

CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 267.

Holland had read the king's mind well, although he was not to gain the constable's until September 1629 (presumably after that year's revenues had been allowed to replenish diminished royal coffers).<sup>3</sup> But with Charles determined to uphold ceremony and re-assert his authority after the strains of recent years, there were other offices which could not be so easily left vacant; and with Holland being given the temporary management of the Mastership of the Horse and appointed Chancellor of the University of Cambridge in the place of Buckingham just five days after his death on 28 August 1628 it was apparent to all that it had not affected his standing and that he had succeeded in maintaining the favour of the king, so much so that for a time it was believed by many that he was going to be a new favourite.<sup>4</sup> Bishop Williams of Lincoln, for example, offered him the position of " High Steward or High Bailiff of Westminster " (which was in his gift as the - albeit titular - Dean of Westminster) in the mistaken belief that this would be acceptable to the king and perhaps provide the foundation of his own return to favour.<sup>5</sup> Holland was not taken in by the apparent certainty of the rumours prevalent around the Court. Having been a confidant of Buckingham's and a close observer of Charles for many years, Holland like

---

24 August 1628. Earl of Holland - Charles I.--

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 53. 8

September 1629. Grant to Henry, Earl of Holland, Captain of the Guard, of the offices of Constable of the Castle of Windsor and keeper of all forests there, and of Lieutenant of the Forest and Castle of Windsor, for life.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 310. 1

September 1628. James Hay - Earl of Carlisle.; HMC, Twelfth Report. Appendix IV. p. 486. 28 August 1628. Portsmouth. Charles I. - Vice Chancellor and Heads of Houses at Cambridge.

<sup>5</sup> The nomination of the Steward or Dean of Westminster rested with whichever of the two was not vacant. Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. I. p. 44.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 276. 29 August 1628. Buckden. Bishop John Williams - Earl of Holland.; Ibid., p. 277. 30 August 1628. Williams - Conway.; Ibid., p. 311. 2 September 1628. Conway - Williams.; Ibid., p. 317. 5 September 1628. Buckden. Williams - Conway.; Ibid., p. 327. 12 September 1628. Windsor Castle. Conway - Williams.; Ibid., p. 330. 16 September 1628. Buckden. Williams - Conway.

Buckingham before him was well aware of the fact that a position of influence under Charles did not depend upon favour alone but also required some demonstration of usefulness. Holland's knowledge of this had played a large part in shaping the active role and consistent support which he had given to Charles's war policies during the early 1620s in conjunction with Buckingham. But with his death and moves towards peace this role had disappeared, and in order to maintain (if not strengthen) his position Holland now attempted to mould an influential new role for himself around Buckingham's old position of lord admiral.

However, despite (or perhaps because of) the administrative and diplomatic duties which Holland had undertaken during the war years he was (like Buckingham) still viewed as a courtier and seen as a political lightweight, lacking the necessary drive or ability to either restore the country to order or to hold such an important position as lord admiral, as even his own supporters appear to have realised, Sir William Masham writing to his mother-in-law Lady Joan Barrington in December 1628 how that whilst " It is hoped my Lord of Holland will be lord admiral. I could wish rather his brother, whom I hold fitter ", adding " I hope he will be advised by him and other his good friends whom you know well...".<sup>6</sup> With current perceptions of Buckingham shaping the likely consequences of the appointment of such a person, Holland's ambition in conjunction with his highly visible favour with the king and queen caused general alarm at Court amongst those striving for a period of reconciliation and stability; and in order to prevent it by November 1628 a plan had been hatched, apparently out of a combination of Lord Steward Pembroke, Lord Chamberlain Montgomery, Lord Treasurer Weston and the Countess of Carlisle by which Pembroke was to be recommended for the position of admiral and replaced as lord steward by his brother, Montgomery, whilst his position of chamberlain was to be sought either for Carlisle or the Earl of Dorset, whose post of lord chamberlain to the queen could go to the Earl of Carlisle.<sup>7</sup> The inclusion of Carlisle despite his being the only person who did

---

<sup>6</sup> HMC, Seventh Report.  
(1879). p. 544. 30 December 1628. Sir William Masham -  
his mother-in-law, Lady Joan Barrington.

<sup>7</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 391.  
22 November 1628. George, Lord Goring - Earl of

not already hold some kind of Court office clearly demonstrates that he was to be the key figure in this plan of effectively promoting an alternative favourite; for although Pembroke was widely popular, he was still viewed with a certain degree of suspicion by the king, and was in any case always hesitant in committing himself to any political cause of which he was not certain of the outcome, whilst Weston was still too uncertain of his own position with the king to be of any direct help, Carlisle alone appearing to possess that combination of skills as courtier and politician which together with the combined favour of king, queen and public would enable it to be effectively implemented.<sup>8</sup> Carlisle, however, was at this time on an embassy to Turin, and throughout the autumn of that year he received numerous letters from people opposed to the promotion of Holland who believed him "to be a principal instrument in that good work..." of restoring the country to normality were calling for or were actively attempting to secure his quick return to England.<sup>9</sup> They included the queen,

---

Carlisle.; --Ibid. p. 394. 24 November 1628. Whitehall. G.R. Weckherlin - William Boswell.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 462. 6 December 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid., f. 463. 13 December 1628. Christ's College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin --Stuteville.; HMC, Seventh Report. p. 544. 30 December 1628. William Masham - his mother-in-law, Lady Joan Barrington.; HMC. Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry MSS. Vol. II. p. 346. 17 December 1629. Unsigned newsletter; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 133. 30 December 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>8</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 410. 19 December 1628. Sir Robert Aiton - Earl of Carlisle.

<sup>9</sup> CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Earl of Calisle.; Ibid. p. 295. Hampton Court. Sir Robert Aiton - Carlisle.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 268. 24 August 1628. The Strand. Sir Francis Nethersole - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 278. 31 August 1628. Southwick. Sir Robert Karr - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 310. 1 September 1628. James Hay - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 343. 3 October 1628. Penshurst. Countess of Carlisle - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 356. 20 October 1628. Lord Goring - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 388. 21 November 1628. Sir Robert Phelips - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 391. 22 November 1628. Whitehall. James Hay - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 391. 22 November 1628. Lord Goring - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 410. 19 December 1628. Sir Robert Aiton - Earl of Carlisle.

who whilst favouring Holland as a person, had no confidence in his political judgement.<sup>10</sup> Returning about the middle of January 1629, Carlisle was at last able to provide the plan to get Pembroke appointed lord admiral with that level of drive and leadership which it had previously lacked, and throughout the rest of that year newsletter writers reported the respective intrigues of Holland and Carlisle.<sup>11</sup>

However, in a continuation of the trend which he had set during the 1620s and in the light of the problems caused by perceptions of the role of Buckingham, Charles had already resolved to hold " the total directory " in his own hands, which meant that whilst both Holland and Carlisle remained in his high personal favour and could use this in order to improve their personal wealth through obtaining grants of favour, he was not going to let them become favourites by allowing them to become directly involved in the distribution of major Court office, subsequently announcing at " the Council that he took very ill the reports that were in circulation about his being about to choose an admiral, as he had never thought about it, and those who were talked about were possibly the ones he had least in view...".<sup>12</sup> So whilst Carlisle was appointed Groom of the Stool upon the death of Sir James Fullerton in February 1631, and Holland succeeded him in this upon his own death in May 1636, with

---

<sup>10</sup> CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649.  
p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 296. 29 September 1628. Hampton Court. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 295. Hampton Court. Sir Robert Aiton - Carlisle.

<sup>11</sup> BL. Harleian 7010. f. 115. 21 January 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Thomas Puckering.; Ibid., f. 133. 30 December 1629. London. Same - Same.; HMC. Duke of Buccleuch and Queenberry MSS. Vol. III. p. 346. 17 December 1629. Unsigned newsletter.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>12</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 339. 30 September 1628. Hampton Court. Viscount Dorchester - Earl of Carlisle.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 270. 18 January 1630. Same - Same.; Searle, ed., Barrington Family Letters. p. 118. 30 December 1629. Sir William Masham - Lady Joan Barrington.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 133. 30 December 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.



neither of them being able to secure their original appointments and their subsequent ones clearly being a consequence of Charles's own choice (Carlisle, who had hoped to become lord chamberlain to the king or queen, believing that it was "not adequate to his rank...") and coming in his own time, they clearly lacked the degree of influence over the distribution of Court office which would have allowed them to become favourites in a political rather than a personal sense.<sup>13</sup> Archbishop Laud and Lord Treasurer Weston are usually held to have attained that degree of influence to which Holland and Carlisle had been aspiring, between them being held responsible for most of the major appointments at Court. In both cases, however, their influence appears to have been much exaggerated as a consequence of Charles's preference for dealing directly with a select group of ministers whilst "leaving the executory part to every man within the compass of his charge".<sup>14</sup> As whilst in the light of this and the confusion which inevitably arose as a consequence of Charles taking patronage back into his own hands not even they themselves were sure of who was actually responsible for making a particular appointment, by virtue of the underlying assumption that their close attendance upon the king brought with it great influence, in the eyes of an equally confused Court and public between them they were held to be the most likely candidates. Laud, for example, is usually seen as responsible for establishing a party of like-minded clerics within the Church and of securing the appointment of Secretary Windebank and Lord Treasurer Juxon at Court. But his

---

<sup>13</sup> Fullerton had died on the 6 January 1631 and was replaced in mid February by Carlisle, who remained in office until his own death on the 25 April 1636. Holland was appointed in his place early in May. That it was Charles's choice can be seen in that whilst he saw it as a position of great honour and therefore equal to Carlisle's status, Carlisle was reportedly attempting to sell it.; PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8 January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPV,1632-1636. p. 478. 21 February 1631. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., May 1636. p. 558. Footnote.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 540. 6 March 1631. Christ's College, Cambridge. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ellis, ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 12.

<sup>14</sup> CSPD,1628-1629. p. 339. 30 September 1628. Hampton Court. Viscount Dorchester - Earl of Carlisle.

ability to influence appointments within the Church had been much reduced by Charles's propensity for advancing his own chaplains in ordinary (over which Laud had little control), and whilst he himself claimed in his diary to have been responsible for Windebank's appointment as Secretary of State and Juxon's appointment as Clerk of the Closet, and was also widely held to have been responsible for his subsequent appointment as lord treasurer, this belief had clearly been prompted by a combination of the public's assumption of his power and his own insecurity in the light of his belief that the Court was being controlled by Cottington and Weston rather than being a true reflection of his influence at Court, Charles having deliberately given him " a charge withal that I should not be earnest in temporal causes, save where I was called in...".<sup>15</sup> These same factors of dealing with ministers direct and allowing them a degree of autonomy within their own sphere but not beyond it appear to have led to a similar overestimation of the political influence of Richard, Lord Weston. For although the accelerated adoption of the policies of financial retrenchment and reform long favoured by him in the light of the death of Buckingham had left him as lord treasurer in an extremely important position, so much so that in a political arena used to seeing one dominant figure he was soon perceived by many as a new favourite, with Charles never allowing any of his ministers to become over familiar, and with Weston acutely aware after having been received into his favour as a consequence of a change in policy that a similar change could secure his fall, he himself remained very uncertain of his position.<sup>16</sup> So whilst Weston's terse and impetuous nature has

---

<sup>15</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 215. 15 June 1632.; Ibid., p. 215. 10 July 1632.; Ibid., Vol. 6. Appendix I. p. 315. 16 September 1633. Archbishop Laud - Bishop Williams.; Carlton, Archbishop Laud. p. 116.; Mason, Juxon. p. 34.

<sup>16</sup> As prince Charles had consistently opposed Weston's appointment as lord treasurer or acting treasurer in the place of Middlesex; and whilst retaining him as chancellor in 1625, it was only with moves towards peace in 1628 that his importance within the government increased and he was appointed treasurer; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 310. 1 September 1628. James Hay - Earl of Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 369. 29 October 1629. Sir Thomas Roe - Sir Robert Anstruther.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. pp. 291-3. 3 September 1628.

usually been interpreted as an indication of his political strength, in reality as with Buckingham in his dealings with former clients it represented a sign of its weakness, reflecting the excessive extent to which which he perceived the actions of others as a threat to his own position with the king. This is clearly expressed in his reaction to the complaints of the queen made in response to his attempts to curb her excessive expenditure and the various accusations of corruption made by Archbishop Laud, where rather than ignoring them or exacting some punishment as would have been expected if he really was as powerful as is usually imagined, he was in fact excessively defensive. For " when by some confidants...he was informed of some bitter expressions fallen from her majesty, he was so exceedingly afflicted and tormented with the sense of it, that sometimes by passionate complaints and representations to the king; sometimes by more dutiful addresses and expostulations with the queen, in bewailing his misfortunes; he frequently exposed himself, and left his condition worse than it was before..."; and taking a similarly unsuccessful line with Laud, having to resort to undermining his position in conjunction with the queen or secretly with the king behind his back rather than face to face through the strength of his own influence, this same degree of weakness and insecurity can even be seen in his relations with a relative newcomer to the government such as Viscount Wentworth.<sup>17</sup> Where bolstering his own favoured policy of retrenchment, in the light of rumours which arose in 1629 as a consequence of the customs crisis and Wentworth's previous stance in relation to the Petition of Right (which gave the impression that he would

---

--Sion. Lord Henry Percy - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 295. 29 September 1628. Hampton Court. Sir Robert --Aiton - Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 367. 3rd March 1630. Sir Toby Matthew - Sir Henry Vane.; Ibid., p. 381. 5th November 1630. William, Lord Powys - Sir Henry Vane.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 89v. 9 October 1628. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 30. 27 April 1629. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 177. 7 September 1629. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 204. 12 October 1629. Same - Same.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 397. 20 September 1629. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.

<sup>17</sup>

Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. p. 27.; Alexander, Weston. pp. 188-9.

prove a moderating influence upon government policy) that he was to be appointed treasurer in his place, rather than treating them with the contempt which they obviously deserved he allowed them to sour the previously good relations which existed between them to the extent that Wentworth felt obliged to write to Weston in October 1632 (at a time when he had already been appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland) assuring him that he had no intentions of replacing him.<sup>18</sup> With Weston already uncertain of his own position at Court even before subsequent accusations of corruption had increased his dependence upon the favour of the king, it is unlikely that he wielded any greater influence over the distribution of Court office than Laud. So whilst he is usually held to be responsible for the appointments of Lord Cottington as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Viscount Wentworth as Lord Deputy of Ireland, with Charles's connections with Cottington (on whose behalf Charles had been seeking a suitable position at Court ever since he had been unable to secure his appointment as secretary to the queen) pre-dating those between him and Weston, and Wentworth willingly acknowledging that Weston had played a part in securing his appointment as President of the Council of the North, whilst believing it "...impossible that it [his appointment as lord deputy] should be plotted for my ruin...", when these are re-examined in the light of his true position at Court and his inability to secure the appointment of his own son and heir as Secretary of State or Master of the Court of

---

<sup>1</sup> While Wentworth was willing to acknowledge Weston's part in his appointment as Lord President of the Council of the North, he was careful to note that this had only been in bringing him into contact with the king, "...being then altogether a stranger to [him]...in service and person...", and not through his having recommended him more directly.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 472. 20 October 1632. Copy of a letter from Lord Deputy Wentworth - Lord Treasurer Weston.; Ibid., f. 273v. 25 June 1629. Winton House. Benjamin Lany - Unknown. Winchester House in Broad Street (where this letter had been written) had been purchased by Weston whilst Chancellor of the Exchequer in August 1624. Thus Weston himself must have been well aware of these rumours. Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. P. 577. 21 August 1624. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 79. 21 October 1632. York. Wentworth - Weston.

Wards it can be seen that they were in fact much more likely to have come from the king himself.<sup>19</sup>

Due to Charles's firmly held convictions on royal authority none of these would-be favourites appear to have possessed the ability to mould the distribution of major Court office in any significant way; but with all of them having at one time or another had to come to terms with the queen (Holland and Carlisle through obtaining her favour, and Weston and Laud through avoiding her enmity or forming loose coalitions) and with her by now enjoying unparalleled access and favour with the king, she would perhaps be expected to have fared rather better. Through being able to sub-consciously influence the decisions of the king by dropping hints (as in his decision to allow her a Catholic secretary) and second guess his intentions and act as a mediator in smoothing the way for them (as in her dealings with Lord Cottington upon Charles's decision to appoint William Juxon and not him as lord treasurer) Henrietta Maria clearly did have a role to play in the distribution of patronage. But

---

<sup>19</sup> Cottington's biographer, Havran, notes that he had known Weston since about 1622. Cottington had been linked with the position of secretary to the prince since the autumn of 1621.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 460. 26 October 1622. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., pp. 410-2. 20 October 1621. Same - Same.; BL Egerton 2594. f. 83. 24 August 1621. Woodstock. Sir George Goring - Viscount Doncaster.; HMC, Eleventh Report. (1887). Appendix IV. p. 22. Nicholas Bacon - Sir Nathaniel Bacon. Undated, October 1621.; Havran, Cottington. p. 112.; With Wentworth already a member of the Committee for Irish affairs in May 1631 it would have been hard for Weston to have secured his appointment without his knowledge. Having initially favoured the appointment of the Earl of Cork Weston was only likely to have switched to Wentworth when he caught wind of the intentions of the king. Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 79. 21 October 1632. York. Lord Deputy Wentworth - Lord Treasurer Weston.; Ibid., p. 389. 17 March. 1635. George Garrard - Wentworth.; H.F. Kearney, Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641. (Manchester, 1959). pp. 30-1.; Alexander, Weston. p. 185.; APC, 1630-1631. p. 316. 4 May 1631. Whitehall.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 634. 9 July 1632. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; PRO. C115/M36/8436. 3 October 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.

with Charles disliking " to hear other people give, what is only fit for him " and forming decisions according to his own criteria, as with Buckingham before her this was based upon making the best use of her proximity to the king rather than a direct ability to mould his mind at will. <sup>20</sup>

With neither the queen or any other major figure at Court able to influence the distribution of patronage in any significant way during the 1630s this meant that it was as subject to the personal preferences of Charles as it had been during the 1620s, and this was to have a significant effect upon its overall political tone. The politics of the 1630s, often arbitrarily termed the " Personal Rule " as if Charles had previously had no effect upon the politics of the reign (something particularly difficult to comprehend given the attention which has been paid to the effects of his actions and assumptions upon parliament) are usually seen as a world apart from the 1620s, but when examined more closely it can be seen that whilst there were certain obvious differences such as the absence of parliament, with this having only been called as a means of financing his war against Spain and with Charles's reluctance to summon another having been formed by events which occurred during the 1620s, they were in fact moulded by the same factors and there was an essential unity to the reign which is often overlooked.

Charles's decision to advance his policy of war against Spain through punishing those who opposed it rather than attempting to increase the number of those who could support it, together with his uncaring attitude to the concerns of parliament in the light of the unpopular financial and religious policies which he had been advancing during the opening years of his reign had produced great political strains and severely damaged the reputation of the Crown. As a consequence of this during the 1630s he should have been using the patronage at his disposal as a means of healing political wounds through providing outlets for all elements of society or strengthening his position by targeting specific groups who could support his policies. However, that

---

<sup>20</sup>

HMC, Third Report, p. 25. 24 August 1634. [Misdated, 1637]. Oatlands. Henry Percy - His brother-in-law, the Earl of Leicester.

Charles had decided to abandon war against France and Spain was because with parliament constantly questioning his actions and failing to provide the necessary levels of finance required in order to adequately implement them, and the extra-parliamentary means such as the Forced Loan which he had attempted to use in its place producing too many political strains, it was threatening his underlying and constant personal objectives of maintaining authority and establishing order and uniformity, not because he had realised that his policies or his distribution of patronage were failing to extract the potential support which lay in his people. So rather than altering any of his original objectives he continued distributing his patronage on the same personal basis as he had during the 1620s and merely removed the inherent contradiction which had been caused by his foreign policy through bringing it into line with his wider objective of order at home by (like James) pursuing it through a diplomatic alliance with Spain rather than a publicly funded war. However, just because Charles was distributing his patronage along personal rather than normal political lines aimed at increasing support for a specific policy did not mean that it had no overall objective to it. As the deliberately promoted notions of peace and harmony in a Europe torn by war was not mere rhetoric aimed at inducing people to support Charles's new accommodation with Spain, but in fact part of a much wider plan in which although he never possessed the political skills required in order to actually achieve it (failing to realise that it would require him to abandon such sweeping and expensive policies as the restitution of the Palatinate or an assertion of sovereignty of the seas through an expansion of the navy), Charles was attempting to establish order and control throughout the Court and kingdom. For although it was prevented from reaching its full effect during the 1620s because of the more immediate effects of Charles's war policy, and has therefore been consistently overlooked because of the more visible actions of his conflicts with those present in parliament, this limited personal objective forms the ideological basis behind most of the major domestic decisions of Charles's reign. It was the root cause of his opposition to doctrinal dispute and the strict enforcement of religious ceremony within the Church (which although hitting those of a more Calvinist persuasion particularly hard was not part of a deliberate plan to alter the doctrinal position of the

Church but of Charles's ambition to secure order and propensity to proceed against those he felt challenging his authority) and its subsequent extension to Scotland and Ireland in the interest of uniformity. <sup>21</sup> It prompted the repeated orders aimed at regulating the organisation of the Court (as in the strict control of access, attendance and the adherence to ceremony within the household) and those within it (as in those commanding the gentry to leave London and reside in their counties so as to be able to fulfil their social obligations, and especially his attempts to improve its morality, replacing the licentious nature of James's reign with an almost puritan tone) so that it could act as a template for society and " spread with more order through all parts of our kingdom ". <sup>22</sup> It accounts for the similar role ascribed to Court culture, where representations in portraits and masques especially not only focussed attention upon the natural authority of the king and queen and their position at head of the social and political hierarchy, but as with the masque *Coelum Britannicum* produced in 1637 deliberately represented Charles's Court as " the pattern of perfect order and the model for Jove's heaven " and something which should be emulated. <sup>23</sup> This same objective was also to provide the basis for the distribution of Court office under Charles, which given the traditional assumption that access carried with it an ability to influence the formulation of policy, was to have a particularly significant effect upon the politics of this reign.

As demonstrated in his use of the reversionary interest of Prince Henry, his dealings with the Howards in the period of reform which came in the light of the fall of Somerset and his subsequent attempts to secure a Spanish match for Prince Charles, James had been particularly adept at using the patronage at his disposal in conjunction with faction at Court in order to secure his wider political aims through building up

---

<sup>21</sup> Charles's determination to promote order and obedience through bringing the Church into line with his own preferences rather than any specific religious position forms the basis of what Julian Davies terms " Carolinism ". Davies, Caroline Captivity. pp. 3, 14-19, 297, 299.

<sup>22</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 210-218.

<sup>23</sup> Hirst, Authority and Conflict. pp. 162-3.



those who supported his policies whilst marginalising or allowing the removal (crucially in the name of others) of those who did not. This gave his reign a muddled, factious and often contradictory tone, but as a means of enabling him to advance his policies without becoming boxed in through allowing the Crown to become associated with one particular group it appears to have worked fairly well. Under Charles, though, this successful mode of political regulation was to be undermined on a number of fronts. In having taken patronage back into his own hands rather than setting the parameters and allowing the actual selection to be made by a courtier he had ultimately focussed attention for its consequences upon the Crown rather than an outside party such as Buckingham who was ultimately disposable with no great constitutional implications. By allowing his appointments to be made according to his own personal preferences he had failed to respond to the real political issues of the day or establish a group who would be able to support him in tackling them when they caught up with him. In undermining the support which the Crown received from its patronage at a time when it did not enjoy the wholehearted support of any one group (such as the support of the Catholic Church in France and Spain) and when it lacked the means of purchasing support in a more direct manner this was a bad enough development in itself. Its effects, however, went far deeper than this. It can be demonstrated that when Charles made these appointments he had given his ministers his delegated authority, which as an essentially insecure person he was determined to uphold to the full in every sphere. He was unable to view them in a disassociated manner as pawns in a much larger political game as James had done or allow them to hold views of their own. He shrank back from sacrificing them for the benefit of the Crown, regarding attacks against them as attacks against himself, and saw disputes or divisions between them as a sign of his own weakness and something to be avoided. He invariably refused to allow ministers to be removed against his will and distributed the patronage at his disposal in such a way that it provided the least possible factional disruption, which in preventing people from achieving their political aims through the normal means of the Court, between them had an effect upon its principal role as a cohesive factor in society.

Charles's propensity to defend his servants can be seen to have begun even before he became king in that as Prince of Wales he had supported Viscount Andover against an attack led by Buckingham; and that this had been based upon the fact that he had received his delegated authority rather than just his personal favour can be seen in that he also subsequently protected Buckingham himself (first against James and then subsequently against parliament) once he began to support his policies during the late 1610s, whilst any notion that Buckingham was an exceptional case can be expelled in that he can be shown to have acted in exactly the same way in the 1630s in his dealings with Lord Treasurer Portland.

Having " carried himself so luckily in parliament, that he did his master much service, and preserved himself in the good opinion and acceptance of the house; which is a blessing not indulged to many by those high powers..." through such measures as claiming when called forth to defend the king's war policy that he had forgotten all his detailed notes and signing an apologia along with such moderate figures as Lord President Manchester, Lord Keeper Coventry and Sir Humphry May upon Charles's decision to invade La Rochelle, whilst carrying out his financial duties with a skill and energy which contrasted markedly with the Earl of Marlborough, during the 1620s as Chancellor of the Exchequer Sir Richard Weston had enjoyed a reasonably good reputation, both in parliament and with the king. <sup>24</sup> But after his appointment as lord treasurer and the death of the Duke of Buckingham (who it was believed would have attempted to remove him had he lived) by which he found himself working both more frequently and directly with the king, he became increasingly accustomed to Charles's preferred style of rule in which it was only his support which mattered and produced many influential enemies. <sup>25</sup> With Weston

---

<sup>24</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 22-3.; CSPD, 1627-1628. p. 353. 21 September 1627. Sir Robert Pye - Duke of Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 375. 7 October 1627. Sir Humphry May - Duke of Buckingham.; Ibid., p. 434. 14 November 1627. Sir Edward Nicholas - Duke of Buckingham.; Thomas Cogswell, ' The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I. and the People in the 1620s ', pp. 187-215 in JBS. Vol. 29. 1990. p. 210.

<sup>25</sup> That Weston would have been removed if Buckingham had lived was asserted both by

(together with Cottington) being held responsible for the pro-Spanish policies now being advanced by the king there had been smouldering opposition to him for some time, and as a means of staving this off Charles had " acted deliberately to protect Weston by integrating him and his dynasty into the court aristocracy " through such measures as investing him into the Order of the Garter and arranging the marriage of his second son and heir, Jerome, to his own cousin, Frances Stuart, a sister of the Duke of Lennox, and of his daughter, Anne, to Basil, Lord Feilding, Buckingham's nephew and the heir of the Earl of Denbigh, besides numerous grants of local office and profit. <sup>26</sup> However, old political habits died hard, and believing as with Buckingham that Charles was either being ill-advised or was allowing Weston to rule the country, and that his removal would therefore lead the way to a change in policy, these actions on the part of the king failed to have the desired effect of quelling factionalism and the rumours continued unabated, which with Weston being absent from Court for long periods as a consequence of the first stages of the illness which was to claim his life exactly a year later, and Laud buoyed by the fact that Wentworth had by now provided him with firm evidence of mismanagement on his part in relation to affairs in Ireland, came to a head on Sunday 27 April 1634 when a loose coalition of Archbishop Laud, Lord Keeper Coventry, Lord Privy Seal Manchester and the Earl of Holland went before the king to formally accuse him of corruption in the hope of securing his removal from office. <sup>27</sup> At this meeting a damning picture of Weston's

---

-Clarendon, who stated that " some, who knew the duke's passions and prejudice... believed he [Weston] would have been shortly cashiered..." if Buckingham had lived, and John Hacket, who observed in the light of Weston's appointment "...my lord duke was soon satiated with their greatness, whom he advanced. It was the inglorious mark of thirteen years of his power to remove officers ". -Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 23-7.; Hacket, Scrinia Reserata. Pt. II. p. 19.

<sup>26</sup> Caroline Hibbard, ' The theatre of dynasty ', pp. 156-176, in R.M. Smuts, ed., The Stuart court and Europe. (Cambridge, 1996). pp. 171-2.; Alexander, Weston. pp. 166-173.

<sup>27</sup> CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 488. 5 March 1634. Secretary Windebank - Charles I.; L.J. Reeve, Charles I. and the Road to the Personal Rule. (Cambridge, 1989). p. 198.; Alexander, Weston. pp.

actions as lord treasurer was produced, against which he himself (who was had probably realised the king's desire to avoid open faction) produced very little defence.

<sup>28</sup> Weston was not entirely alone, though, for whilst Charles's attempts at staving off attacks and avoiding factionalism through tying him more closely to himself through giving him what he saw to be clear demonstrations of his own favour had failed as a consequence of his opponents's refusal to believe that this had been the intention which lay behind them, it at least inadvertantly ensured that in the light of them Weston was not alone, being supported by the Duke of Lennox, " who is dear to the king, a sister of whom [Frances] is married to the treasurer's eldest son [Jerome]...", the Earl of Denbigh (whose son Basil, Lord Feilding, had been married to Weston's daughter, Anne) and the Duchess of Buckingham (who was Feilding's aunt), who all " advertise[d] his great deserts with this kingdom, which has experienced such relief, so they say, since he entered the government "; but with all this largely coming from relations who were bound by honour and self-interest to protect him, and the attack having by this point in time also been joined by the Earls of Carlisle and Dorset, Weston was clearly distanced from most of the major figures at Court and in both political terms and as a means of eradicating faction it was of only limited use. <sup>29</sup> If Charles had merely been interested in eradicating faction Weston may have been treading upon thin ice, but an equally important element in Charles's objective of establishing order was the need to maintain the hierarchical command structure, so having long " resolved to hold the reins [of government] in his own hands, and to put no further trust in others, than was necessary for the capacity they served in ", and looking upon " him [Weston] as a wise and able servant, and worthy of the trust he reposed in him " he saw this not as an attempt to bring an improvement in the

---

190-192.; --CSPV,1632-1636. p. 220. 12 May 1634.

Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 221.

12 May 1634. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 223. 26 May 1634.

Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 226. 2 June 1634. Same - Same.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 221. 12 May 1634.

Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>29</sup> Alexander, Weston. p. 192.;

Reeve, Charles I. p. 198.; CSPV,1632-1636. p. 221. 12

May 1634. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 223. 26 May 1634. Same - Same.

administration of the government as intended by Laud, or as a politically (and part personally) motivated attack intended as a presage to a change in policy as in the case of Holland, or a combination of the two as with Coventry and Manchester, but as a direct challenge to his own authority as king, and therefore not only refused to act upon their accusations (thereby undermining the normal convention in which ministers were removed when opposition reached a certain critical mass), but took a number of additional measures aimed at demonstrating his personal support for Weston as a means of defending it.<sup>30</sup> When Charles had suspended Lord Chief Baron Walter from office in 1629 for "dealing cautiously and not plainly with him in the business concerning the parliament men: as if he had given his opinion to the king privately one way and thereby brought him on the stage and there left him, and then was of another judgement" it had been made with the clear intention that he should yield his office.<sup>31</sup> Rumour at the time held that he was to be replaced by Sir James Whitelocke (a Puisne Justice of the King's Bench), but Charles appears to have already planned to replace him with Sir Humphry Davenport, who in the light of Walter's decision to stand upon the terms of his patent (holding his position during good behaviour rather than during pleasure) and Charles's decision not to proceed to a perhaps embarrassing trial, was appointed a Puisne Justice of the Common Pleas in the place of Sir Henry Yelverton in February 1630 with a promise of the position of Lord Chief Baron once it became vacant by the death of Walter.<sup>32</sup> Consequently,

---

<sup>30</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 24-5.

<sup>31</sup> Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials of the English affairs from the beginning of the reign of Charles I. to the happy restoration of King Charles II. (Oxford, 1853). pp. 45-6.

<sup>32</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 475v. 17 October 1629. Christ's College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 265. 24 October 1629. Essex House. George Gresley - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Ibid. f. 270. 5 November 1629. Essex House. Same - Same.; Whitelocke, Memorials. p. 46.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. ed., Seddon. Vol. 3. p. 400. 7 December 1629. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.; PRO. C115/M31/8142. 30 January 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M31/8121. 6 February 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; BCL.

within a week of Walter's death on 18 November 1630 there was talk of him being replaced by Davenport, who was duly appointed on 10 January 1631 (the first day of the new law term) and himself replaced on 8 May 1631 by Sir George Vernon, who was currently a Baron of the Exchequer, whilst Vernon was replaced by James Weston, " a lawyer kinsman of my lord treasurer...".<sup>33</sup> Sir James Weston had died early in 1634 leaving vacant his position as Baron of the Exchequer, which with everybody looking for signs that his kinsman the Lord Treasurer was slipping in the king's favour, Charles deliberately granted to another kinsman (Richard Weston) within three days of his having first been accused of corruption, seeing no better way of demonstrating his continued support for him than by replacing one deceased member of his family with another.<sup>34</sup> Perhaps aware of the shock which this attack

---

--DV.896/603183/80. 2 February 1630. A patent during pleasure granted unto Sir Humphry Davenport, kt., one of his majesty's sergeants-at-law, of the office of one of the Judges of the Common Pleas.; --Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. P. 221.

<sup>33</sup> Ellis ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 5.; Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. pp. 221-2.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 524. 28 November 1630. Christ's College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Ibid., f. 525v. 5 December 1630. Christ's College, Cambridge. Same - Same.; Ibid., f. 533. 30 January 1631. Christ's College, Cambridge. Same - Same.; BCL. DV. 896/603183/128. 10 January 1631. A patent during pleasure granted to Sir Humphry Davenport, kt., one of the Justices of the Common Pleas, of the office of Chief Baron of his Majesty's Exchequer, with all fees and commodities thereto belonging.; BCL. DV. 896/603183/152. 8 May 1631. A patent during pleasure granted to Sir George Vernon, kt., one of the Barons of the Exchequer, of the office of one of the Justices of the Common Pleas.

<sup>34</sup> With Weston absent from Court at this time (it being this which made it possible for his opponents to lay accusations of corruption against him) he could not have been responsible for this appointment, which would appear to have been the work of the king. BCL. DV.896/603183/304. 30 April 1634. A patent during pleasure granted unto Richard Weston, sergeant-at-law, of the office of one of the Barons of his Majesty's Exchequer.

had had upon Charles, and in any case having learnt through his dismissal of her own French household the importance of supporting her husband whatever her own personal feelings, this act on the part of the king was soon after emulated on the part of the queen, who crucial to any continued proceedings against Weston, later that same month gave an unequivocal sign of her support for him by appointing Weston to her council.<sup>35</sup> Listening to the case against Weston and then deliberately demonstrating his continued support for him was totally in keeping with Charles's wider objectives of protecting his authority and maintaining the perception of a settled and ordered Court; as those opposing him were allowed to have their say and would hopefully not repeat them, Weston was humbled and forced to be more careful in the future, whilst retaining him in office not only upheld Charles's authority to make his own decisions in his own time, but also increased Weston's personal dependence upon him.<sup>36</sup> Through this Charles had typically succeeded in moulding wider political factors to his own personal preferences, but in doing so he had exacerbated his minister's greatest shortcomings. For the protection which Charles

---

<sup>35</sup> Rymer, *Foedera*. Vol. VIII. Pt. III. p. 75. 22 May 1634. De commissione speciali Thome domino Coventry and aliis as sacramenta ministranda officiariis dominiae Henriettae Mariae Reginae. AD. 1634.

<sup>36</sup> One of Weston's greatest problems was his inability to protect himself by establishing a party of his own because of Charles's control of patronage. This is noted by Clarendon, who notes that after Buckingham's death he "found himself to succeed him in the public displeasure, and in the malice of his enemies, without succeeding him in his credit at Court, or in the affection of any considerable dependents". And was not "superior to all other men in the affection, or rather resignation, of the king, so that he might dispense favours and disfavours according to his own election...the king himself being resolved to hold the reins in his own hands, and to put no further trust in others, than was necessary for the capacity they served in. Which resolution in his majesty was no sooner believed, and the treasurer's pretence [of influence] taken notice of, than he found the number of his enemies exceedingly increased, and others to be less eager in the pursuit of his friendship...". Boyle, ed., *Selections from Clarendon*. pp. 24-5.

gave Weston ultimately meant that the odium for his actions ultimately came to rest upon him.

In forming his actions solely according to his own objectives and refusing to allow pressure from courtiers and other ministers to dictate when an officer of his should be removed Charles's fear of faction and focus upon order and obedience can be seen to have undermined half of the traditional means through which political discontent at Court had previously been eased, through providing a simple means by which it could be transformed into a change of policy. However, as Charles himself had learnt in the part which he had played in the removal of Lord Treasurer Middlesex there were two elements in the use of faction as a political tool; as whilst removing a minister from office could have an effect upon the direction of policy given the right circumstances, its results were likely to be extremely limited unless he was replaced by someone who was more conducive to their aims, and through having taken the distribution of patronage back into his own hands and then using it as a means of avoiding faction and establishing a settled Court rather than achieving a true representation of the political concerns of the time at Court, Charles's actions can be seen to have had as detrimental an effect upon this aspect of the use of faction as a political tool as they had had on the ability of courtiers to remove officers in the first place.

Looking back from his vantage point after the civil war Edward, Earl of Clarendon noted that a major problem in Charles's personal distribution of patronage was that " he paused too long in giving, which made those, to whom he gave, less sensible of the benefit...", and that he " saw and observed men long, before he received them about his person; and did not love strangers..."; and that this was the case was not because Charles took little interest in the patronage at his disposal or was lazy, but because he was using the intervening period to ensure that those promoted and the manner in which their appointment was conducted would not upset the delicate factional balance of a Court formed along personal favour and containing representatives of a number of ideological perspectives.<sup>37</sup> This can be seen in his decision to appoint William

---

<sup>37</sup>

The lack of use which Charles made of patronage as a political tool (as well as his underlying assumption that people were appointed to serve him and not benefit them) can be seen in



Juxon as lord treasurer rather than the more obvious choice of Lord Cottington. The same desire to avoid factional dispute within the Court can also be seen in Charles's actions surrounding the appointment of the Earl of Northumberland as lord admiral in 1638. Knowing from his previous actions upon being left out of the admiralty commission in 1628 that the Earl of Holland might cause a disturbance upon missing out again and that his principal means of support lay with the queen, Charles deliberately informed her of his decision in advance, who then rather than supporting Holland in his subsequent display of political discontent helped marginalise it through taking "notice of it and the weakness with which it had been carried..." and then "laughing at it...".<sup>38</sup> It is perhaps most clearly expressed in his actions surrounding the appointment of a successor to Attorney General Noy in August 1634, where his desire to maintain stability can be demonstrated to have been strong enough to overcome his usual reluctance to succumb to Court pressure and allow one of his servants to be removed from office.

By the summer of 1634 Attorney General Noy was clearly dying, and through using her connections with the Earl of Holland and an apparent arrangement with

---

-Clarendon's statement that Charles "was not in his nature very bountiful, though he gave very much...".

Ibid., p. 225.

<sup>38</sup>

Upon discovering that he was not amongst the six commissioners nominated to govern the admiralty in September 1628 it had been reported "from Court that the Earl of Holland, had gone from thence in a pett, and returned again before he was sent for...", whilst when he became aware of Charles's decision to appoint Northumberland lord admiral in 1638 he had been "as much troubled at it as could be" and had "called a council, my Lady of Devonshire, my Lady Rich, Lady Essex, Cheek and Lucas his secretary, to whom he uttered his griefs, that the admiralty was disposed of, and in such close manner, that he knew nothing of it before all was done."; BL Harleian 390 f.437v. 20 September 1628. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 421. 27 March 1638. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 441. 30 May 1638. Same - Same.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 156. 3 April 1638. London. Lord Viscount Conway - Wentworth.; CSPD, 1637-1638. p. 321. 21 March 1638. Thomas Smith - Sir John Pennington.

Archbishop Laud it would appear that Henrietta Maria was attempting to secure the appointment of Sir John Finch, her own attorney, in his place.<sup>39</sup> However, Henrietta Maria and Laud were not the only people with designs upon this office. As in the light of the attacks upon him earlier that year at the Council Board and more recently in the forest courts under Holland, and with his preferred mode of securing a restitution of the Palatinate through negotiations with Spain apparently stalling, Lord Treasurer Weston was determined to retain control of the new policy of ship money which was at this time being advanced by the Protestant element within the Council as a means of marginalising him and easing the way for Holland's appointment as lord admiral.<sup>40</sup> He saw the best means of achieving this as being through the appointment of his own

---

<sup>39</sup> Many commentators noted that Laud had been courted by Finch and his allies in their attempt to get him appointed attorney general that summer, whilst from a later entry in his diary it is clear that he either had an audience or been contacted by the queen herself. In relation to this it is interesting to note that after the beginning of August there was no further mention of Littleton in relation to this office, perhaps indicating that where Laud had previously backed him in opposition to Weston's candidate of Bankes, through the intervention of the queen he had been persuaded to support Finch. As Justice Itinerant Holland had secured the appointment of Finch as Crown counsel in the forest courts held earlier that year in the place of Noy. This enabled him to be paraded before the king. DNB, sub Noy.; Cowper, II. p. 58. 13 July 1634. Tunbridge Wells. Viscount Chaworth - Secretary Coke.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 161. 22 July 1634. Lord Keeper Coventry - Charles I.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. ff. 43-4. 2 August 1634. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.; PRO. SO3/10. May 1631. Office of Warden, Chief Justice Itinerant...on this side Trent...granted to the Earl of Holland. Subscribed attorney general upon signification of the king's pleasure by the Lord Viscount Dorchester.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 222. Saturday 30 August 1634.

<sup>40</sup> PRO. C115/M36/8427. 1 August 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; Alexander, Weston. p. 195.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. ff. 43/4. 2 August 1634. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.; Quintrell, Charles I. pp. 61-2.

candidate of Sir John Bankes as attorney general (whose job it would be as the legal representative of the government to see ship money implemented), and was like the queen attempting to achieve this through parading him before the king, in his case as an intermediary with the dying Noy, who was at this time at the waters at Tunbridge Wells.<sup>41</sup> As Noy's health gradually deteriorated over the summer and particularly in the light of his death on the evening of Friday the 9 August there had been a great deal of speculation and jostling over who was to replace him, but ultimately the decision lay with Charles and not the courtiers who attempted to influence his decision or the newsletter writers who commented upon them; and despite the confidence of Finch and his allies, he ultimately decided upon the appointment of Bankes, who was already closely involved in the laying plans for the development of ship money and as an ally of Weston's would not be involved in any attempt to use it as a means of marginalising him.<sup>42</sup> Characteristically, though, Charles appears to have resolved upon this appointment some time before he made it known to either the Council or any of those involved, and in another typical action of his had used the intervening period in order to try and remove any obstacles or problems which had

---

<sup>41</sup> As a result of his links with Weston Bankes had been rumoured as a possible successor to Attorney General Heath in September 1631, and was linked with the position again in January 1634 when there was speculation that Noy was to be appointed Master of the Court of Wards.; HMC, Seventh Report. p. 400. 11 September 1631. Earl of Exeter - Sir Gervase Clifton.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 470. 23 January 1634. John Gresley - Thomas Puckering.; Cowper, II. p. 59. 22 July 1634. Canbury. Lord Keeper Coventry - Secretary Coke.

<sup>42</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 221. Friday/Saturday August. 9/10 1634.; Ibid., p. 222. Saturday 30 August 1634.; Ellis, ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 9. 9 August 1634.; SRO. DD/Ph/212. f. 12. 16 August 1634. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelips.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. f. 44. 2 August 1634. Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robt. Phelips.; PRO. C115/N3/8555. Saturday 9 August 1634. Ribsford. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M36/8432. 2 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M36/8433. 4 September 1634. Same - Same.; Cowper, II. p. 62. 14 August 1634. Middleton. Christopher Fulwood - Secretary Coke.

been consequent upon it; as with the queen having most likely informed him (although probably through a relation of the actions of others rather than through revealing the true extent of her own involvement) of the opposition to the appointment of Bankes as part of her campaign on behalf of Finch, in the interest of avoiding it he had decided upon the appointment of Richard Lane (the queen's councillor-at-law) to Bankes's old position of attorney general to the prince, and Edward Littleton (who the queen was likely to have advocated for the position of her own attorney as her part in the deal with Laud) as solicitor general in the place of Sir Richard Sheldon, who had been persuaded to retire.<sup>43</sup>

However, as soon as the queen discovered that it was Weston's candidate and not hers who was to be appointed attorney general she was furious; for whilst her efforts had unexpectedly helped to secure the appointment of Littleton as solicitor general, her support for him had only been based on the assumption that the top position would go to her candidate of Sir John Finch, whilst the appointment of Richard Lane as attorney general to the prince was in her eyes hardly adequate compensation for this given the extent to which her influence (although unknown to the king) had been

---

<sup>43</sup> With ship money about to be implemented for the first time Charles had foreseen " that he [the solicitor] should have much to do in Westminster Hall ", and fearing that Sheldon would not be up to the task, had pressed him to resign and appointed Littleton in his place, who " looked upon as the best antiquary of the profession, who gave himself up to practice ", was the ideal replacement given the extent to which this policy was based upon historical precedent.; PRO. E101/439/3. f. 92v. Pensions and wages of the queen's household, 1634-5. Richard Lane, councillor-at-law to the queen.; PRO. C115/M36/8433. 4 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M36/8435. 26 September 1634. Same - Same.; PRO. SO3/10. October 1634. Office of attorney general to the prince granted to Richard Lane of the Inner Temple, esq. Subscribed attorney general. King's pleasure signified by Secretary Windebank, and by him procured. Passed the Great Seal 22 October 1634. BCL. DV.896/603183/330.; Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. p. 108.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 470. 23 January 1634. John Gresley - Thomas Puckering.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 335. 10 November 1634. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

involved, and as a means of retrieving the situation had immediately set about rallying her support, the first consequences of this being seen in reports of " some clashing between Sir John Bankes and Sir John Finch about the attorneyship ".<sup>44</sup> Laud also happened to be present at Court at this time, and given his earlier involvement in her plan and his interest in its outcome the queen arranged a meeting with him on Saturday 30 August 1634 at Oatlands, where they were almost certain to have discussed the consequences of recent events, especially those relating to the perceived influence of Lord Treasurer Weston.<sup>45</sup> Given the part which he had earlier played in the attempt to remove Weston from office in the course of this meeting Laud was likely to have expanded upon his belief in the latter's corruption and his fear that Bankes was likely to follow in his footsteps, but given his blinkered approach to affairs and the fact that upon the death of Noy he had written in his diary that " I have lost a dear friend of him, and the Church the greatest she had of his condition, since she needed any such ", he was particularly likely to have mentioned the sorry position of the Church now that it had no protectors amongst the higher echelons of the legal

---

<sup>44</sup> Although it is not possible to discover the exact date when Charles announced these appointments it would appear to have been the last week of August, as Weston had then informed Windebank to stop pressing for Bankes and by the beginning of September they had become common knowledge amongst the newsletter writers.; CSPD,1634-1635. p. 196. 25 August 1634. Lord Treasurer Weston - Secretary Windebank.; Ibid., p. 206. 11 September 1634. Reginald Burdin - Sir John Lambe.; Cowper, II. p. 62. 14 August 1634. Middleton. Christopher Fulwood - Secretary Coke.; PRO. C115/M36/8432. 2 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115/M36/8433. 4 September 1634. Same - Same.

<sup>45</sup> This meeting substantiates the existence of some sort of deal between Laud and the queen over the backing of Finch. As Laud later wrote that whilst there " she gave me thanks for a business which she trusted me ". Which given his earlier meeting with her, the ending of his campaign for the appointment of Littleton and the timing of this meeting, appears to have been in relation to the appointment of Finch.; Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 222. Saturday 30 August 1634.; CSPD,1634-1635. p. 206. 11 September 1634. Reginald Burden - Sir John Lambe.

profession, in which he was likely to have laid special emphasis upon the examples of Sir Thomas Richardson and Sir Robert Heath.<sup>46</sup>

Described by some as a puritan, Richardson had consistently clashed with Laud and his adherents in what they were attempting to achieve in the Church; and having already been demoted to the home circuit and received a check at the Council Board in 1633 for refusing to reverse a ban which he had issued the year before upon the holding of wakes in the Diocese of Bath and Wells without first informing the bishop there, by the summer of 1634 he had also been suspended from the bench for some other unconnected reasons.<sup>47</sup> Heath had equal cause for concern at this time for the part which he had played earlier that July in the Star Chamber trial of George Mynne, the Clerk of the Hanaper, who was being charged for taking excessive fees; for being the good and impartial judge that he was, despite strong pressure from Lord Treasurer Weston and various other members of the Court he had refused to convict him, arguing instead that the terms of the Elizabethan statute which he was said to have contravened were too ambiguous for an ordinary man and non-lawyer to have governed his conduct by, which whilst perhaps true, impressed neither Laud, Weston or the king, and for which he was warned " if he do not mend, he may chance be removed from the Common Pleas ".<sup>48</sup> It is possible that Laud had mentioned all of

---

<sup>46</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 221. Saturday August 10 1634.

<sup>47</sup> Richardson's suspension perhaps related to a cause he had brought against William Fanshawe, the auditor of the Duchy of Lancaster.; Carlton, Archbishop Laud. p. 103.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 243.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 425.; Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. PP. 360/1.; Cowper, II. p. 17. 3 June 1633. John Bancroft, Bishop of Oxford - Secretary Coke.; Ibid., p. 46. 22 February 1634. Lord Chief Justice Richardson - Sir John Coke.; Kopperman, Heath. p. 243.; Barnes, ' Cropping of the Heath ', in BIHR. p. 342.; CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 387. Undated 1633. Petition of William Fanshawe, Auditor of the Duchy of Lancaster.; B. Schofield, ed., The Knyvett Papers 1620-1644. Norfolk Record Society. Vol. XX. (1949), p. 85. Thomas Knyvett - his wife, Katherine Knyvett. Undated January 1635.

<sup>48</sup> PRO. C115/M36/8426. 11 July 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; T.G. Barnes, '

this to the queen during their first interview earlier that summer, but in the light of recent events she was likely to have paid much greater attention to what he said at this second meeting than before; which with Laud receiving " her promise then, that she would be my friend " (probably in relation to what he was attempting to do in relation to the Church and Court) appears to have culminated in a similar plan to that which had come out of the first, in which with Charles's views upon authority making it impossible to attempt to get him to change his mind over the appointment of Bankes as attorney general the original objective of securing the promotion of Finch would now be met through pressing for the removal of Richardson or Heath.<sup>49</sup> In the pursuit of this the queen was likely to have had many other agents apart from Laud, and may herself even have been dropping hints to the king as to why he allowed such weak servants as Heath and Richardson to remain in high office whilst such loyal and competent men as Finch were left in the lesser ones; but however she achieved it, by the beginning of September it was definitely this message which was beginning to filter through, as it was now being rumoured " by my Lord Chief Justice Heath's friends, that his lordship shall be removed from the Common Pleas ", and that " Lord Chief Justice Richardson had [had] his writ of ease ".<sup>50</sup> Despite their shortcomings, in Charles's eyes both Richardson and Heath remained deserving servants of the Crown; and whilst in an ideal world he would have preferred to have maintained the status quo (as demonstrated in his earlier decision to part with Sheldon rather than either of them), with the queen and her allies vigorously pressing for a place one of them clearly had to go in order to maintain his wider objective of stability at Court. Already suspended, it at first appeared that this was going to be Richardson, and that Heath was going to be removed " from the Common Pleas, to a higher place ", being Richardson's office of Lord Chief Justiceship of King's Bench, but in the end this

---

-Cropping the Heath: the fall of a Chief Justice, 1634', pp. 331-343, in BIHR. Vol. 64. 1991. p. 333.

<sup>49</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 222. 30 August 1634.; Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus. p. 304.

<sup>50</sup> PRO. C115/M36/8432. 2 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 206. Reginald Burdin -Sir John Lambe.

never came to fruition, for the actions of Laud, the influence of the queen and pure chance were to bring one final twist which, along with the support rallied on the behalf of Richardson, led Charles to dismiss Heath instead.<sup>51</sup>

The rallying of support was not normally a factor in politics under Charles; but here he had decided that one of them would have to go and it came down to who had the most support and who had the least enemies, and in this it was Heath who came off worse. For whilst Richardson may have been an enemy of Laud's, he was by no means friendless, enjoying (amongst others) the support of the Earl of Arundel and the elusive but influential Lord Cottington, with whom he had been in correspondence over the summer, thanking "him for moving his Majesty to restore the writer to the western circuit, where formerly he rode...", whilst particularly useful in such circumstances as these was his marriage to Buckingham's aunt, nee Elizabeth Beaumont, who now used all her connections and "all his friends to keep him in the King's Bench...".<sup>52</sup> Heath, too, had possessed connections with Buckingham, but whilst Richardson's was a living one Heath's was dead; and the Earl of Carlisle apart, who was in any case unlikely to have acted against the inclinations of the queen, he had no alternative means of support, and in desperation had even attempted to court Wentworth, perhaps as a means of pacifying Laud.<sup>53</sup> With Charles determined to secure these appointments with the least possible disruption Heath's inability to rally a significant level of support had already put him at a distinct disadvantage in relation to Richardson, and unfortunately for him other factors were also leading in the same direction.

At their meeting on Sunday 30 August 1634 Laud had agreed to assist the queen's plan to secure the promotion of Finch, most likely through helping to secure the

---

<sup>51</sup> PRO. C115/M36/8432. 2 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.

<sup>52</sup> On the 3 October 1634 Arundel had written to Lord Deputy Wentworth on Richardson's behalf, possibly with the intention that he intervened with Laud. Kopperman, Heath. p. 243.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 70. 9 June 1634. Sir Thomas Richardson - Francis, Lord Cottington.; PRO. C115/M36/8435. 26 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.

<sup>53</sup> Kopperman, Heath. pp. 244-6.



removal of Richardson or Heath, with the first opportunity at which he could put this into execution coming on Sunday the 7 September, when he waited on the king at Nonsuch. <sup>54</sup> Just what Laud said to the king at this meeting is unrecorded, but whatever the exact details the principal thrust was likely to have been of a nature which in confirming the presence of great discontent within the Court added to the general pressure on Charles to find some means of placating the supporters of Finch. Desperate to remove this evidence of disharmony as soon as possible yet ever protective of his authority and reluctant to allow the removal of any of his servants because of Court pressure, Charles had initially hoped to win over those opposed to the appointment of Bankes, soon after the announcement of his initial decision at the beginning of September arranging a meeting between Finch and Bankes at which he intended to settle the differences between them once and for all and which was evidently fixed for some point between the 8-15 September. <sup>55</sup> By the time they actually met, though, the situation had changed considerably; for whilst in his meeting with the king on Sunday 7 September Laud was only likely to have entered into his general fears over the future of the Church, he met with him again at some point over the weekend of the 13-14 September, by which point he was in a much stronger position to enter into particulars, having on Friday 12 September, a day or so before his second meeting with the king, received important information relating to Sir Robert Heath which would finally enable him to fulfil his obligations to the queen. <sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 268. Saturday 13 September 1634. Archbishop Laud - Bishop Godfrey Goodman of Gloucester. In this it is mentioned how that " on Sunday last Laud waited upon his Majesty at Nonsuch ". The significance of this rough correlation with his meeting with the the queen does not appear to have been noticed in other accounts.

<sup>55</sup> PRO. C115/M36/8433. Thursday 4 September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.

<sup>56</sup> Kopperman, Heath. p. 241; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 208. Croydon. Saturday the 13 September 1634. Archbishop Laud - Bishop Godfrey Goodman of Gloucester.; Ibid., p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement of the case of Bishop Montagu, of Chichester, concerning the Manor of Selsea.; Ibid., p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement by Bishop Montagu of Chichester of his claim to Lincoln's Inn...

The Reformation had long since robbed the Church of most of its financial assets, but enjoying the support of a king and archbishop who were sympathetic to their cause, many churchmen were now attempting to turn back the clock through the courts.<sup>57</sup> As part of this trend the Bishop of Chichester, Richard Montagu, was attempting to assert a claim to the Manor of Selsea, West Sussex, and earlier that week his case had been heard before Sir Robert Heath as Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas; who in a similar act of independence as he had demonstrated in the Star Chamber case of Mynne rather than supporting this crucial and cherished policy of Laud's, had not only thrown out Montagu's particular claims, but worse still had openly asserted his opposition to whole policy, stating " that if way should be given in this case (his conscience I think telling him, it was but right) they should be troubled with hundreds of cases in like nature...".<sup>58</sup> At once realising the wider significance of this ruling to the archbishop plans aimed at restoring the financial position of the Church, Montague immediately wrote to inform him of it, which being personally indorsed by Laud as having being received on Friday 12 September, was just a day or so before he met the king at Hampton Court.<sup>59</sup>

If Laud had been concerned upon the death of Noy about how the Church would fare now that it was left friendless amongst the higher levels of the legal profession then this episode had confirmed his worst fears. Never one to back down in the interest of his own personal political security where he felt that he was right (as is

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement of the case of Bishop Montagu, of Chichester, concerning the Manor of Selsea.; Ibid., p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement by Bishop Montagu of Chichester of his claim to Lincoln's Inn...; Kopperman, Heath. p. 241.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 241.; CSPD, 1634-1635. p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement of the case of Bishop Montagu, of Chichester, concerning the Manor of Selsea.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 206. 12 September 1634. Statement of the case of Bishop Montagu, of Chichester of his claim to Lincoln's Inn...; Ibid., p. 208. Saturday 13 September 1634. Croydon. Archbishop Laud - Bishop of Gloucester.

amply demonstrated in his earlier tussle with Sir Thomas Richardson, and his later persistence in opposing the appointment of Lord Cottington as lord treasurer when repeatedly advised against doing so by Wentworth); and as this was within his own sphere of influence of the Church, he would in this subsequent meeting with the king have almost certainly complained to him of Heath in the strongest possible terms.<sup>60</sup> Although in normal circumstances such complaints would have been ignored, and may even have brought Laud a rebuke for interfering, with the general pressure at Court already leading Charles to consider the dismissal of either Richardson or Heath, and with the strong support which Richardson enjoyed at Court making further dissent likely if he was to be removed, this in all probability proved the final straw in Charles's decision to dismiss Heath, it being more than coincidence that when the Council met on Sunday 14 September Charles had made up his mind and "declared at the Council Board his displeasure against my Lord Chief Justice Heath, that he would have him removed from the Common Pleas" and was to appoint Sir John Finch in his place.<sup>61</sup>

Heath's removal was therefore caused not by a single factor but the combined pressure of a number of quite different ones being brought together as a consequence

---

<sup>60</sup> In relation to Laud's attempts to secure the appointment of Wentworth as lord treasurer in October 1635 he had informed him "...you advise me to leave it as a desperate case. So I will when I cannot choose, but wish it I must for the public...". Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 177. 4 October 1635. Hampton Court. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>61</sup> In relation to his actions over the case of Myne Weston had complained of Heath in terms every bit as strong as Laud in relation to the Church; and although this was primarily for the threat it posed to his objective of improving the revenues of the Crown, he was also likely to have been aware of the fact that in the light of the queen's support of Finch not everyone could be satisfied through the death of Noy and the office vacated by the person appointed in his place.; PRO. C115/M36/8435. 26 [sic 19] September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore. The date given for this letter is clearly wrong, and from internal evidence was probably written a week earlier on Friday the 19 September.

of the queen's determination to secure the promotion of Sir John Finch and acted upon because of Charles's preference for an ordered and faction-free Court; the truth of this being confirmed not only in the fact that it was only at this final meeting when all disputes had been resolved that the whole series of promotions (including Finch's as Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, as well as the earlier ones of Bankes and Littleton) were officially acknowledged, but with Heath having given up his position " with the king's good favour " and Charles having therefore " taken off the intended bill that was to be pursued against him ", the speed with which he re-entered the government.<sup>62</sup> For by the end of 1634 and the early months of 1635 he was already back working for the Crown with the king's personal knowledge, it being reported on Saturday 14 February 1635 that " at the Committee of Trade, his Majesty being present. Sergeant Heath read at the board a proposition, for an imposition upon salt " (something which is hard to reconcile with the belief that Charles had ever seriously considered charging him with corruption in Star Chamber for any other reason than to put pressure upon him to go quietly, or that Laud had possessed sufficient to force him out for religious dissent), and just three years later on Thursday 12 October 1637 he was appointed to the prestigious position of king's sergeant; whilst a confirmation of the involvement of the queen and her purely pragmatic motivations in orchestrating his removal as a means of advancing her own plans can be seen in that when early the following year Finch was too ill to ride the western assize circuit he nominated " Sergeant Heath the fittest man " to sit in his

---

<sup>62</sup> Before the 14 September Littleton was unable to comment on reports that he " is to be solicitor ", but after this date it was reported that " he can now acknowledge it ".; *Ibid.*, 26 [sic 19] September 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; In keeping with the notion of a Court plot, Heath himself clearly knew no obvious cause for his dismissal. BL. Egerton 2978. f. 48. Undated petition of " Your majesty's most humble and most loyal and now most distressed and disconsolate subject, Sir Robert Heath, kt., Chief Justice of your Court of Common Pleas ".; PRO. C115/M36/8437. 18 October 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; *HMC, Marquess of Ormond MSS.* New Series. Vol. I. p. 28. 30 September 1634. Henry, Lord Maltravers - Marquess of Ormond.

place, and that perhaps in atonement for her earlier actions, by 1639 Heath appears to have been acting as her unofficial solicitor general.<sup>63</sup>

With Heath having so clearly been removed from office as the result of a political coup at Court as a means of removing a possible demonstration of discontent rather than for any specific wrongdoing, and with similar actions having been taken in the appointments of Juxon as lord treasurer and Cottington as Master of the Court of Wards, together with the general discouragement which Charles gave to the involvement of courtiers in what he saw to be his own preserve there can be little doubt that having taken the distribution of patronage back into his own hands he was only using it as a means of bringing the Court into line with his own personal preferences of order and stability rather than a means of providing an outlet through which courtiers could legitimately obtain their political objectives, thereby mirroring the equally radical effect which these preferences had had upon their ability to use faction in removing ministers from office without directly challenging the Crown. The general appearance of peace, order and stability which can be seen at Court during

---

<sup>63</sup> Henry Calthorp, the queen's solicitor, had not been replaced upon his death in August 1637, possibly because the duties had gone to Heath, who being a King's Sergeant would have to have acted in an -unofficial capacity.; CSPD,1634-1635. p. 453. 5 January 1635. Sir Robert Heath - Charles I.; Ibid., p. 513. 14 February 1635. Notes of business transacted at the Committee of trade.; Kopperman, Heath. p. 280.; BCL. DV.896/603183/535. 12 October 1637. Westminster. A patent during pleasure granted unto Sir Robert Heath, kt., sergeant-at-law, of the office of one of his Majesty's sergeants-at-law.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 128. 19-29 October 1637. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Ibid., p. 122. 31 August 1637. Same - Same.; Foss, Judges of England. Vol. VI. p. 231.; PRO. C115/N4/8622. 13 February 1638. London. John Burroughs - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO. C115/N4/8623. 14 March 1638. Same - Same.; CSPD,1636-1637. p. 274. 24 February 1637. Lord Keeper Coventry - Secretary Coke.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. P. 152. 20th March 1638. Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Hirst. Representative of the People ? pp. 70, 82.; Gruenfelder, Influence. p. 185.; W.J. Jones, Politics and the Bench. The Judges and the Origins of the English Civil War. (London,1971). p. 40.; A. Pulling, The Order of the Coif. (London,1897). p. 171.

the 1630s as a consequence of the absence of open faction and relative lack of change amongst the officers and ministers of State bears ample testimony to the success of Charles's policies in carrying his personal preferences onto a wider plane, but this was only achieved at a very high price; for Charles was a king and not a private individual, and his actions also had far-reaching political implications.

As the main point of contact between the king and his people and not only the place where the king resided, the principal role of the Court was supposed to be " to ingretrate the social and political elites into a system of dynastic rule...".<sup>64</sup> That it had for the most part been able to fulfil this role so successfully under James and Elizabeth was because their careful use of patronage, their open and accommodating approach to dissent and above all their ability to mask their true intentions (either through dissimulation in the case of Elizabeth, or the use of favourite as with James) and therefore maintain the perception that they held a position above the faction present at Court, had enabled them to ensure that " no one who subscribed to a few basic loyalties needed to feel left out " and that " none of the main solutions to the problems of the day lacked advocates within the very sphere of the Court itself ".<sup>65</sup> However, lacking the caution and political reality which naturally came to these two monarchs as a consequence of having been subject to continual political crises from an early stage in their lives, and therefore deliberately involving his own authority as king in a plan to use the Court as a vehicle by which he hoped to carry his vision of government to the country as a whole this was a role which it was no longer able to fulfil under Charles. For whilst in distributing his patronage along personal rather than political lines Charles had not closed off any particular religious or political group from access to the Court, in preventing the ability of courtiers to campaign for let alone secure the removal or appointment of Crown officers beyond the extent to

---

<sup>64</sup> G.R. Elton, ' The Tudor Court: the points of contact. Part III. The Court ', pp. 211-228 in TRHS. (London,1976). Vol. 26. p. 227.; R.G. Asch and A.M. Birke, eds., Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility. The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age. c 1450-1650. (London,1991). p. 24.

<sup>65</sup> Elton, ' The Court ', in TRHS. pp. 227-8.

which they were supported by the king he had in fact managed to achieve something far worse. As whilst his actions had understandably hit some groups harder than others, this had merely been a consequence of whether their objectives had happened to agree with his or no in the light of his firm determination to be obeyed and not because he was actively seeking them out, and in removing the ability of outside parties to influence any part of the decision making process he had in fact prevented all courtiers (whatever their political or religious persuasion) from being able to seek their political objectives in conjunction with the Crown through the Court. This undermined the whole *raison d'être* of obtaining Court office as a means of gaining access to the king and forced courtiers to either accept things as they were or seek change through alternative means such as passive and then ultimately open opposition.

However, with it still being possible as a consequence of the purely personal basis upon which Charles's patronage was distributed for people from all political or religious groups who (out of conviction, duty, or self-interest) were outwardly willing to conform to his commands to obtain grants of office and particularly favour the immediate consequences of this were underlying resentment and political frustration rather than open conflict; and produced a Court which whilst broadly-based and on the surface in accordance with Charles's objectives apparently settled and well-regulated, in containing courtiers like the Earl of Holland whose attendance was based upon personal gain rather than any urgent desire to serve in such influential office; and with Charles having deliberately shunned the need to increase the support of the Crown or heal any of the political wounds of the 1620s, was in political terms a great deal more unstable than the haphazard and unruly Court of James I. As long as Charles was able to pursue his objectives on the strength of his own authority through advancing a domestic policy aimed at re-settlement in conjunction with a pro-Spanish foreign policy and faced no sudden emergency these weaknesses remained largely hidden and caused no immediate problem, but when towards the middle of the 1630s he was forced to call upon the support of his people as a means of financing the expansion of the navy which would enable him to strengthen his bargaining position with Spain as a means of securing a solution to the Palatine problem, something

which he had to repeat towards the end of the 1630s and throughout the 1640s in settling problems closer to home, the same weaknesses in the distribution of his patronage which had dogged him in the pursuit of his political objectives in the 1620s can be seen to have re-appeared, in patronage terms the 1630s representing as much an opportunity missed as the 1620s had been.



## Chapter 8.

### Lost opportunities. The impact of Charles's patronage during the 1630s.

Charles had been deeply affected by the eviction of his sister and her family from their ancestral lands in the Palatinate by Habsburg forces in 1619; he had been wounded too by the failure of his Spanish match in 1623. He was then moved by a combination of personal affection and a keen awareness of the slights which had been dealt to Stuart family honour. As a consequence the guiding principle of his foreign policy was to recover what had been lost: to put an end to Elizabeth's enforced exile and to avenge his family's honour as and when he could. Charles was in no way politically isolated in his stance, as his concerns (although for different reasons) were also shared by a majority of the political nation. The marriage of Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine had originally been intended by James as a preliminary to a Spanish marriage for Prince Henry, together providing a means of reconciliation between the two branches of the Christian Church and thus advancing his ambition of taking confessional strife out of his domestic and foreign policy. However, Henry's sudden death disrupted James's plans; as the Palatine marriage came to have a special significance, interpreted at home as having extended the hand of friendship to the Protestant princes of Europe. Their summary expulsion a few years later was viewed with dismay as a possible turning point in the Counter-Reformation and something which called for immediate action. The cause provided a firm basis of potential support from which Charles should have been able to have extracted that level of support required in order to secure his objectives. But much the same as in the spread of Nazism during the 1930s, whilst all were deeply concerned with what was going on in Europe at this time they differed over what should be done about it. Some saw England as ill-prepared to face war against the combined might of the Habsburgs; in the short-term at least, a good proportion (perhaps the majority) of the country saw it to be more important to first use its unique position as an island to establish it as an outpost against the spread of Catholicism before running the risk of leaving itself

open to attack through wasting its meagre resources on risky enterprises abroad. Those who did support military action by and large favoured a self-financing blue-water policy aimed at raiding the Spanish treasure fleets rather than direct action in the Palatinate or land-based attacks upon mainland Spain. Provided that Charles was able to ease the fears of his subjects by demonstrating that his plans were well thought-out and would be skillfully managed and ensured that they were moulded in such a way that they provided suitable outlets for the support which was available, together with the careful use of the patronage which was at his disposal this need not have represented any great difficulty; but hurriedly pressing ahead with his plans and refusing to settle for anything less than their complete adoption whilst simultaneously distributing his patronage along personal and administrative lines rather than in such a manner as would serve to promote his objectives the opportunities for advancing this policy had been squandered, producing discord and suspicion at home and ineffective and underfunded action abroad rather than an effective policy behind which all elements could have united in a common cause. However, whilst this had ultimately forced Charles to abandon his attempts aimed at waging war against Spain he remained as determined as before to secure a restitution of the Palatinate, and had therefore merely entered into negotiations with Spain in the hope of obtaining by diplomacy what he had been unable to achieve through force. And although his actions during the war years had certainly caused a great deal of political damage to the reputation of the Crown, leading a few to doubt his ability to rule and an even greater number to question his political judgment and susceptibility to bad advice, that this had occurred was a result of the very level of their awareness of the wider consequences of what was happening in Europe rather than of disinterest; and with none of these underlying concerns having been resolved by Charles's decision to abandon war, having in fact in many ways been increased as a consequence of his hard-line approach to conformity within the Church (which in being especially directed against those of a more determined Protestantism averse to ceremony had given the impression that he was attempting to change its doctrinal position), his cosmopolitan Court and above all his pro-Spanish foreign policy, with the stakes being much higher there was as keen an interest in seeing the victory of the forces of

Protestantism in the Thirty Years' War in the 1630s as there had been in the 1620s. This being clearly demonstrated in the large number of British troops and officers in the service of foreign countries through the efforts of such people as the Marquess of Hamilton (who had in 1631 gained permission to levy 6,000 troops to join Swedish forces), the attention paid to foreign affairs in newsletters (so much so that in 1632 Charles felt it necessary to curb the enthusiasm of his people by banning the circulation of corantoës through which they gleaned their information), and above all the action still being taken against Spanish shipping by such people as the Earl of Warwick through the Providence Island Company and the repeated efforts of such staunch supporters of the Queen of Bohemia as Sir Thomas Roe to enter Crown service, in his case in the influential position of Secretary of State.<sup>1</sup> So whilst the political occurrences of the 1620s had left Charles with the distinct impression that there was a small but troublesome element in society particularly prone to manifesting itself in parliament which was attempting to undermine his authority in the Church

---

<sup>1</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 79, 166.; Searle, ed., Barrington Family Letters. pp. 196-7. 24 June 1631. Aldersgate Street, London. Sir Thomas Barrington - his mother, Lady Joan Barrington. This series of letters (Thomas's in particular) clearly demonstrate the continued interest of the gentry in European affairs; Wedgwood, King's Peace. pp. 117-124.; Roe was a staunch supporter of Elizabeth's cause. On the death of Secretary Carleton in 1632 he had hoped to advance it by replacing him. But rather than taking advantage of Roe's position as a means of furthering his own similar objectives, Charles instead appointed him to the position of Chancellor of the Order of the Garter, which whilst a highly prestigious position carried with it none of the political influence which Roe had hoped to wield.; Carola Oman, Elizabeth of Bohemia. (London, 1964). pp. 211-3.; PRO. C115/M35/8394. 18 February 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; Ellis, Original Letters. p. 266. 23 February 1632. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. S03/11. December 1636. Office of Chancellor of the Order of the Garter granted to Sir Thomas Roe, kt., during life.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 74. 28 April 1637. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

and State, and a good proportion of his subjects that there were people about the king who for their own selfish aims were advising him to take measures which if not actually aimed at introducing Popery and arbitrary government, given the wider political circumstances came near enough to be of concern, with their being a shared concern over the state of the Palatinate the political paralysis which this had caused need not have been permanent, with all that was needed to overcome it was a political outlet through which the mutual suspicions could be removed and the two elements brought together. With the seventeenth century constitution placing responsibility for the formulation of policy firmly in the hands of the Crown this obligation usually fell to the king or a person acting in his name, whose normal procedure of loosely basing their policies upon the likely level of support which was available to them at the time if not allowing them to avoid all disputes at least provided a natural remedy to heal them when they did. However, with Charles having taken the distribution of patronage back into his own hands and prevented courtiers from removing officers or even openly discussing policy as a means of eradicating factionalism, and forming policies along his own preferences, this self-regulating political balance was no longer able to play the same role under him; which with his notions on obedience and the fact that the constitution provided no means of by-passing a politically inept monarch making the likely political effects of such a course too high to risk inaction, ultimately had the effect of forcing his subjects to take up this essential political task themselves through attempting to demonstrate their loyalty through influencing the development of policies from within the narrow sphere where they knew their objectives loosely coincided with Charles's. The ultimate aims of those who were attempting to establish such policies as these was for the summoning of a parliament which they hoped would allow for a full settlement of the religious and constitutional questions which had been raised since the Petition of Right, this then perhaps being followed by a parliamentary sanctioned though probably privately funded privateering foreign policy against Spain.

As demonstrated in the wording of his proclamation suppressing false rumours of the re-calling of parliament issued towards the end of March 1629 in which he had stated his intention not to summon another until such time as " our people...see more

clearly our intents and actions ", it had never been Charles's intention to permanently abolish Parliament as part of any wider plan to introduce absolutism as feared by many of his critics, but believing that because of their actions he had been forced by " the necessities grown by that war...to yield to conditions incompatible with monarchy...", what he had decided was " that he would never be urged by necessity or against his will to summon..." another, and would therefore only do so when he himself felt that this had been achieved; and having reportedly informed the Council in December 1631 that " ...by the discourses of many concerning a parliament he was now offended and his proclamation violated, and therefore wished all men to be wary how they displeased them in that kind...", and for ignoring this again in October 1633 had " so rattled my lord keeper [Lord Coventry] that he is now the most pliable man in England, and all thoughts of parliaments are quite out of his pate...", by this point in time at least his criteria had clearly not been met and he obviously required further proof of the loyalty of his people. <sup>2</sup> With Charles being as closed to outside influence in this as he was in the formulation of all other areas of his policies and at this time pursuing a pro-Spanish foreign policy based entirely upon diplomacy without the threat of war it was almost impossible during the early 1630s for those courtiers and ministers looking for an accommodation with the Crown to find a suitable outlet through which they could draw together their shared objectives over the Palatinate in a common policy and re-establish the unity which they so desired, but by 1634 a potential means had at last been found in the form of the navy. Tentative peace negotiations with the Spanish had first been entered into in 1627 in the light of the primary focus of Charles's war policy having been transferred from them to France, but with the Spanish appearing unlikely to take any further action unless provoked and Charles's mind being on other things these had not been pursued

---

<sup>2</sup> J.F. Larkin, ed., Stuart Royal Proclamations, 1625-1646. Vol. II. (Oxford, 1983). p. 228.; Gardiner, ed., Constitutional Documents. p. 30. 10 March 1629. The King's Declaration showing the Causes of the Late Dissolution.; PRO. C115/M35/8387. 24 December 1631. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 140. 29 October 1633. Lord Cottington - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

in any real sense until the summer of 1629, when in the light of various meetings between the envoy of the Infanta Isabella, Peter Paul Rubens, Lord Treasurer Weston, Lord Steward Pembroke and Lord Cottington it had been decided that they should exchange official emissaries, Coloma being dispatched to England and Cottington being sent to Spain, leaving for Madrid in the last week of October 1629.<sup>3</sup>

It had initially been hoped that this would have led to an immediate restitution of the Palatinate, but despite initial optimism with the picture being complicated somewhat by the interests of the Duke of Bavaria and with Charles's bargaining position having been seriously weakened due to his financial and military impotence when the peace treaty was eventually concluded in November 1630 it made no direct mention of the Palatinate, the settlement of which now rested upon an understanding that Spain would use its influence in obtaining this end in return for English neutrality and tacit assistance in running troops and materials through the channel to their possessions in the Spanish Netherlands, practical as well as personal factors on the part of Charles dictating that this should be through his navy.<sup>4</sup> For whilst the conclusion of peace agreements with France and Spain had been an admission that England could no longer afford (either financially or politically) to fight, with Charles's interest in restoring the Palatinate remaining as strong as before it was not to be accompanied by a complete withdrawal from European politics, merely prompting a realignment in policy so as to allow it to be brought into line with the wider pattern of his

---

<sup>3</sup> Cowper, I. p. 386. 5 June 1629. Deciphered letter. On outer covert Sieur Jacques Ilan Marchand en Anvers.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 93. 15 June 1629. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 226. 9 November 1629. Same - Same.; BL. Harleian 7000. f. 261v. 20 June 1629. Essex House. George Gresley - Thomas Puckering.; Ibid., f. 265. 24 October 1629. Essex House. Same - Same.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 51. 5 August 1629. Lord Cottington - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 127v. 22 October 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; Havran, Cottington. p. 96.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 479. 7 November 1629. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 67-8.

<sup>4</sup> BL. Harleian 390. f. 502v. 13 March 1630. Christ Church. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 67-8.

objectives; in which rather than having to rely upon the risky and expensive policy of dispatching fleets to undertake amphibious landings against foreign countries he now hoped to be able to wield a similar level of political influence through exerting pressure upon foreign powers through an assertion of his rights of sovereignty over the sea, this course having the additional advantages of being nearer to home, not involving dangerous landings, and perhaps most important of all, being at one with his wider personal objectives of establishing order and maintaining his authority as king.

Although further investigated and clarified by Sir John Borroughs in his "*Sovereignty of the British Seas, Proved by Records, History and the Municipal Laws of this Kingdom*" and John Selden in his "*Mare Clausum*", the legal basis of this right rested primarily upon the sovereign rights of jurisdiction over the "Sea of England" supposed to have been exercised by the early Plantagenets, and which were perceived as applying not only to English coastal waters, but extraordinarily also to "the whole of the English channel to the shores of France, and of the North Sea to the shores of Flanders and Holland...".<sup>5</sup> Being formed when English monarchs still had possession of the French Crown or a realistic claim to it rather than a traditional customary one it may have been assumed that by the seventeenth century such claims of sovereignty were seen in a similar vein; but as in all areas of his rule, unlike Elizabeth or his father who had been willing to maintain such rights as these in principle whilst asserting them sparingly in practice, in hoping to revive England as a great naval power and in any case seeing it as an essential right of the Crown which needed to be upheld, Charles was determined to enforce its obligations to their fullest extent, this effectively meaning that he was to rule over the seas under its broad jurisdiction "as a part of his territory" in which "no other fleets or men of war - be they Spanish, or Dutch, or French - were to be allowed to keep any guard there, to offer any violence, to take prize or booty, or to search the merchant vessels of other nations".<sup>6</sup> With Charles taking it upon himself "to protect the commerce and navigation of his friends and allies" (it being asserted that "all men trading or sailing

---

<sup>5</sup> Fulton, Sovereignty of the Sea. pp. 209, 364-374.; Gardiner, History. Vol. VII. p. 358.

<sup>6</sup> Fulton, Sovereignty of the Sea. p. 209.

within those his Majesty's seas do justly take themselves to be in pace Domini Regis ") and only asking in return that foreign vessels make an acknowledgement of his absolute dominion through " striking their flag and lowering their top-sails " whenever they met any royal ship, and that any...fishing there should obtain licences to do so " on one level this would merely allow him to establish a similar position of order and stability in the seas around his kingdom as he was attempting to secure in within it; but with it not necessarily having to be based upon a strict neutrality, at the same time as it could offer protection to his " friends and allies " it could by implication also pose an obstacle to his opponents and enemies, thereby giving scope if need be for its use as a political tool. <sup>7</sup> Designed to solve a number of pressing problems all at once and receiving a great deal of attention as a consequence of the personal interest of the king, the notion of sovereignty over the seas was perhaps the nearest that Charles's reign ever came to a single all-embracing policy. But whilst the assertion of these rights was relatively easy, the success of the policy as a whole would depend upon Charles's ability to effectively implement them - and this was a good deal more difficult.

Given his keen personal interest in the navy it comes as no surprise that when Charles first took action in aid of the Palatinate upon his accession to the throne in 1625 that he should have chosen a naval led attack against Spain rather than the land-based one in mainland Europe favoured by James; but even at this early stage the assertion of these rights of sovereignty of the seas appear to have been a motive of some importance, having in October 1625 listed the preservation of the " dominion of the Narrow Seas, which have been assumed justly by our predecessors, and given to them and us by all our neighbours " as one of the principal aims of the fleet which had been sent out to Cadiz under Edward Cecil, later Viscount Wimbledon. <sup>8</sup> However, with the Spanish having never wished to enter into a war against England (and therefore not showing the least sign of making any military response to his attacks), and with the primary focus of their naval strength being eastwards towards their

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 210.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Dalton, The Life and Times of General Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon. (Sampson Low, 1885). p. 383.



colonies across the Atlantic (where even the broad definition of Charles's rights of sovereignty of the seas did not purport to apply) they did not represent as great a challenge to this assumed right of sovereignty as the French, Charles's supposed allies. The lending of a fleet of English ships to the French in 1625 had for them been a political coup of mammoth proportions, but on a practical logistical level and in the longer term it had only served to indicate to them the desperate need for the expansion of their own navy. Charles had felt deeply the indignity of his own ships being used against the Protestant Huguenots, and been reminded of the way in which he had earlier been tricked by the Spanish. He had therefore rejected Richelieu's argument that Louis XIII. could not consider joining England in a war against Spain in agreement with their treaty obligations whilst they had problems of internal order at home, and had instead characteristically given his word to protect the Huguenots. In this he had naively assumed that Louis would see the futility of taking further action against them and come to some arrangement which would allow him to fulfil his obligations in relation to the military alliance against Spain. But if Richelieu had misread Charles, then Charles had also misread him and Louis. For the French resented foreign interference in their internal affairs as much as Charles did, and his actions left them with no other option than to call his bluff through continuing in their attempts to solve their problems at home regardless of its consequences to the anti-Habsburg alliance. With the French no longer able to rely upon the loan of ships from England and the dissent of the Huguenots and later war with England focussing around the port of La Rochelle this in itself would have called for some kind of limited expansion in the French navy. But Richelieu's determination to reduce the Huguenots to obedience had only ever been part of a much wider plan aimed at bringing about the establishment of France as a great nation; and with the usefulness of the navy in this episode (both as a means of maintaining internal order and warding off foreign invaders) having convinced him of its importance in achieving his wider objectives, he had ultimately decided that its reconstruction should be long-term. In the pursuit of this and in keeping with his usual style of getting things done Richelieu had taken things into his own hands, in the summer of 1626 not only purchasing the office of lord admiral from the Duke of Montmorency but also establishing his own

trading company and embarking upon a substantial building programme, with the central role which he played in this general broadening of French naval ambition being confirmed by Louis's subsequent appointment of him as Grand-Maitre, Chef et Surintendant general de la Navigation et Commerce de France.<sup>9</sup> The immediate problem which this expansion of the French navy posed to Charles and Buckingham was that the fear that it was going to be used against the Huguenots, thereby prolonging and perhaps undermining a largely unnecessary war which had already distracted their attention from their primary concern in the Palatinate, but in the longer term also had important implications for Charles's assertions of sovereignty, the Council fearing that it would be used "for the usurping of an absolute or equal dominion with his Majesty upon the British Ocean, to the great prejudice of his Majesty's regality and the ancient inheritance of his imperial Crown...".<sup>10</sup> Through dispatching a fleet under Sir John Penington in early 1627 aimed at launching a pre-emptive strike against the as yet uncompleted French fleet whilst it still lay in port, Buckingham had hoped to avert the consequences of this expansion before they posed a real threat, but like those before it this operation had been undermined through the usual combination of ill-prepared ships and bad weather. This, together with a tendency of historians to look at the political motives of Charles at the expense of his personal interest in order and authority, ensures that the main focus of attention in the naval events of this period has not been directed at the underlying assumption of sovereignty over the seas which formed the basis of all his actions in this sphere, but on his equally unsuccessful yet much higher profile objectives aimed at defending the Huguenots and attacking Spain.<sup>11</sup> Only where action against Spain had ended with the dispatch of the fleet under Robert, Lord Willoughby in the autumn of 1626, and active intervention on behalf of the Huguenots of La Rochelle had effectively ceased with the failure of the fleet sent out to relieve the blockade there after the death of Buckingham in August 1628, Charles's underlying objective of establishing his sovereignty over the seas had remained. For the expansion of the French navy had

---

<sup>9</sup>  
345-346, 359.

Lockyer, Buckingham. pp. 338,

<sup>10</sup>

Ibid., p. 352.

<sup>11</sup>

Ibid., p. 360.

not ended with the Peace of Susa but had continued unchecked throughout the 1620s and early 1630s, not only leading to an increased reluctance on their part to show that level of deference to the English fleet which Charles felt was his natural right, but also consistent rumours that they were preparing a fleet in Brittany for a pre-emptive strike against England; which with similar problems of authority being posed by the Dutch (who due to their strength showed an equal reluctance to the French to strike their sails in deference to the English fleet) and the numerous pirates whose presence around the coasts of England represented a constant danger to trade, in common with other areas of his government in the light of the removal of the pre-occupation of war left him determined to set about enforcing what he saw to be his natural rights of sovereignty of the seas.<sup>12</sup> However, in spite of the vast sums of money which had been expended upon the navy during the expeditions of the 1620s, in 1630 (the year he struck his first medal asserting his maritime dominion) despite a resolution having been made at the Council " to set apart a sum...for restoring the ships and sending a certain number to sea...", " so fragile was the guard which Charles [could even]...mount in the Narrow Seas that the admiralty reckoned it a dishonour to his name...".<sup>13</sup> Had the policy of sovereignty of the seas and the correspondent expansion of navy being of little interest or importance to Charles then in the adverse financial circumstances of the 1630s it would have been expected that he would have quietly let it drop. However, both the navy as an institution and the ideology of sovereignty over the seas which provided an additional reason for its existence were matters of the utmost importance to Charles, and within the restrictions of his own understanding of what was required he was determined to establish a fleet adequate to see his theoretical rights put into practice. For although he does not appear to have ever fully grasped the size of the fleet which would be necessary in order to

---

<sup>12</sup> CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 329-30. 16 June 1631. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.

<sup>13</sup> Quintrell, Charles I. p. 69.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Quintrell, ' Charles I. and his navy ', pp. 159-179. in The Seventeenth Century.

implement such a grandiose plan as was sovereignty of the seas, he had in the light of this revelation nevertheless undertaken a number of measures aimed at improving the administration of the navy and increasing its fighting strength. His first act was to call Sir Henry Mervyn (the commander of the fleet to guard the narrow seas) to account for his actions, the likely impression which he gained from this being demonstrated in that later that September he was persuaded to yield his position to Sir Kenelm Digby, a gentleman of the privy chamber who not only enjoyed the firm support of Charles himself, but also that of Sir John Coke, whose judgement Charles was known to respect in naval affairs.<sup>14</sup> Neither did this personal action on the part of the king end here, for it was supplemented early the next summer through him undertaking a "vigorous tour" of the naval dockyards and ships at Woolwich, Portsmouth and Chatham, in the light of which and his personal desire to see a more royal fleet less dependent upon merchantmen he decided take up Secretary Coke's suggestion that he should resurrect the same programme of shipbuilding which had been followed by the naval commissioners after the 1618 Commission of Enquiry, with ten ships subsequently being built and three re-built between 1630 and 1641.<sup>15</sup> However what mattered was not so much the overall size of the navy but the actual number of ships which were able to put to sea at any one time and the length of time which they were able to spend once they got there; and with Charles having soon realised this, and with the financial and administrative difficulties involved having immediately ruled out the establishment of permanent standing patrols, the main burden for asserting his authority at sea had therefore fallen upon the yearly dispatch of just one strong royal

---

<sup>14</sup> PRO. C115/M32/102. 25 September 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore; Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 102.

<sup>15</sup> Quintrell, 'Charles I. and his navy', in The Seventeenth Century.; Quintrell, Charles I. p. 70.; BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 329/30. 16 June 1631. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 159v. 25 May 1631. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; PRO. C115/N3/8547. 1 July 1631. Henry Herbert - Viscount Scudamore.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. pp. 98-9.; Andrews, Ships, Money and Politics. Chapter 6.; M. Oppenheim, A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy and of Merchant Shipping in relation to the Navy. (London, 1896). Vol. I. p. 254.

fleet every summer, the first of which he was apparently hoping to dispatch in 1634.<sup>16</sup> In keeping with this objective in January 1634 Charles had ordered the Lords of the Admiralty, Lord Treasurer Portland, Chancellor of the Exchequer Cottington, Sir Henry Vane, the Earls of Lindsay and Dorset and Secretaries Coke and Windebank to "consider ways of financing the navy".<sup>17</sup> Just what conclusions (if any) they came to at this time are not clear, but it would appear that for domestic political reasons none of the proposals which they made were deemed suitable; and based upon the secret understanding which Cottington had negotiated with the Spanish in conjunction with the peace treaty in 1631 by February 1634 a third way was apparently being investigated in which Charles's first major fleet was to be used to secure the coast of Flanders in return for a grant of Spanish money and their help in securing the restitution of the Palatinate.<sup>18</sup> As early as April 1634, though, the English ambassador in Spain (Arthur Hopton) had noticed the underlying contradiction of this plan created by its dependence upon Spanish money, subsequently informing Secretary Windebank that the king would "oblige them more and remain at better liberty to alter his course as occasion shall serve if he would set out this armada at his own cost", which would then allow him to negotiate over the Palatinate from a position of strength rather than weakness.<sup>19</sup> This was no doubt something of which Charles and his advisers were already aware, but (in part explaining both James and Charles's repeated adherence to them) with negotiations with the Spanish having as always appeared to offer an easy way out of a difficult situation it was something which they had for the time being conveniently chosen to ignore. However, as the year passed and it gradually became clearer that there would be no immediate subsidy or even a loan from the Spanish, in the light of Hopton's advice and Charles's determination to see a fleet put to sea that year they were again forced to look for

---

<sup>16</sup> Quintrell, Charles I. p. 70.;  
Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 548.

<sup>17</sup> Alexander, Weston. p. 209.

<sup>18</sup> Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 549.

<sup>19</sup> BL. Egerton 1820. ff. 334-334v. 8  
April 1634. Arthur Hopton - Secretary Windebank.

some alternative source of finance, in the end settling on a new version of the old procedure of ship money.

Earlier that year there had been a number of failed attempts to secure the removal of the pro-Spanish crypto-Catholic lord treasurer Richard Weston, Earl of Portland, in response to which partly out of a personal vendetta with Weston, and partly out of a wider policy aimed at demonstrating that money-making measures were not a preserve of the pro-Spanish faction, the Earl of Holland had subsequently used his right to implement forest law as " Warden, Chief Justice, and Justice Itinerant of all his Majesty's forests, parks, and chases on this side Trent " to raise the not inconsiderable sum (given the state of the Crown's finances) of £240,000 and maintain the pressure upon Weston through securing the prosecution of a number of his Catholic allies (including Sir Basil Brook, his partner Mynne and his own secretary, Gibbon) and laying aspersions that he had deliberately mismanaged the timber of the Forest of Dean " from which alone the best timber is obtained for the royal ships..."; and now in the king's haste to discover a means by which he could finance the formation of a fleet the moderate Protestant element within the Council such as Lord Keeper Coventry and the Earls of Manchester and Holland thought they saw in the vigorous advancement of ship money not only an opportunity through which they could carry the political motives earlier demonstrated by Holland onto a wider plane, but in allowing them to show their natural loyalty in a matter which deeply concerned the king perhaps also a means by which they could ease his distrust of his people as a first step towards securing the summoning of the parliament which they saw to be the panacea of all their problems.<sup>20</sup> The combination formed against

---

<sup>20</sup> PRO. SO3/10. May 1631. The office of Warden, Chief Justice, and Justice itinerant of all his majesty's forests, parks, and chases on this side Trent granted to the Earl of Holland during pleasure... Subscribed attorney general upon signification of his majesty's pleasure by Viscount Dorchester, and by him procured.; SRO. DD/Ph/219. f. 44. 2 August 1634. Sir Nathaniel Tomkins - Sir Robert Phelps.; CSPV, 1632-1636. pp. 263-4. 25 August 1634. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; PRO. C115/M36/8427. 1 August 1634. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; Alexander, Weston. p. 217.

Weston was a considerable one, but he had one great advantage over them in that the king trusted him. Weston had used this influence over the formation of fiscal policy to keep the preliminary discussions of ship money in his own hands, and still holding out hopes of a subsidy from Spain, had demonstrated little interest in developing it further. Had it been up to him there is little doubt that Weston would have preferred to have kept things this way, Secretary Windebank subsequently writing to him in early June how that he had "acquainted him [the king] with your lordship's opinion concerning the forbearing to communicate the great business [of ship money] to the whole board until the manner of ordering it...were thoroughly debated and settled...".

<sup>21</sup> However, by June 1634 Weston was very ill and no longer able to exert the same degree of control. Charles was working according to an agenda of his own, and determined to get things under way as soon as possible rather than agreeing to Weston's request would "by no means be removed from his former resolution of publishing it to the whole Council on Sunday next, telling me [Windebank] that to consult it first were an unnecessary delay, where laws and precedents are so clear, as well as the manner of the thing itself...". <sup>22</sup> This allowed continued scope for those hoping to use it as a means of establishing an understanding between the king and his people.

With Charles's foreign policy ultimately being based upon a naval solution to a land-locked problem through the false assumption that the Spanish held sufficient influence over their Habsburg cousins to persuade them to act against their own interests the likelihood of him ever being able to secure his objective of a restitution of the Palatinate through this policy were always extremely remote; but unaware of the assumptions and secret agreements which lay behind it and in any case being forced by virtue of their inability to shape the political agenda themselves into taking such opportunities as fell before them, those hoping to secure political objectives of

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211.; Ogle and Bliss, ed., Calendar of Clarendon State Papers. p. 44. Westminster. 6 June 1634. Secretary Windebank - Earl of Portland.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44. Westminster. 6 June 1634. Secretary Windebank - Earl of Portland.

their own only perceived the extent to which they could take advantage of Charles's desire to set-out a regular fleet as a means of demonstrating their loyalty as a means of fulfilling Charles's conditions for the summoning of a parliament. This objective was not in itself undermined by the inherent weaknesses in Charles's overall policy, but with his foreign policy essentially being based upon an assertion of his rights of sovereignty over the seas rather and the protection of Spanish shipping rather than action against it this was always going to be a difficult task; but with there being a good deal of flexibility upon the uses to which this policy of sovereignty was put if handled correctly it need not have been an impossible one, provided that they were able to capture the imagination and support of the people, as demonstrated in the high level of support which was subsequently shown in relation to the idea of sending out a fleet under the banner of Charles Louis in 1636. <sup>23</sup> In a letter on the subject, the dying Noy envisaged it as an opportunity to engender national pride which the people might willingly flock to support, seeing the essential element in achieving this to be the appointment of a popular and charismatic lord admiral who could rally the support of the people and perhaps in time also persuade the king to use it against Spanish shipping. <sup>24</sup> This, however, was where the problem came. For whilst it was possible to provide outlets through which the king could tap into the support of his people in the hope that he would take them up, with Charles not being a party to the reasoning behind them and therefore remaining as determined as ever to maintain his authority and rule in person, whenever he did it was only ever upon his own terms; it being possible to demonstrate here that whilst Charles latched on to the policy of ship

---

<sup>23</sup> In March 1637 Charles was considering sending out a fleet of his own ships under the banner of the Elector Palatine, in which George Garrard reported "...my Lord of Essex, my Lords of Warwick, Craven, Grandison, pressed much to go as commanders...". But rather than taking advantage of this enthusiasm, perhaps fearful that it would become too popular and he would lose control of it, Charles "very civilly denied them" and eventually abandoned the whole scheme. Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 56. 23 March 1637. London. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>24</sup> Quintrell, 'Charles I and his navy', in The Seventeenth Century.



money itself, in acting solely according to his own personal interests and not those of his people he not only failed to appoint the charismatic lord admiral believed by Noy to be at the heart of any chance of its success, but had in fact delayed appointing one at all until the opportunity had been lost and it was too late for it to be utilised as an outlet for popular support.

The formation of the naval commission to which Buckingham had apparently agreed to yield some of his authority as lord admiral during the early stages of the 1628 parliament had probably originally been planned to take place at some point during the autumn after the return of the expedition to Rhe. But whilst not identical in form or duties, in the event this form of government had come much sooner; as with the assassination of Buckingham on 23 August 1628 having deprived the navy of any form of effective leadership, within a week the decision had been made to hand over the duties of the lord admiral and a good deal of the authority which came with it to a commission, this being formally constituted on 20 September 1628 and consisting of Lord Treasurer Weston (the senior commissioner), Lord Steward Pembroke, Robert, Earl of Lindsey (the Lord Great Chamberlain) and the Earl of Dorset (Lord Chamberlain to the queen).<sup>25</sup> The formation of this commission rather than the appointment of another lord admiral was not at first perceived by contemporaries to presage anything unusual, as whilst they could not have known that it was intended by Charles to be permanent measure prompted by his reluctance to appoint another non-royal lord admiral they were at least aware of a number of other factors which

---

<sup>25</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 270. 27 August 1628. Viscount Carleton - Queen of Bohemia.; Ibid., p. 273. 28 August 1628. Considerations touching the execution of the office of lord admiral by commissioners.; Ibid., p. 333. 20 September 1628. King - Lord Treasurer Weston, Earl of Lindsey, Earl of Pembroke, Earl of Dorset, Viscount Dorchester and Secretary Coke. Commission authorising them to execute the office of lord admiral.; BL. Egerton 2541. f. 127. Late August/September 1628. Draft by Edward Nicholas of his grant for the office of naval secretary.; CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 291. 3 September 1628. Sion. Henry, Lord Percy - Earl of Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. George, Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.; N.A.M. Rodger, The Admiralty. (Suffolk, 1979). p. 1.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 437v. 20 September 1628. John Pory - Joseph Mead.

were also working for delay, the first of which being Charles's immediate announcement upon the death of Buckingham " that he would hold up the duke's places for a good while, and that the first suitors shall be most sure to fail " as a means of discouraging suitors from involving themselves in what he perceived to be his preserve, and the second his promise to take care of the duke's debts. <sup>26</sup> With Charles soon after making an interim appointment of the Earl of Holland as Master of the Horse and subsequently granting it to the Marquess of Hamilton belief in the first of these assertions as a likely delaying factor in the appointment of a new admiral was soon likely to have waned, but the question of the settlement of the duke's debts took rather longer.

That Buckingham lived ostentatiously cannot be denied, but as the right hand man and favourite of the monarch under James, and even more so as a leading minister and administrator determined to maintain something of his old appearance as favourite under Charles, with so much of his ability to do this depending upon mere appearance he had a reputation at Court which had to be upheld and his style of living should only be used as an indication of his wider character with extreme caution, with even S.R. Gardiner remarking how that whilst " nothing can be asserted positively...there is every reason to believe that the real accounts, if they were ever to be recovered, would tell more in Buckingham's favour than against him...". <sup>27</sup> This is especially the case in relation to the navy. As with Buckingham's position under Charles being by no means certain and dependent to a great extent upon his ability as lord admiral to prepare a series of fleets against France and Spain, and with the grants of parliamentary supply which should have helped finance them having failed to materialise, over the first three years of Charles's reign he had engaged his own personal credit in borrowing nearly £70,000, all of which had been expended upon the navy. <sup>28</sup> Buckingham's assassination had clearly affected Charles, but with the

---

<sup>26</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 270. 27 August 1628. Viscount Dorchester - Queen of Bohemia.; *Ibid.*, p. 413. 22 December 1628. Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.

<sup>27</sup> Gardiner, *History*. Vol. VI. p. 102.

<sup>28</sup> Rymer, *Foedera*. Vol. VIII. Pt. III. p. 43. 18 May 1629. Westminster. De Warranto speciali Richardo Weston domino Treasario and allis pro solutione

personal bond between them having been greatly exaggerated it is possible that the reasons for this have been consistently misunderstood; for with his father-in-law and grandfather having both been assassinated, and with their having been several attempts made against his father, with political circumstances being what they were at this time it may (especially with Charles so clearly viewing opposition against Buckingham as really intended against himself) have owed as much to a fear of his own and his family's safety than to the loss of an old and trusted servant.<sup>29</sup> However, this is not to say that Charles was unaware of the fact that Buckingham had died in his service and for executing his commands, which together with the affection in which he and his relations had been held by James had led him to promise in the light of his assassination that he would be " a husband to his duchess, a father to his children, a master to his servants, and an executor to pay his debts...".<sup>30</sup> Although in the light of his death Buckingham's estate still owed some fifty-three thousand pounds of the money which he had borrowed in order to finance the navy, with the terms of his patent as lord admiral now being void the financial benefits which he had previously received through them had reverted back into the hand of the Crown. Fortunately for Buckingham's family, though, Charles was nothing if not honourable, and being determined that they should not have to suffer for the forwardness of the duke in carrying out his orders, had (after delays caused by the Crown's own financial problems and the outside chance of continued action in conjunction with parliament) on 18 May 1629 written to Lord Treasurer Weston and Chancellor of the Exchequer Cottington informing them " that all the profits, benefits and sums of money whatsoever which have arisen since the death of the said duke, and shall hereafter arise, by reason of the said places or office of admiralty of any commission granted concerning the same, or of such or like profits [be reserved] until...[all] sums of money as were due unto the said duke at the time of his death, being disbursed to several our officers, and otherwise expended to our service and occasions be fully

---

--diversarum pecuniae summarum debitarum Duci Bucks.

<sup>29</sup> CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 268. 24 August 1628. The Strand. Sir Francis Nethersole - Earl of Carlisle.; Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 454.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 461.

satisfied and paid...".<sup>31</sup> With the income from the admiralty amounting to some thirty or forty-thousand pounds per annum the fifty-three thousand or so still owing should have been paid off by around 1630, thereby removing this as a possible cause for Charles's failure to appoint a lord admiral.<sup>32</sup> It therefore comes as no surprise that the respective attempts of the Earls of Holland (who himself wished to become lord admiral) and Carlisle (who was acting on behalf of the Earl of Pembroke) around the office of lord admiral, frequent since the death of Buckingham, should have come to a head at this point in early January 1630; but with Charles disliking the challenge to his authority which came through the interference of others in a decision which he saw to his alone as much as the faction which it inevitably brought with it he was determined to stem all such moves in the bud, unequivocally informing them at the " Council that he took very ill the reports that were in circulation about his being about to choose an admiral..." and that " he had never thought about it...".<sup>33</sup> Charles's statement that he had not even considered appointing a lord admiral could be dismissed as a mere piece of rhetoric aimed at protecting his authority, but this would appear unlikely given that it was a position which he subsequently consistently upheld throughout the 1630s; for despite repeated rumours as to the possible appointment of the Earl of Holland, Lord

---

<sup>31</sup> CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 291. Sion. Henry, Lord Percy - Carlisle.; Rymer, Foedera. Vol. VIII. Pt. III. p. 43. 18 May 1629. De warranto speciali Richardo Weston...; PRO.S03/9. May 1629. A warrant to the lord treasurer and Chancellor of the Exchequer, requiring them to take order, that the profits due to the place of lord admiral be brought into the Exchequer....for the payment of divers sums of money...due from his majesty to the late Duke of Buckingham... By order from the lord treasurer. Procured Viscount Dorchester.

<sup>32</sup> CSPD, Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. George, Lord Goring - Earl of Carlisle.

<sup>33</sup> CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 263. 11 January 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; Ibid., p. 270. 18 January 1630. Same - Same.; Searle, ed., Barrington Family Letters. p. 118. 30 December 1629. Sir William Masham - Lady Joan Barrington.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 133. 30 December 1629. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.

Treasurer Weston, the Duke of Lennox or the Earl of Danby, and a failed campaign in the late 1630s by Lord Deputy Wentworth (who having by now bought out the other shareholders in the Irish customs wished to protect his interests through eradicating piracy and smuggling through strengthening the fleet off the coast of Ireland) and Archbishop Laud on behalf of the Earl of Northumberland up to 1638 no appointment had been made, and those in a good position to know the king's mind (such as Charles's naval secretary, Sir Edward Nicholas) did not believe that there would be.<sup>34</sup>

With the navy clearly being so important to Charles's overall political, diplomatic goals and being an area of intense personal interest his failure to appoint an admiral clearly did not reflect a lack of interest, with the only rational explanation which appears to fit the facts being that it was a consequence of his wish to maintain royal authority through keeping the position in royal hands. Given its wide jurisdiction and importance in the overall defence of the country even James had realised that it was a matter of vital importance that whoever was appointed lord admiral should be as closely allied to the Crown as possible, in the absence of any alternative and before the death of Prince Henry apparently intending to maintain the elderly but experienced

---

<sup>34</sup> PRO. C115/M32/8180. 25 September 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 540. 6 March 1631. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 329-330. 16 June 1631. London. John Pory - Sir Thomas Puckering.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 86. 25 March 1633. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 177. 7 August 1633. Sir Edward Nicholas - Sir John Pennington.; Ibid., p. 287. 10 November 1634. Tehidie. Francis Basset - Sir Edward Nicholas.; Wedgwood, Wentworth. pp. 196-200, 210-212, 216.; Works William Laud. Vol. VI. Pt. II. p. 465. Ult. August 1636. Oxford. Archbishop Laud - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., Vol. VII. p. 308. 18 January 1637. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 316. 11 February 1637. Lambeth. Same - Same.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 54. 6 March 1637. Dublin. Wentworth - Earl of Northumberland. Here Wentworth writes "remember if you please, what, upon the first imparting of your lordship's purpose in the matter, I said in your gallery at Sion..."; Ibid., p. 54. 6 March 1637. Dublin. Same - Same.; Ibid., p. 67. 7 April 1637. London. Northumberland - Wentworth.

Earl of Nottingham in office until such time as Prince Charles was of an age to be able to replace him. In the end, though, this position went not to Charles but to the Duke of Buckingham, but this appears to have been very much an exception caused by the characteristically Jacobean circumstance of his being a de facto member of the royal family (and entirely dependent upon their support) combining with the characteristically Caroline one that those receiving favour from the Crown should also have obligations to fulfil. With James having previously recommended him to Charles upon coming to the throne had promised Buckingham that he would not remove him from any position which he had been appointed to by his father, and in relation to the admiralty there was in fact no real need to, for the death of James, his general unpopularity and the attacks which this had inevitably raised against him in parliament had all increased his dependence upon the position of administrator which he had developed under Charles and ensured that he took its duties seriously. However, whilst this unusual set of circumstances had allowed Buckingham to hold a position which was (when possible) usually reserved for members of the royal family, it had done so without providing him with the constitutional protection from criticism which for them automatically came with it. Under normal circumstances this need not have mattered too much, but with Charles expecting Buckingham to press ahead with implementing his policies despite having failed to gain the support of parliament it did. With Buckingham doing nothing more than implementing the king's own orders and Charles seeing the attacks against him as against himself there was never any question of him allowing Buckingham to be sacrificed, but this is not to say that it did not have a lasting impact upon his actions in this sphere; as with it first threatening to undermine his war policy and then subsequently confirming his impression of a group present in society who were attempting to undermine his authority as king it had first prompted him whilst Buckingham was alive to propose countering its worst effects through spreading responsibility for the actions of the admiralty as wide as possible through the re-instatement of the naval commission, and then after his death to take the position of lord admiral into his own hands. With Charles's forming a naval commission of trusted men just over a month after Buckingham's death and subsequently expanding it in November 1632 to include Francis, Lord Cottington and

Sir Henry Vane (who were also trusted figures with long-term connections with Charles) it would appear that he was first hoping to achieve this through retaining the position of lord admiral (and therefore ultimate authority) in his own hands whilst allowing less important day to day decisions to be carried out by a hand-picked commission of trusted figures.<sup>35</sup> However, despite the importance of this position neither Charles nor any of the other commissioners (who by definition of Charles's selection policy based upon evidence of service had other tasks to undertake in addition to the naval commission) could devote either the time or effort necessary in order to remain on top of its routine administrative duties or provide an overall sense of direction; and as a means of filling this vital role whilst providing him with the flexibility of being able to leave things to the commission or by-pass them altogether and act directly Charles had characteristically turned to an old face, appointing Buckingham's former naval secretary, Sir Edward Nicholas, " to be our clerk or secretary, during the time we shall think fit to continue the said commissions ", having taken notice of his " former care and experience " in the very similar role which he

---

<sup>35</sup> CSPD,1628-1629. p. 270. 27 August 1628. Viscount Dorchester - Queen of Bohemia.; BL. Egerton 2541. f. 127. Undated, August 1628. Draft by Edward Nicholas of his grant as secretary to the admiralty.; CSPD,1628-1629. p. 273. 28 August 1628. Considerations by Edward Nicholas touching the execution of the office of lord admiral by commissioners.; Ibid. p. 333. 20 September 1628. Charles I. - Lord Treasurer Weston, Earl of Lindsey, Earl of Pembroke, Earl of Dorset, Viscount Dorchester and Secretary Coke. Commission to execute the office of lord admiral.; CSPD,Addenda. 1625-1649. p. 291. 3 September 1628. Sion. Lord Percy - Earl of Carlisle.; Ibid., p. 294. 16 September 1628. London. Lord Goring - Carlisle.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 437v. 20 September 1628. Christ College. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; PRO. C115/M35/8414. 13 October 1632. London. John Pory - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPD,1631-1633. p. 440. 20 November 1632. Commission to Lord Treasurer Weston, Earl of Lindsey, Earl of Dorset, Lord Cottington, Sir Henry Vane, Secretaries Coke and Windebank, or any three of them, to execute the office of lord admiral.; Ibid., p. 454. 6 December 1632. Sir Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.; Charles's retention of ultimate control can be seen in BL. Harleian 7000. ff. 338-9. 25 October 1632. London. John Pory - Robert, Baron Brooke.

must have played between him and Buckingham.<sup>36</sup> This arrangement of in effect holding the position of lord admiral himself whilst delegating much of the day-to-day administration to the commissioners and Sir Edward Nicholas (as indicated by the central role which Nicholas was to play in the collection of ship money through such measures as the vetting of prospective sheriffs) allowed Charles to deal fairly effectively with the problem of balancing the importance of this position to his overall policy objectives against the fear of the consequences of allowing it to be held by another subject. At the same time, though, it was clearly not ideal, and in the light of the expansion of his family (Prince Charles was born on 29 May 1630, and Prince James on 14 November 1633), like his father before him his long-term objective appears to have been to grant it to his second son, in his case James, Duke of York, this being noted by the Venetian Ambassador, Anzolo Correr, as early as December 1634 and confirmed by such a well-informed person as Edward Nicholas, who remarked in June 1636 upon speculation that an admiral was to be appointed that "... (for ought I can perceive) his Majesty reserves [it] for the Duke of York...".<sup>37</sup> In placing the overall control of the navy in the hands of a single person who by virtue of his position would neither represent a challenge to the authority of the Crown or subject it to paralysis through his means as had Buckingham, if this plan to appoint the Duke of York as lord admiral had ever come to fruition it would have enabled Charles to have removed the inefficiencies of the present system of naval government

---

<sup>36</sup> BL. Egerton 2541. f. 127. Undated, late August 1628. Draft by Nicholas of his appointment as clerk or secretary of the navy.; -CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 273. 28 August 1628. Considerations by Sir Edward Nicholas touching the execution of the office of lord admiral by commissioners. Given his experience of working under Charles and Buckingham, the very fact that Nicholas even thought it worth considering whether to "acquaint his Majesty with all passages" appears to indicate a keen interest on the part of the king to remain informed.

<sup>37</sup> Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. pp. 100, 114.; CSPV, 1632-1636. p. 303. 1 December 1634. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; HMC, Seventh Report. p. 279. 15 June 1636. Hampton Court. Edward Nicholas - Lord Feilding.



without causing him any other problems in its light - all that was needed was a period of relative stability until such time as the Duke of York was of an age to personally undertake the duties of lord admiral during which there was no crisis of a sufficient magnitude to bring out the shortcomings of the interim administrative arrangement and require authority to be held in the hands of one overall commander. With the negotiations for an Anglo-French alliance against Spain having come to nothing by 1637 and the ship money fleets being adequately regulated by annually appointed admirals it looked at one time as though there would be no need for Charles to alter the interim style of government which he had established, but this was all altered in the light of the escalating crisis in Scotland.<sup>38</sup>

In having deprived Scotland of its own Court and effectively turned it into a dominion James's accession to the English throne had produced many tensions in addition to those which had existed before and greatly increased the difficulties of ruling that kingdom, but through being able to draw upon his vast experience, personal connections and above all Scottish pride in seeing their monarch ascend to the English throne he had been able to keep them under control. However, with his express wish to join his father on his progress to Scotland in 1617 having rather surprisingly been turned down, Charles, on the other hand, had never re-visited his homeland since leaving it as an infant, which meant that unlike James who still viewed as one of their own he was instead perceived as a distant, unfamiliar and essentially Anglocentric figure who possessing little knowledge of their affairs or concern about their welfare.<sup>39</sup> Enjoying neither the experience or the personal connections of his father Charles was always going to find the absentee government of Scotland difficult, but was made far more so by the fears as to his ultimate intentions which arose out of his secretive and autocratic style of rule, this being demonstrated soon after he became king in his hurried attempts to secure a revocation of all Crown and Church lands in Scotland.<sup>40</sup> With Charles's style of rule based upon unquestioning obedience not leading him to question the popularity of his policies as in England

---

<sup>38</sup> For the background to the Anglo-French negotiations see Sharpe, Personal Rule, pp. 525-536.

<sup>39</sup> Quintrell, Charles I. p. 9.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., pp. 12-14.

over a period of time this allowed a considerable number of grievances to develop over a wide front, of which whilst they remained independent of each other and did not break out into open conflict he was largely unaware. But whilst invisible this is not to say that they were not real or deeply felt; and with only some additional action which served to bring them all together being necessary to see them brought out into the open, things began to change in 1637 when as part of his objective of uniformity Charles attempted to bring the Scottish Church more into line with the Church of England through the imposition of a new prayer book - this not only leading people to believe that Charles was attempting to shift its doctrinal position as he was believed to have done in England, but being introduced " by royal fiat, without the consultation of the clergy " or people, and perceived to have been devised by English clerics, also drawing attention to the wider problems of being ruled at a distance from England.<sup>41</sup> The first attempt at conducting a service according to these new rights (which took place on 23 July 1637 at the Cathedral of St. Giles's, Edinburgh) had quickly descended into a riot, which under the banner of a covenant to protect the Scottish Church had as a consequence of Charles's subsequent decision to ignore the advice of a great proportion of the aristocracy and his ministers there and attempt to implement it in its entirety rather than seeking an accommodation by February 1638 become a general rallying point for all those holding grievances over Charles's style of rule. This represented a direct challenge to Charles's authority, and whilst he was apparently as yet still hoping to solve the problem as quickly as possible through diplomacy, it nevertheless appears to have focussed his mind upon the need to cover the eventuality of becoming involved in a war which would involve his prolonged absence and an increased role for the navy, with this, together with the fact that he had been buoyed by the verdicts of those judges who had so far submitted their judgements on the ship money case into a more belligerent mood rather than the influence of any courtier or an intention to add popularity to his policies prompting him to appoint the Earl of Northumberland (the current admiral of his ship money fleet) lord admiral.<sup>42</sup> As whilst circumstances may have forced Charles into

---

<sup>41</sup>

Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 784.

<sup>42</sup>

Northumberland's appointment was

appointing an admiral long before he actually intended he nevertheless retained a firm grip upon the situation, with it being possible to demonstrate that the decision had been his alone and as near as possible to his original intentions. For although Charles's statement upon Northumberland's appointment at a meeting of the Council on 18 March 1638 " that it was his own choice, for that lord never made any means to him for the place, neither direct nor indirect..." could be dismissed as a mere piece of rhetoric aimed at defending his authority, it receives apparent confirmation not only in that in spite of the extreme difficulty in keeping attempts at wielding influence at Court away from the attention of the newsletter writers throughout 1637 there had been no speculation over the appointment of a lord admiral at all, let alone Northumberland, until such time as he himself declared " all was resolved and concluded...", but perhaps most clearly of all in the fact that his appointment was upon terms which could only have been of benefit to Charles himself.<sup>43</sup> For whilst

---

announced by Charles at a meeting of the Privy Council on the 18 March 1638. Northumberland believed that the Scottish crisis lay behind his appointment.; -Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 152. 20 March 1638. The Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 154. 21 March 1638. London. Earl of Northumberland - Wentworth. Here Northumberland writes that the king " did yesterday in Council declare " his appointment as lord admiral. The announcement had in fact been made at a meeting on 18 March; and although there were a number of meetings on the 20th, neither the king nor Northumberland had attended. He had either forgotten that a day had passed, or more likely given his exclamation that " If I had lately met with any means of conveying a letter to your lordship ", that he was trying to give the impression that he had informed Wentworth of his appointment more quickly than he had.; Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. p. 338.; Quintrell, Charles I. pp. 64-7.; Wedgwood, King's Peace. p. 202.; PRO. C115/N4/8623. 14 March 1638. [Sic. 24 March]. John Borough - Viscount Scudamore.; Privy Council Registers Preserved in the P.R.O. Reproduced in Facsimile. Vol. III. (London, 1967). p. 35. 18 March 1638. Whitehall.

<sup>43</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 152. 20 March 1638. The Strand. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 154. 21 March 1638. London. Earl of Northumberland - Wentworth.

Charles's order on 13 February 1638 (shortly before he announced his decision to appoint a lord admiral) " that no grant of the office of governor of any of his Majesty's garrisons, or of any office of the navy or ordnance, shall henceforth be made for life, but to continue during his Majesty's pleasure only " was clearly of no benefit to Northumberland, who would have wished for as much patronage as possible in order to bolster his position, it was totally in accordance with Charles's determination to protect both his authority and future royal patronage in advance of an appointment which he would rather have avoided, with this same pattern also being repeated in relation to the terms of the grant itself, where Charles not only deliberately declared his intention of making " his son the Duke of York admiral of England, when he should be fit for the execution of the place...", but as a means of safeguarding this had had grants of the position simultaneously prepared for both Prince James and Northumberland, only where the prince's was " for his life ", in order to allow him to replace Northumberland automatically the moment he came of age Northumberland's was only " during pleasure..." and "...in respect of the yet tender years of the said Prince James...", clearly demonstrating that Charles had never had any intention of using the vacant position of lord admiral as a political tool. <sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> CSPD,1636. p. 259. 29 February 1636. Sir John Penington - Sir Edward Nicholas.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 91. 2-12 March 1637. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; CSPD,1637-1638. p. 256. 13 February 1638. Lords of the Admiralty - Clerks of the Signet.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 154. 21 March 1638. London. Earl of Northumberland - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 152. 20 March 1638. The Strand. George Garrard - Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 156. 3 April 1638. London. Viscount Conway - Wentworth.; CSPD,1637-1638. p. 321. 21 March 1638. Thomas Smith - Sir John Penington.; Ibid., p. 351. 7 April 1638. Charles I. - Lord Keeper Coventry. To pass letters patent under the Great Seal granting to Prince James the office of lord high admiral with all fees, emoluments, and privileges pertaining to the same, to be held by him for life.; PRO.S03/11. April 1638. Grant unto Prince James for his life of the office of Lord High Admiral of England, Ireland, Wales... Subscribed attorney general, by warrant under his Majesty's Sign Manual. Procured Mr Windebank. [Presumably Secretary Windebank's son, Thomas]; Although this was Charles's intention for legal reasons this

This failure on the part of Charles to uphold his side of the bargain and appoint a lord admiral (let alone the charismatic and popular one which it ideally required) until such time as he was driven to by outside circumstances beyond his immediate control ensured that the policy of ship money never took-off as the popular policy rallying the country behind it which those originally advancing it had intended; which whilst in itself representing the loss of an important political opportunity which may have helped pave the way for a reduction in the underlying tensions which had existed between king and people right from the beginning of the reign, in keeping with the disruptive although not malicious nature of his style of rule when things did not go his way was to cause far worse political damage as a consequence of his insistence that others should nevertheless stick to theirs. In that rather than abandoning ship money altogether and reducing the scope of his naval policy to a level which could be met out of the Crown's own finances Charles continued advancing that part of it which was beneficial to him whilst ignoring that which was supposed to have made it palatable to his people; and therefore unlike Elizabeth and James who had by and large allowed their subjects to believe that they were contributing to the cause of the Crown of their own free will, thereby providing an official outlet for their loyalties as was originally intended to have been the case in relation to ship money, Charles instead took the unilateral assumption that the security of the country was under threat and turned to the law, using short-term emergency powers under the prerogative to force them to contribute to the long-term problem of funding a

---

grant did not pass the seal, but was kept in the Council Chest until such time as Charles wished to see it implemented. --Gardiner, History. Vol. VIII. p. 338 and Oppenheim, History of the Navy. p. 283. Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. p. 421. 27 March 1638. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud - Wentworth.; Ibid., Vol. VI. Appendix II. pp. 521-526. 14 May 1638. Same - Same.; PRO. C115/N4/8624. 11 April 1638. London. John Borough - Viscount Scudamore.; PRO.S03/11. April 1638. Grant of the office of lord admiral in respect of the yet tender years of the said Prince James unto Algernon, Earl of Northumberland. Subscribed attorney general by warrant under his majesty's Sign Manual. Procured Mr Windebank. This passed the Great Seal on the 13 April 1638. BCL. DV.896/603183/581.

standing navy for which they could see no need. Which in forcing people to support a cause with which they did not agree not only threatened the success of the policy itself, but also had the effect of inflaming public opinion and could undermine long-term support for the Crown. For the effect of removing the ability of subjects to freely demonstrate their loyalty through making them support a particular policy prescribed by the Crown was not to channel it in the pursuit of one particular aim, but because of the unpopularity which arose as a consequence of the wider plan which was felt to be behind it was to merely drive it away, especially significant in this being the fact that with the underlying cause lying with Charles's distinctly unpolitical character rather than a mere difference over policy, it was repeated right across his government rather than being restricted to just one particular area of it, this being clearly demonstrated in his actions over the establishment of the household of the prince.

One of the most consistent themes of early Stuart history is what would have happened if Prince Henry had not died in November 1612 but had succeeded to the throne on the death of James I. in March 1625. For with his staunchly Protestant religion, well regulated household and keen interest in military affairs he is seen as the " ideal monarch England never had ", who would neither have treated fruitlessly with Spain as James was to do, or make such a disaster of the war policy which Charles was to do. <sup>45</sup> This has tended to bring about a perception of a great political gulf between Charles and Henry, but when their characters and personalities are compared what is striking are not the differences but the similarities. Much is usually made of Henry's physique, William Heydon, for example, writing that he was tall and of an high stature, his body strong and well proportioned, his shoulders were broad. <sup>46</sup> It is true that in this Henry differed markedly from Charles, who was himself short; but whilst in early years he had been of a weak constitution, according to Sir Robert Cary at the age of four being unable " to go, nor scant stand alone ", being " so weak in his joints and especially his ankles, insomuch as many feared they were out of joint ", by

---

<sup>45</sup> Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p.

7.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

the age of eleven he had grown " more and more in health and strength both of body and mind, to the amazement of many that knew his weakness when she first took charge of him ", and by 1614 Dr. George Carleton was writing to his brother Sir Dudley how that he must praise Charles's " accomplishments, his skill in riding, running at the ring &c. ".<sup>47</sup> Charles was therefore at least Henry's equal in this respect, and definitely had the edge as regards intellect; for whilst in 1614 Carleton had noted that he had " more understanding than the late prince at his age ", something which according to the Venetian Ambassador James had noted himself in 1612, quipping to Henry that " if he did not attend more earnestly to his lessons the Crown would be left to his brother, the Duke of York, who was far quicker at learning and studied more earnestly ".<sup>48</sup> The one weakness which Charles did have was in his speech, and although James had recommended " that the string under his tongue should be cut " as a means of remedying this, it appears that this impediment " had a mental rather than a physical cause; for this same trait was shared by Henry himself, with Francis Bacon explaining that " in speech he was somewhat slow, and as it were embarrassed ", and Thomas Birch later noting that " his speech was slow and attended with some impediment ".<sup>49</sup> They also appeared very similar in their personal appearances, but more important than this were their similarities in their dealings with other people, and especially in their patronage. Clarendon notes of Charles's

---

<sup>47</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Robert Cary. pp. 84-5. Charles's weaknesses appear to have been exaggerated. By 1611 he was already taking riding lessons along with Henry at the hands of Monsieur St. Anthony, the prince's principal equerry. CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 273. 10 February 1614. Nuffield. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 65.; Birch, Life of Henry. p. 223.

<sup>48</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 273. 10 February 1614. Nuffield. Dr. George Carleton - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPV, 1603-1607. pp. 513-4. Relazione of 1607 by Nicolo Molin.

<sup>49</sup> Roger Lockyer, Tudor and Stuart Britain. p. 244.; Coward, Stuart Age. pp. 136-7.; Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. p. 85.; Francis Bacon, ' Henricium Principem Walliae Elogium ', pp. 327-329, in J. Spedding, ed., Bacon Vol. VI.; Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 301-2, 331-2.; Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 13.

patronage how that " he saw and observed men long before he received them about his person ", and this appears to have been shared by Henry, with Sir John Holles (his comptroller) noting that he was " a great, a judicious, and a silent, searcher into dispositions, wise, just, and secret, a curious observer..."; and whilst " with ambassadors and strangers, princes, etc, he did stare sopra di se and usually received them with that order and majesty as they appeared before him rather as a king than a prince..." and had a certain height of mind, and knew well how to keep his distance...admitting no near approach either to his power or his secrets ", this emphasis upon royal authority was also to be an important factor with Charles, who " kept state to the full, which made his Court very orderly; no man presuming to be seen in a place where he had no pretence to be ".<sup>50</sup> With Sir Francis Bacon noting that Henry's distance and gravity meant that " he seemed quite another man in conversation than his aspect promised; and altogether he was one who might easily get himself a reputation at variance with his manners ", and with this same trait being a central cause of the belief that Charles was allowing Buckingham to rule the country and overturn the civil and religious position of the country, given the great problems which either would have had to have faced at one level this indicates that there is no reason to believe that politics would have been so very different if Henry had lived after all, but more importantly it also indicates that the great popularity of Henry was by no means spontaneous, but had been formed by those around him and in the public at large who read into his style of living and interest in military affairs their hope for a king who would not lay back like James but who would take an eager interest in their brand of religion and allow England to take its proper place as the leading Protestant country in Europe, and not only tolerated but actively manipulated by James through such measures as having establishing his household along the lines of what Roy Strong calls " an academy filled with aristocratic youths of roughly the same age " as Henry, containing such staunch Protestants as the Earl of Essex, William Cecil, Lord

---

<sup>50</sup> Boyle, ed., Selections from Clarendon. pp. 205, 225.; Strong, Henry Prince of Wales. p. 8.; Birch, Life of Henry. pp. 301-2.;



Cranborne, and John Harrington so as to enable it to provide an outlet at Court for those who did not share his objects.<sup>51</sup>

Although with things having threatened to get out of hand under Henry this was initially a role which James had no intention of allowing Charles to follow, having announced " that the young prince be kept within a stricter compass than the former " and therefore only allowed five of the former household of over a hundred of Prince Henry's to be continued in office under Charles, this was a role which he had subsequently allowed it to play under Charles, for as a counterfoil to his own pacific policies he had (as with Henry) first encouraged Charles to take an interest in naval and military affairs through such measures as granting him a reversion of the position of lord admiral when only twelve years of age and staging regular tournies in which he could demonstrate his military prowess to an expectant public, and then later when Charles represented more of a problem to his objectives as Henry ever had through allowing him to actively advocate a military solution to the Palatinate as a means of containing such calls within the orbit of the Court.<sup>52</sup> The Court of the heir to the throne under James (whatever their age) had therefore been used to the best effect in providing outlets which ultimately also benefited his own wider policy objectives, and in the light of this with the births of Prince Charles on 29 May 1630 and Prince James on 14 November 1633, and with Charles also evidently aware of the fact (if not the reasons behind it) that his own government had become distanced from a good proportion of the politically influential nobility, something which can be seen in a letter which he had sent out to the Earls of Warwick, St. Alban's, Essex, Dover, Carlisle, Clare, Northampton, Cleveland, Kent, Hertford, Devonshire and Rochford in

---

<sup>51</sup> Spedding, ed., Bacon. Vol. VII. pp. 327-9.; Strong, --Henry Prince of Wales. pp. 42-3.

<sup>52</sup> CSPD, 1611-1618. p. 111. 15 January 1612. Grant to Charles, Duke of York, in reversion after the present lord admiral, of the office of Lord High Admiral of England for life...; Ibid., p. 273. 10 February 1614. Nuffield. Dr. George Carleton - Sir D. Carleton; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 25. 12 October 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 359. 28 March 1621. London. Same - Same.; Carlton, Charles I. pp. 16, 26-7.

May 1638 in which he informed them that he had " formerly taken notice of some slackness amongst the lords in giving their attendance upon his royal person in the places of public solemnity, and expecting it more frequent in the future...", he could not have been unaware of the chance offered by the use of his son's household as a reversionary interest.<sup>53</sup> Unfortunately, though, Charles's primary consideration was for maintaining his royal authority and establishing an ordered Court not gaining support for his policies or providing means by which those who opposed them could find alternative outlets in the Court, with his actions over the establishment of the prince's household representing as much an opportunity lost as his failure to appoint a lord admiral. As Charles appears to have made remarkably little use of the political opportunities offered by the birth of his son, as apart from the appointment of the countess of Dorset as the prince's governess (after having initially favoured that of the Countess of Roxborough, a Scotchwoman and former lady of the bedchamber to his mother until discovering that she was " supposed to be a Catholic " the only other immediate appointment made was that of John Aiton (who confirming the idea that Charles had initially intended a household for his son based entirely upon his former observations, was perhaps a relation of his mother's and currently his wife's Scotch secretary Sir Robert Aiton) as a gentleman usher daily waiter.<sup>54</sup> In 1632 he was appointed eleven grooms of his chamber, but these were merely " to attend the

---

<sup>53</sup> Carlton, Charles I. p. 133.; Hamilton, Henrietta Maria. p. 114.; PRO.LC5/134. 14 May 1638. Whitehall. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery - Earls of Warwick, St. Albans, Essex, Dover, Carlisle, Clare, Northampton, Cleveland, Kent, Hertford, Devonshire and Rochford.

<sup>54</sup> Powell, ed., Memoirs of Sir Robert Cary. pp. 92-3.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 44. 21 December 1616. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; Ibid., p. 99. 11 October 1617. London. Same - Same.; PRO. C115/M31/8126. 10 July 1630. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPV,1629-1632. p. 373. 12 July 1630. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; PRO.LC5/132. 3 July 1630. Appointment of the Countess of Dorset as governess to the prince.; Ibid., Such servants as are sworn to his majesty to attend Prince Charles. 4 June 1630. Gentleman usher daily waiter, John Aiton.

prince's highness in the quality of players " rather than being political appointments; and although his household was subsequently expanded in 1633 through the appointment of James Hopkins and Sylvester Shephard as grooms of the chamber, Richard Griffith (who had been one of the king's footmen) and Thomas Duckworth as pages of the backstairs, and Dr. Edmund Mason as his tutor (who given the importance of his position in shaping the opinions of the prince had characteristically been selected by the king as a consequence of his observations of him as his chaplain in ordinary) it fell far-short of the Protestant academy of nobles which James had established around Prince Henry.<sup>55</sup> It may be tempting to see Charles's neglect of the prince's household as a political tool as a consequence of the fact that he was still an infant rather than through any neglect by him. But as with Henry before him the most important role which the prince could have played was an ideological one, and therefore did not necessarily require his active involvement, the potential which this situation offered being demonstrated in that with their being a shortage of Court office under Charles because of his tendency to keep people in office and a general disaffection with his policies people had already begun of themselves to look to the reversionary interest as a means of obtaining office without being tainted with the polices of the king, George Garrard first reporting rumours towards the end of 1635

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 10 May 1632. Warrant to swear various servants as grooms of the chamber in ordinary without fee to attend the prince in the quality of players.; Ibid., 16 May 1633. James Hopkins and Sylvester Shephard sworn grooms of the chamber to the prince.; PRO. SO3/8. January 1626. Grant to Richard Griffith, one of the king's footmen...; PRO. LC5/132. 16 May 1633. Rice Griffith and Thomas Duckworth sworn pages of the backstairs to the prince.; Ibid., 20 April 1633. Dr. Edmund Mason sworn scholar master to the prince by the king himself. Upon the death of Mason he was replaced by another of Charles's chaplains, Dr. Brian Duppa. PRO. LC5/134. 27 March 1635. Dr. Brian Duppa, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, was sworn the prince's tutor by his lordship in the place of Dr. Mason, Dean of Salisbury, who died the day before.; HMC, Hastings MSS. (1930). Vol. II. p. 78. 28 March 1635. Unaddressed letter of Edmund Rossingham.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. 8 April 1635. Mr Howell - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

of the " naming a governor to the prince, as Sir Thomas Chaloner was to Prince Henry " which then continued for the next two years and included such varied candidates as the Earl of Danby, George, Lord Goring, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Thomas Jermyn, Charles's tutor, Dr Brian Duppa, and the Earl of Newcastle.<sup>56</sup> Unfortunately, though, this opportunity was not taken up by Charles, for although he already appears to have decided upon the appointment of the Earl of Newcastle as the prince's governor by the end of 1635, Charles does not appear to have been in any hurry to put it into execution, George Garrard, at least seeing " no real basis " to the rumours of an imminent appointment; and had it not been for the need to prepare for the future as a consequence of the wider threat to his security as represented by the Scottish crisis, as in his selection of a lord admiral there is no reason to believe that he would have proceeded in making the appointment of a governor to the prince at this time, the fact that they were shaped by a common cause being indicated in that Newcastle was informed of his appointment as " sole gentleman of the bedchamber to the Prince of Wales " on 19 March 1638 the day after Charles had announced the appointment of the Earl of Northumberland as interim lord admiral, it appearing that what had prompted Charles to make these decisions was not a wish to bolster the position of the Crown but a desire to see his long-term intentions for the princes implemented whilst he was still in a position to do so.<sup>57</sup> This much is confirmed in

---

<sup>56</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. pp. 489-90. December 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., pp. 56-7. 23 March 1637. Same - Same.; Ibid., pp. 522-3. 15 March 1636. Mr. Howell - Wentworth.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. p. 477. 1 February 1636. Earl of Clare - Lord Haughton.; T.P. Slaughter, Ideology and Politics on the Eve of the Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II. (Philadelphia, 1984). p. XXIV. 8 April 1636. London. Earl of Newcastle - Countess of Newcastle.; Ibid., p. XXV. 15 April 1636. Same - Same.; Ogle and Bliss, ed., Calendar of Clarendon State Papers. Vol. I. p. 150. 19 March 1638. Whitehall. Sir Francis Windebank - Earl of Newcastle.; Works of William Laud. Vol. VII. P. 421. 27 March 1638. Lambeth. Archbishop Laud Wentworth.

<sup>57</sup> In December 1635 Charles was forced to confront the question of selecting a governor for the prince after being petitioned for it by Danby, Goring and Leicester. He appears to have decided upon

the complete lack of political use to which the positions of the prince's new household were put, for whilst like Northumberland Newcastle had hoped that his position would have been accompanied by sufficient freedom to be able to use it to bolster the policies of the Crown, with the king having settled everything in advance he was not even able to choose who was to dine with him at Court, but was to be joined by " the Duke of Buckingham and his brother, and Bishop Duppa the tutor, one of the prince's chaplains, all by appointment, which it is thought is not very pleasing to him...".<sup>58</sup> This considerably reduced the benefits of being appointed to such a position, but this was not all, as being applied generally to all appointments within the household it was something which undermined the entire political opportunity which it had offered, for rather than using it as a means of containing and perhaps utilising the support of those elements who did not share all aspects of his policies but were in broad agreement over the objectives of his foreign policy, fearful of dissent and determined that his son's household should conform to the same degree of order as his own, it was

---

Newcastle soon after. This is indicated in the actions of the queen; as where she had previously backed Goring, in January 1636 she demonstrated a new warmth for Newcastle, Garrard reporting to Wentworth that Lord Savile " must leave his commands in the north about Pontefract, the queen will bestow them on the Earl of Newcastle ".; Geoffrey -Trease, Portrait of a Cavalier. William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle. (London,1979). p. 75. 15 April 1636. Earl of Newcastle - Countess of Newcastle.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. pp. 489-90. Undated. December 1635. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; Ibid., p. 506. 8 January 1636. Same - Same.; Ibid., Vol. II. pp. 56-7. 23 March 1637. London. Same - Same.; Ogle and Bliss, ed., Calendar of Clarendon State Papers. Vol. I. p. 150. 19 March 1638. Whitehall. Secretary Windebank - Earl of Newcastle.; PRO. SO3/11. Commission to the Earl of Newcastle to take into his charge his highness Prince Charles... Subscribed attorney general. King's pleasure signified by the Marquis Hamilton, lord chamberlain, Mr Treasurer and Mr Comptroller. Procured lord chamberlain.; Privy Council Registers, 1638. Vol. III. p. 35. 18 March 1638. Whitehall.

<sup>58</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. pp. 165-8. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

formed entirely of current members of the royal household or those he knew he could trust.

As of the four grooms of the bedchamber who were appointed at this time, Richard Neville, Thomas Jermyn, Thomas Bray and Henry Seymour, all had previous connections with Charles or the Crown.<sup>59</sup> Richard Neville, had been a gentleman of his own privy chamber (a position which his father, Sir Christopher, had held under James), Thomas Bray had been one of his carvers, Henry Seymour had been a page of the queen (who by virtue of Charles's perception of a dual Court had in 1636 been termed as " his Majesty's servant"), whilst he would have been equally well acquainted with Thomas Jermyn, who as well as being a servant of the king himself was also the son of Sir Thomas, his vice-chamberlain and Master of the Game to the queen, and brother to Sir Henry, a gentleman usher of the queen's privy chamber.<sup>60</sup> This can also be seen in the appointment of the four gentleman of the privy chamber. As although Garrard asserts that both Sir John Harpur and Sir William Withrington had been " brought in by my Lord Newcastle ", if they had even in this he would appear to have been subject to a degree of pre-selection through Charles's use of the office of sheriff as a test for loyalty; for Harpur had been appointed as Sheriff of Derbyshire in October 1636, and was to be later disparagingly described by Henry

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.

<sup>60</sup> PRO.LC5/132. 3 July 1630. His lordship swore Sir Thomas Jermyn vice chamberlain.; Ibid., 29 January 1632. List of gentlemen of the privy chamber.; PRO. LC5/134. 24 April 1638. Warrant to swear Charles Murray, esq., a carver to his Majesty upon the removal of Mr Thomas Bray to be a groom of the bedchamber to the prince.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; CSPD, 1636. p. 316. 23 March 1636. Grant to Henry Seymour, his majesty's servants.; PRO. SO3/9. January 1630. Grant to Thomas Jermyn, esq., his majesty's servant of the office of Governor of the Isle of Wight in reversion... Subscribed by warrant under his majesty's Sign Manual. Procured Viscount Dorchester.; PRO. E101/439/3. f. 89v. Wages of queen's servants and officers 1634/5. Sir Thomas Jermyn, Master of the Game.; Ibid., f. 4. 1634/5. List of gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber.

Hastings in a letter to the Earl of Huntingdon as " a courtier...[who] hath been sheriff and collected ship money...", Witherington (a close personal friend of Newcastle's) had been sheriff of Northumberland the previous year, as had one of those not nominated by Newcastle, John Lucas, who had served that same year as sheriff of Essex, whilst the fourth, Thomas Nott, although described by Garrard merely as " a mercer near Temple Bar ", evidently had connections at Court, being about " to marry a niece of the Lady Denbigh's ", who as well as being the sister of the late Duke of Buckingham, was a lady of the queen's bedchamber and a personal friend of the king and queen.<sup>61</sup> Neither was this pattern restricted to the more important positions, as these same influences were also felt lower down the scale in the office of usher of the privy chamber, where of the two appointed to serve the prince, John (Jack) Pooley had been brother-in-law to Charles's deceased loyal servant and vice-chamberlain Sir Humphrey May and had held a share in the office of Clerk of the Council of Star Chamber, whilst " Frank Windebank " was the son of Charles's secretary, Sir Francis Windebank, clearly indicating the way in which in being based upon familiarity and demonstration of service Charles's patronage had become excessively insular and prevented him from using the reversionary interest as a political tool.<sup>62</sup>

A similar opportunity can be seen to have been lost in relation to the realm of Court culture. During the 1620s and 1630s " a generation of the peerage had sought service in foreign wars - against Spain in the Low Countries, and in the campaigns of the Thirty Years' War - seeking the martial glory which was seen as the proper

---

<sup>61</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. pp. 165-8. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, from the earliest times to A.D. 1831. List and Index Society. Vol. XI. p. 31, 99. 3 October 1636.; Sharpe, Personal Rule. p. 857.; Trease, Portrait of a Cavalier. pp. 46, 99.

<sup>62</sup> The connection between Pooley and May is inferred by Garrard and confirmed in that after May's death Pooley was granted a share in the office of Clerk of the Council which May had held.; Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. pp. 165-7. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth.; CSPD, 1631-1633. p. 68. 4 June 1631. Greenwich. Charles I. - Attorney General Noy.

complement of the noble estate ", but this was insufficient to satisfy their notions of honour on its own and they also required status from their own prince as well. <sup>63</sup> Although James himself had possessed no great interest in military affairs, and indeed even expressed a good deal of fear at the sight of a drawn sword or the sound of cannon-fire, he had been astute enough to realise this and that it could provide a useful counterpoint in his own diplomatic negotiations; and therefore in addition to the encouragement which he had given to the marital interests of his sons, had complimented it with regular tournaments at Court. Whilst not fully compensating for active service in the name of their prince, such active events as this provided an outlet through which subjects could demonstrate their military prowess and at least their willingness to serve their king. Whilst prince Charles had actively engaged in tournaments himself, so when he became king it would have been expected that he would have enlarged their scope. In fact, though, the reverse was to be the case, as with Charles now able to involve himself (however unsuccessfully) in the real problem of solving the Palatinate he no longer appears to have felt the same need to prove himself through such measures, and as far as can be determined no tournaments appear to have been held after the one celebrating Charles's proxy marriage in May 1625. <sup>64</sup> With Charles's own personal artistic interests now being based upon the " new concept of collecting " works of art along a " humanist ideal of enlightened cultural leadership..." which in being viewed and understood by relatively few people formed an " implicit cultural boundary ", and with his visual display now focussing upon such activities such as Court masques and the annual procession of the Order of the Garter whose message was largely linked to order and authority and participation in which was largely passive, not only meant that he was unable to satisfy the

---

<sup>63</sup> J.S.A. Adamson, ' The baronial context of the English Civil War ', pp. 83-110, in The English Civil War. p. 99., 110. note 129.; Caroline Hibbard, ' The theatre of dynasty ', pp. 156-176, in R.M. Smuts, ed., --The Stuart court and Europe. p. 162.

<sup>64</sup> A. Young, Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments. (London, 1987). p. 41.; R.M. Smuts, ' Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England ', pp. 86-112, in R.M. Smuts, ed., The Stuart court and Europe. p. 86.



demands of the very section who would have been able to provide his policies with their greatest support, but in the light of the general lack of provision of alternative outlets for royal service and the events occurring at this time in Europe left young nobles in an even greater position of frustration as that which Charles himself had been in the light of the expulsion of his sister and her family from the Palatinate during the late 1610s and early 1620s.<sup>65</sup>

Indeed in having delayed the appointment of a lord admiral until it was too late to catch the public imagination and having failed to use the position of the prince or other means at Court in providing an outlet through which they could freely vent their anti-Spanish militarism, although advancing a policy aimed at restoring the Palatinate through the veiled threat of action Charles had ultimately managed to extract less benefit from the genuine interest of his people in securing this objective than the genuinely pacific James. With Charles's expectations on obedience and authority driving him on in the pursuit of this policy through the courts regardless, given the political context of the rival conspiracy theories which had arisen as a consequence of the events of the 1620s and the absence of parliament this was always going to cause wider political problems. But that the effects of these were in the end to prove so devastating was because the problem was much more fundamental than an inability to implement just one particular policy, as with his personal preferences rather than the pursuit of his policies underpinning all of his patronage decisions these same effects of his inability to harness the support of his people to a particular cause had been carried across the board into every sphere of government and had served to bring together a number of disparate groups into opposition to the policies of the Crown and undermine the inherent loyalty of the people at the same time as he had failed to establish a creditable alternative group in its place. The negative effects of these personal preferences upon his ability to purchase support being clearly demonstrated in the lost opportunity of Charles's patronage in relation to what should have been the cockpit of Crown support, the royal households, whose potential for exploitation as a means purchasing support in the light of altered political circumstances can not only be demonstrated to have stagnated through having remained largely unaltered since

---

<sup>65</sup>

*Ibid.*, pp. 97, 101

Charles's accession to the throne, but to have actually declined as Charles increasingly withdrew into himself during the 1630s and surrounded himself with old and familiar faces through filling vacancies from within and in some cases even leaving positions vacant rather than replacing them with new people from outside.

This can clearly be seen in the king's household in relation to those most potentially influential of positions, the gentleman of the bedchamber and within it that of groom of the stool. As upon coming to the throne Charles had maintained in office those who had served him as prince, only supplementing these with the Duke of Buckingham, the Duke of Lennox and the Marquess of Hamilton, and the Earls of Carlisle and Holland later in August 1626.<sup>66</sup> Of these four, the Earl of Ancrum, the Dukes of Richmond and Lennox, the Marquess of Hamilton and the Earl of Holland remained in office throughout the 1630s and were still in office in 1641, but the Duke of Buckingham, Sir James Fullerton and the Earls of Carlisle and Monmouth had all died without being replaced, meaning that by 1639 the number of Charles's gentlemen of the bedchamber had shrunk by more than half from nine to four.<sup>67</sup> This pattern was mirrored in relation to the position of groom of the stool, which was granted solely upon the death of the previous incumbent and always to a member of the surviving group of officers, being held successively by Sir James Fullerton (who was re-appointed upon Charles's accession to the throne and remained in office until his

---

<sup>66</sup> Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 609. 9 April 1625. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; CSPV, 1625-1626. p. 19. 15 April 1625. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.; PRO. LC3/1. f. 1. Thursday 3 August 1626. The Earls of Carlisle and Holland sworn gentlemen of the king's bedchamber.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., f. 2. A list of his majesty's servants of the bedchamber, 1641.; Buckingham had been assassinated on the 23rd of August 1628. Lockyer, Buckingham. p. 453.; Fullerton had died on the 6 January 1631. PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8 January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; Carlisle had died on the 25 April 1636. Ellis ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 12; Sir Robert Cary, Earl of Monmouth, had died in April 1639. R.R. Reid, The King's Council in the North. (London, 1921). p. 496.

death on 6 January 1631) and the Earls of Carlisle (appointed mid-February 1631 and remaining in office until his death on 25 April 1636) and Holland (who was appointed in early May until replaced by the Marquess of Hertford in 1641).<sup>68</sup> This was clearly no exception, for Charles's reluctance to replace ministers can also be seen in his failure to appoint a new lord steward after the death of the Earl of Pembroke in April 1630, whilst his preference for old faces can clearly be seen in relation to his actions upon the retirement of the Treasurer of the Household, Sir Thomas Edmondes, in 1639.<sup>69</sup> As Edmondes's position of Treasurer of the Household went to Sir Henry Vane (who had been in Charles's household as prince and was already comptroller of the household), his position went to Sir Thomas Jermyn (whose attendance Charles had specifically requested whilst in Spain in 1623 and was already his vice chamberlain), he was replaced George, Lord Goring, who was also promoted from within the government, having held the position of Master of the Horse to the queen since July 1628, whilst the general sense of insularity was maintained in his replacement of Sir Henry Jermyn, who was the son Sir Thomas Jermyn the new comptroller and already a gentleman usher of the queen's privy chamber and a great favourite of hers.<sup>70</sup> The fact that when Edmondes had been forced because of

---

<sup>68</sup> PRO. LC2/6. f. 69. 1625. Sir James Fullerton, groom of the stool to the prince.; NLW. Wynn of Gwydir 1336. 29 April 1625. Sir Roger Mostyn - Sir John Wynn.; PRO. C115/M31/8130. 8 January 1631. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; CSPV, 1629-1632. p. 478. 21 February 1631. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; The appointment of Holland is contained in a newsletter sent by Salvetti on the 30 of May 1636. Ibid., p. 558. Note.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 540. 6 March 1631. Christ College, Cambridge. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; PRO.LC3/1. A list of his majesty's servants of the chamber in ordianry, 1641. Earl of Holland, groom of the stool.

<sup>69</sup> Works of William Laud. Vol. III. Diary. p. 211. 10 April 1630.; Edmondes retired from office in January 1639 and died in September.; HMC, Tenth Report. Appendix II. p. 172. 31 January 1639. Andrew Mingay - Framlingham Gawdy.; Ellis, ed., Obituary of Richard Smyth. p. 16.

<sup>70</sup> HMC, Tenth Report. Appendix II. p. 172. 31 January 1639. Andrew Mingay - Framlingham Gawdy.; Letters of John Chamberlain. Vol. II. p. 488. 5

ill-health to retire from Court for a time in June 1635 the king was said to have been moved on behalf of forty people to replace him clearly indicates that there was no problem with the patronage system itself and that the problem lay with Charles himself, so neither was this trend restricted to the major offices at Court, but also appears to have continued throughout his household servants, too.<sup>71</sup> This is clearly demonstrated amongst Charles's gentlemen of the privy chamber.

With the vast majority of the forty-eight appointed to this position upon Charles's accession to the throne having previously held office under him or James there was clearly no great change at the outset of the reign, meaning that if there were any alterations of a significant enough magnitude to explain the subsequent malfunctioning of the Court then they must have come later through such alterations as were made to this initial establishment. This, however, appears unlikely, for of those who had been appointed between 1625 and 1628, forty-one were still in office in 1630, thirty-three or four in 1635, and eighteen or nineteen (just under half) as late as 1641.<sup>72</sup> This same pattern can also be seen in other areas of his household, too.

---

April 1623. London. John Chamberlain - Sir Dudley Carleton.; HMC, Fourth Report. p. 294. 2 September 1629. Duchy House. Nicholas Herman - Earl of Middlesex.; CSPV, 1636-1639. p. 571. 9 September 1639. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.; BL. Egerton 1048. f. 186v. Undated list of queen's servants c.1639-1641. Mr Henry Jermyn, Master of the Horse.

<sup>71</sup> Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. I. p. 434. 24 June 1635. George Garrard - Sir Thomas Edmondes.

<sup>72</sup> In the absence of other lists those appointed to this office 1625-1641 have been worked out through taking the 1641 household list and working back using information on appointments and removals provided in the lord chamberlain's warrant books. The same process has been used the other way around with the list of Charles and James's servants in the latter's funeral precedent in 1625. Therefore in this and following examples only any additional sources to the warrants of appointment are listed in full. PRO.LC3/1. ff. 2v. A list of his majesty's servants of the chamber in ordinary..; Changes between 1630 and 1635. CSPD, 1635. p. 245. 4 July 1635. Charles I. - Attorney General Banks.; Richard Crane. CSPD, 1637. p. 197.; Maynard appears in January 1632 and is not

For of the fourteen or so appointed as grooms of the privy chamber between 1625 and 1628, thirteen were still in office in 1630, eight by 1635 and seven by 1641, and was especially the case in that subsequent vacancies were filled by those of James's servants in this position who had not been continued in ordinary service in 1625.<sup>73</sup> Whilst of those servants in office in 1641 two of his four gentlemen ushers daily waiters, six of his eight gentlemen ushers quarter waiters, six of his ten grooms of the bedchamber, five of his nine sewers of the chamber, two of his four sewers, all five of his carvers and two of his four gentlemen ushers of his privy chamber had all been appointed in the period 1625-1628.<sup>74</sup> In severely undermining the main centre of support for an early modern monarch this would have been a serious enough development in itself if it was merely restricted to the household of the king, but unfortunately this was not the case; for due to Charles's determination to establish

---

mentioned as dying or being removed from office by 1635.

<sup>73</sup> PRO. SO3/8. April 1626. Warrant under the signet to the treasurer of the chamber -for...John Wonham, Thomas Haile, Joshua Ellis, John Heale, George Reading, Francis Holding, Ralph Frith, Walter Brisco, Francis Frith and Joseph Walker...to be sworn to his Majesty as supernumerary grooms of of the chamber. By order of the lord chamberlain. Procured Sir Ralph Freeman.; Of the other seven of James's ex-servants, Richard Scott and Robert -Smethwicke were appointed to serve the queen in the same capacity, with the other five presumably dying or retiring before achieving ordinary service. PRO. LR5/57. f. 113v. Establishment book of the queen's household, 1626. List of grooms of the chamber.

<sup>74</sup> Those appointed 1625-1628 and still in office in 1641 were John Leech and Peter Newton as gentlemen usher quarter waiters; Peter Watson, Bartholemew Parker, Paul French, Richard -Baghall, Edward Bordman and Richard Parsons as gentleman usher, quarter waiters; William Murray, James Levingstone, Endymion Porter, George Kirke, James Maxwell and Patrick Maule as grooms of the bedchamber; Edward Brown, Edward Hobson, Nathaniel Chambers, Thomas Holness and Edward Deckfield as sewers of the chamber; Richard Green and Sir Thomas Reynell (who had earlier served as a cupbearer) as sewers; and Sir Edward Salter, William Salter, Sir Gilbert Houghton and Robert Bruce as carvers.; PRO. LC3/1. ff. 2-4. List of his Majesty's servants of the chamber in ordinary, 1641.

order and maintain his authority through establishing a unitary Court he had exacerbated the weaknesses of his patronage system through spreading its effects to the Courts of the queen and prince. For after the period of 1626-1628 during which Charles had replaced much of Henrietta Maria's French household with (where possible) that of his mother, there followed a period of stability, with her lord chamberlain (the Earl of Dorset), the lord steward of her revenues (the Earl of Holland) and her treasurer and receiver-general (Sir Richard Wynn) all still being in office in 1640, whilst the master of her horse George, Lord Goring, had only been removed in September 1639 in order to become vice-chamberlain to the king in the place of Sir Thomas Jermyn.<sup>75</sup> Whilst when Sir Robert Killigrew (who had been appointed vice-chamberlain in the place of Goring in July 1628) died around 1633 there were rumours that his position would not be filled in haste, and despite there being consistent speculation that it was to be given to Walter Montagu (the Recusant son of the Earl of Manchester) or Sir Thomas Stafford (a gentleman usher of the queen's privy chamber who had served under Queen Anne and was the illegitimate son of the Earl of Totnes, who had held this office under Anne), in the end the office appears to have been allowed to lapse, for the office was still unfilled in September 1639, six years after it had first become vacant, as was that of the office of her solicitor general after the death of Henry Calthorp in August 1637.<sup>76</sup> Just like the

---

<sup>75</sup> Rymer, Foedera. Vol. IX. Pt. III. p. 9. 22 June 1640. Westminster. Commission to (amongst others) Edward, Earl of Dorset, lord chamberlain to the queen.; Ibid., Pt. II. p. 232. 18 November 1639. Westminster. Commission to Sir Richard Wynn, the queen's treasurer...; HMC, Fourth Report. p. 294. 2 September 1639. Duchy House. Nicholas Herman - Earl of Middlesex.; CSPV, 1636-1639. p. 571. 9 September 1639. Venetian Ambassador - Doge and Senate.

<sup>76</sup> CSPD, 1633-1634. p. 242. 10 October 1633. Edward Nicholas - Sir John Penington.; PRO. C115/M31/8156. 13 July 1633. London. John Flower - Viscount Scudamore.; BL. Kings 136. f. 503. c. 1624/1625. List of Queen Anne's former servants and officers used by the French. f. 503. HMC, Hastings MSS. Vol. II. p. 76. Unaddressed Rossingham newsletter. 14 February 1635.; PRO. C115/M36/8449. 10 February 1635. Edmund Rossingham - Viscount Scudamore.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 180. 28 Aug/2 Sept. 1639. Westminster. William

king's household, neither was this an isolated trend restricted to its upper levels. As of those holding office in 1641 four of the seven English grooms of the privy chamber had been appointed upon the re-establishment of the queen's household in 1626 (of which two, Simon Killigrew and Arthur Doddington, had been in the service of Queen Anne in 1619 and a third, George Eliot, had previously been in the in the service of Charles as Prince of Wales, the fourth being Lodovick Carlisle), as had seven of the twelve grooms of the queen's chamber (of which five had been in the service of Queen Anne). <sup>77</sup> Whilst the similarities between the king and queen's household at this level are also apparent in both its propensity to have positions left vacant, as was the case in relation to the gentlemen ushers of her privy chamber (where a failure to appoint replacements upon the death or retirement of Sir William Gordon between 1627-1629 and the removal of Henry Percy to be master of the queen's horse in September 1639 meant that the number of servants in this position had fallen by 1641 from five to three) and especially in its reliance upon promoting candidates from within; where in the pages of her bedchamber attending the backstairs Arthur Boderon was replaced by Henry Brown (who was already in the service of the king, having been jointly appointed by him Underkeeper of Denmark House, and Keeper of the Wardrobe and Privy Lodgings there) and Alexander Stephenson (who had at one point been in the service of the king) by James Ross (who after being a page of the bedchamber to Prince Charles had been continued in

---

Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; Henrietta Maria's solicitor general had been Henry Calthorp. After his death in August 1637 he does not appear to have been replaced.; PRO. E101/439/3. f. 91. Wages of the queen's officers 1634/5. Thomas Mallet, esq., solicitor general to the queen. But under the Midsummer and Michaelmas quarter of 1635 it has in the margin Henry Calthorp, solicitor general to the queen.; Foss, Judges of England.-- Vol. VI. p. 231.; De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 122. 31 August 1637. Hawkins - Leicester.

<sup>77</sup> Comparison of PRO. LC2/5. 1619 and PRO. LR5/57. An Establishment book of ordinary wages, fees, allowances and petitions, 1626-1629 with BL. Egerton 1048. f. 186v. c.1639 - 1641. List of her Majesty's servants in ordinary.

his service as king).<sup>78</sup> Neither was this something which was overcome by the use of the reversionary interest of the household of the prince as under James, as when it was finally established in early 1638 like that of the king and queen it essentially remained unaltered. Newcastle remained as governor until his resignation in 1641, which was primarily the consequence of an internal struggle with the Earls of Holland and Essex and the general rising of political tensions over the state of royal government rather than because of any action or desire on the part of Charles himself; and whilst amongst the grooms of the bedchamber by 1641 Richard Neville and Thomas Jermyn had been replaced by Richard Harding and John Ashburnham (who had been a kinsman and servant of the Duke of Buckingham), Henry Seymour and Thomas Bray were still in office, whilst the ushers and gentlemen of the privy chamber together with other offices in the prince's household remained unaltered.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup>

Most of this information has been gleaned from a comparison of PRO. LC2/5. 1619, PRO. LR5/57. 1626-1629, PRO. E101/439/3. 1634-1635 with BL. Egerton 1048. f. 186v. c. 1639 - 1641. Therefore only any additional sources used are listed in full.; PRO. SO3/8. May 1625. The office of Underkeeper of Denmark House, and Keeper of the Wardrobe -there...granted to Richard Brown and Henry Brown his son during their lives. Subscribed attorney general by order from Lord Conway. Procured, Endymion Porter.; Ibid., January 1626. Alexander Stephenson, one of the pages of his majesty's bedchamber.; PRO. LC2/6. f. 69. 1625. List of pages of the bedchamber to Prince Charles.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 19. 15 March 1628. Confirmation to James Ross, Hugh Wood, Hayward Rogers and Hugh Henn, pages of the bedchamber.

<sup>79</sup>

The evidence for this is based upon a comparison of Knowler, Strafford Letters. Vol. II. p. 165. 10 May 1638. Charterhouse. George Garrard - Lord Deputy Wentworth. with BL. Harleian 3791. ff. 108/9v. 1641. The names of all servants that attend the prince his highness and the rest of his Majesty's royal children in chamber, household and stable. Only any additional sources are listed in full.; Slaughter, Ideology. p. XXVI. Newcastle was replaced as governor to the prince by the Earl of Hertford.; Commons Debates, 1628. Vol. IV. p. 116. 5 June 1628. Speech of John Ashburnham.; With there being no additional lists of the prince's servants (appointments to his household no longer being included in the lord chamberlain's warrant books by virtue of the fact that it was now an



Indeed, the only major change came in the form of an addition rather than an alteration with the appointment of Henry, Lord Percy a month or so after Charles's return from his expedition to Scotland in August/September 1639; but even here the motive was likely to have been to ensure that the prince was transported with dignity equal to his rank rather than looking to bolster political support, Percy being very much an appointment from within, having previously held the position of Master of the Horse to the queen.<sup>80</sup> So whilst as a consequence of his perceptions over the nature of the Court Charles had established a firm personal grip over the patronage of his own as well as his wife's and son's household, placing himself in an ideal position to have used it as a means of bolstering the political support of his regime, with his

---

independent institution), and Garrard's letter not listing them in full it is impossible to stage a full comparison. Although it is possible to demonstrate that James Hopkins and Sylvester Shephard, who had been appointed as grooms of the great chamber to the prince in 1633, were still in office in 1641. PRO. LC5/132. 16 May 1633. Such servants as are sworn to his Majesty to attend Prince Charles. --

<sup>80</sup> De l'Isle. Vol. VI. p. 180. 29 August/8 September 1639. Westminster. William Hawkins - Earl of Leicester.; HMC, Fourth Report. p. 294. 2 September 1639. Duchy House. Nicholas Herman - Earl of Middlesex.; Charles had arrived at Theobalds from Scotland on Thursday 1 August 1639, and at Whitehall on the 3rd. Works of William Laud. Vol. III. p. 232. 1 August 1639.; Percy had been appointed master of the queen's horse upon the dismissal of her French servants in 1626, in which position he remained until July 1628, when according to John Beaulieu he had "retired himself with his young lady into the country", the young lady in question being a daughter of the Earl of Salisbury's, whom he had recently married. PRO. LR5/57. f. 3v. Accounts of the queen's household for the year 1626-7. Henry Percy, Master of the Horse to the queen.; BL. Harleian 7010. f. 87. 23 July 1628. London. John Beaulieu - Sir Thomas Puckering.; CSPD, 1628-1629. p. 218. 18 July 1628. Sir Robert Aiton - James, Earl of Carlisle.; BL. Harleian 390. f. 340. 12 January 1628. London. John Pory - Joseph Mead.; Ibid., f. 424. 19 July 1628. Christ College, Cambridge. Joseph Mead - Sir Martin Stuteville.; Seddon, ed., Letters of John Holles. Vol. III. p. 385. 24 July 1628. Earl of Clare - Bishop of Lincoln.; BL. Harleian 383. ff. 62-62v. 25 July 1628. London. Unsigned newsletter.

personal preferences and notions on authority by and large leading him to appoint people who he knew and trusted and making him reluctant to even appoint replacements to those who had retired or died, let alone deliberately dismiss people in order to make room for the appointment of those who would bring him political benefit, in neither was the patronage at his disposal used in this way, representing another lost opportunity which together with the others prevented him from securing his personal objectives and lost the Crown a considerable amount of political support.

## Conclusion.

In direct contrast to his father as both prince and king Charles I. can be seen to have tightly controlled the patronage which was at his disposal. Not just in positions which entailed personal attendance upon himself or his wife or in those areas where he had a particular interest, but with Charles taking his role as king extremely seriously throughout the Church and State. Patrons were still able to use their influence or position to act on behalf of those who shared their political opinions or enjoyed their favour, but with this only being possible in accordance with Charles's own preferences their scope for independent action was much reduced and it was in a very different way than had been normal with James. As where under him all that was necessary to receive Crown patronage was to find someone in his favour willing to intervene on your behalf, with Charles possessing firmly defined notions of royal authority and discouraging such action from below under him the role of patrons was restricted to bringing people into the orbit of the king and getting them into his favour at the right time in the hope that he would select them rather than another. This control of patronage on the part of Charles meant that he was able to have a significant personal impact in shaping the politics of the reign, and begs the question as to the role which his distribution of it played in the causes of the Civil War. Guided by the pioneering work of the Whigs, it is usually assumed (although not so blatantly) that Charles was attempting some kind of political and religious revolution aimed at introducing Arminianism and arbitrary government. The fact that he had taken personal control of Crown patronage may at first appear to tie in with such an objective. But what lay behind this was Charles's latent insecurity driving a continual fear of disobedience rather than any intention of implementing a pre-meditated plan. So driven, it had different effects in different areas of his government due to the particular ways in which he gauged obedience in that sphere; with his personal control of the Church leading him to be pre-disposed to those from the high-Church end of the religious spectrum who shared his doctrinal and especially his ceremonial preferences, at the same time as he was being served by such convinced Protestants as Sir Robert Heath and Sir John Coke in his administration, and George, Lord Goring, the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, Sir Henry Vane and the Jermyns at the heart of his

government in the household. Indeed, his Church patronage apart, religion (provided that it was accompanied with outward conformity) does not appear to have been a significant factor in Charles's selection of officers, servants or ministers; and with all those appointed by him appearing to have no identifiable perspective other than a willingness to defer to his authority, whether this be out of custom, self-interest, or a genuine belief in the justness of his cause, the type of person he promoted in other areas would not appear to have been a major factor in any move towards civil war. There is at first sight greater scope for seeing Charles's patronage as a possible cause in the manner in which he distributed it. James I. had always been acutely aware of his own weakness in the face of suitors for royal patronage, but his personal weakness in the end turned out to be a political strength. As whilst this fault in itself ensured that his patronage never became restricted to any one particular religious or political group, his mode of overcoming it by dispensing patronage through a personal favourite ensured that any political discontent ultimately rested not with him but another who could be dispensed without any serious constitutional implications. On the whole this system appears to have served James fairly well, enabling him on two separate occasions to advance a pro-Spanish foreign policy whilst keeping his diplomatic options open and containing opposition at home through simultaneously allowing a son to take a diametrically opposed position. Under Charles, though, the exact reverse was true, as his apparent personal strength turned out to be a political weakness. For although he possessed none of his father's frailty in the face of a determined suitor, neither did he possess any of his political skill; and his consistent failure to extract any benefit from his patronage either through playing one side off against another and deflecting opposition away from himself like his father, or to purchase political support more directly, was both a major hindrance to his ability to implement his policies and seriously damaging to the long-term support of the Crown. For in shunning the use of a favourite like James and taking patronage back into his own hands as a means of tying those he appointed to himself Charles had ultimately raised the stakes of any opposition to his policies, which he had made a good deal more likely through allowing his personal characteristics to be carried onto a wider plane by dispensing his patronage in line with his own preferences and upon the basis

of familiarity and past service rather than political necessity. As his inability to secure sufficient support to implement any of his policies without resorting to the force of the prerogative or hitting out through his disfavour at those he perceived to be opposing them gave the impression that he was undermining the constitution and drove those who did not share his exact opinions into opposition. His refusal to allow the involvement of courtiers in the removal or appointment of officers may have enabled Charles to strive towards the settled and ordered Court which he so desired, but it gave them no personal stake in the regime. It also prevented the Court from fulfilling its role as a medium through which political change could be secured in conjunction rather than in opposition to the Crown, thereby forcing people to act outside of it. Whilst his preference for selecting people on the basis of personal knowledge and past service, together with his refusal to use the reversionary interest of the prince to provide alternative outlets for those opposing his policies, ensured that his patronage, and through it his government, was unchanging, overly insular and unable to incorporate important elements of the political nation. However, whilst these weaknesses in Charles's patronage had meant that many opportunities of healing old wounds and advancing new policies had been missed, on their own they were not serious enough to have led to civil war. As with old habits dying hard and people instinctively wishing to avert a greater crisis, until his assassination in 1628 the blame for these shortcomings had been placed upon the Duke of Buckingham, and then after that as a consequence of Charles's secretive style of rule and pre-disposition to work with and protect a small, unchanging group of select ministers they were seen to be the work of self-interested advisers such as Weston, Wentworth and Laud rather than Charles himself, who had only been using them to breath life into what were own objectives. Thus with the ultimate cause of the problems in Charles's patronage lying with the unorthodox political opinions (as moulded by his particular perception of events) which lay behind them rather than with one particular element of it it is even possible to argue that in this sense his patronage policy had staved off some of the worst effects of his policies. For with Charles deliberately maintaining his personal right to decide policy and demanding obedience from all those who served him, as demonstrated in the actions of those advancing more publicly acceptable polices

within the government (such as Manchester, Coventry and Holland in relation to the initial proposal for the policy of ship money) there was very little which they could do to alter things even when they were in office; and as can be seen in the 1640s with the eventual appointment of such people as Essex, Hertford and Bristol, whilst a more orthodox patronage policy could have increased the immediate political popularity of Charles's regime, unless it had also been accompanied by a correspondent change in policy this would have soon ebbed and ultimately worked against him as the appointment of respected figures with little or no change in his underlying policies produced the perception of a king who could or would not be advised. The root cause of the problem therefore rested in Charles's character. This meant that the same effects were felt throughout the entire government rather than being restricted to just one specific element of it, with the weaknesses in his distribution of patronage being a manifestation of one of the many wider problems which eventually came together to cause the civil war rather than being a principal cause in itself. In that whilst civil war had not in any way been made inevitable by Charles's presence on the throne, with him being a king who was determined to uphold his right to be obeyed to the full in every sphere despite possessing a complete inability to gain the support of any significant group of his people through his patronage, he was particularly ill-suited to deal with the religious and political problems facing the country at this time. As in producing many enemies yet fewer friends Charles had rendered himself especially susceptible to any outside factor which would serve to unite the many groups who because of his earlier actions during the 1620s and 1630s had come to fear the ultimate consequences of what they thought were his objectives more than their reverence for him and ultimately the institution of monarchy itself.

# Bibliography.

## Manuscript Sources.

- 1 Birmingham Central Library. Croome Court Collection. Dockets of grants passed under the Great Seal by Lord Keeper Coventry. DV.892/602918, DV.896/603183, DV.888/602426, DV.899/603626, DV.901/603736, DV.907/604012.
- 2 BL. Additional MSS. 4177, 15,552, 15,630, 19,398, 22,548, 26,785, 27,402, 28,621, 34,600.
- 3 BL. Egerton MSS. 784, 1048, 1525, 2533, 2541, 2551-3, 2592-7, 2618, 2978, 5976.
- 4 BL. Harleian MSS. 383, 385, 390, 781, 1580, 1718, 3791, 6988, 7000, 7010.
- 5 BL. King's MSS. 136.
- 6 BL. Stowe MSS. 176, 561, 743.
- 7 PRO. C115/M and N. Various newsletters sent to John, Viscount Scudamore.
- 8 PRO. E101 429/3. Pensions and wages of the queen's household for the period beginning 29th September 1634 and due at Michaelmas 1635.
- 9 PRO. E101/439/1. Acquittances for the fees, pensions and wages for the queen's servants and officers due to them for the year beginning at Michaelmas 1635.
- 10 PRO. LC2 5. The president of the funeral of our late sovereign lady Queen Anne, 1619.
- 11 PRO. LC2/6. The president of the funeral of our late dread sovereign of blessed memory King James, 1625.
- 12 PRO. LC2/4/6. The president of the funeral of the high and mighty Prince Henry late Prince of Wales.
- 13 PRO. LC3/1. Establishment Register of the Household, 1641-44.
- 14 PRO. LC3/31. Royal Establishment Book, 1626-1697.
- 15 PRO. LC5/117. Royal Establishment Book, 1627.

- 16 PRO. LC5/132. Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book. Warrants ab Anno, 1628-1634.
- 17 PRO. LC5/134. Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book. Warrants ab Anno, 1634-41.
- 18 PRO. LR5/57. Henrietta Maria. An establishment of ordinary wages, fees, allowances and pensions yearly allowed by us to our officers and servants of our chamber and household. And to the officers and servants of our revenue, 1626-1629.
- 19 PRO. LS13/169. Board of green cloth entry book, 1627-1642.
- 20 PRO. SO3/6-12. Signet Office Docket Books 1616-1640.
- 21 PRO. SP14. State Papers Domestic James I.
- 22 PRO. SP16. State Papers Domestic Charles I.
- 23 SRO. DD Ph/216, 219 and 221. Phelips MSS.

#### Primary Printed Sources.

1. Acts of the Privy Council of England., ed. J.R. Dasent et al. 10 vols. (London,1930-1964). Then published on micro-opaque fiche for the period June 1631 to 31 May 1637, and after reproduced in facsimile.
2. Andrewes, Lancelot., The Works of Lancelot Andrewes., ed. J.P. Wilson and J Bliss. 9 vols. (Oxford,1841-1854).
3. Ballinger, J., (ed.), Calendar of Wynn (of Gwydir) Papers 1515-1690. In the National Library of Wales and elsewhere. (London,1926).
4. Birch, T., (ed.), The Court and Times of James I; Illustrated by Authentic and Confidential Letters, From Various Public and Private Collections. 2 vols. (New York,1973).
5. Boas, F.S., (ed.), The Diary of Thomas Crosfield. (London,1935).
6. Bramston, Sir John., The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the hundred of Chelmsford., ed. Lord Braysbrooke. (London,1845).
7. Boyle, G.D., (ed.), Selections from Clarendon. Characters and Episodes from the Great Rebellion. Selected from the History and Autobiography of Edward, Earl of Clarendon. (Oxford,1889).



8. Bruce, J. (ed.), Letters and papers of the Verney family down to the end of the year 1639. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 56. (London,1853).
9. Cabala: Sive Scrinia Sacra. Mysteries of State and Government: In Letters of Illustrious Persons, and Great Agents; in the Reigns of Henry the Eighth, Queen Elizabeth, King James and the Late King Charles. (London,1654).
- 10 Calendar of Close Rolls. 14 vols (London,1896-1913). Vol. X. 1354-1360.
11. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Edward VI. to James I., ed. R. Lemon et al., 12 vols. (London,1856-1872).
12. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Charles I., ed. J. Bruce et al., 23 vols. (London,1858-97).
13. Calendar of State Papers, Venetian., ed. A.B. Hinds, vols. X-XXV. (London,1900-25).
14. Cherbury, Edward Herbert., Lord of, Autobiography of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury., ed. Sidney Lee. (London,1906).
15. Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, History of the Rebellion., ed. W.D. Macray. 6 vols. (Oxford,1888).
16. Coke, E., Institutes of the Laws of England 1628-1644. Cap. I. The High Court of Parliament. (1642).
17. Cooper, J.P. (ed.), Wentworth Papers 1597-1628. Camden Society Fourth Series. Vol. 12. (London,1973).
18. Davies, G. (ed.), Autobiography of Thomas Raymond, and memoirs of the family of Guise of Elmore, Gloucestershire. Camden Society Third Series. Vol. 28. (London,1917).
19. D'Ewes, S., The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds E'Ewes., ed. J.O. Halliwell. 2 vols. (London,1845).
20. Dodridge., Sir John, The History of the Ancient and Modern Estate of the Principality of Wales, Dutchy of Cornwall, and Earledome of Chester. Collected out of the Records of the Tower of London, and divers ancient Authors. By Sir John Dodridge knight, late one of his Majesties Judges in the King's Bench. And by himself dedicated to King James of ever blessed memory. (London,1630).
21. Ellis, H. (ed.), Original Letters Illustrative of English History; Including Numerous Royal Letters: From Autographs in the British Museum and One or Two Other Collections. (London,1827).

22. Ellis, H. (ed.), The obituary of Richard Smyth, secondary of the Poultry Comptor, London; being a catalogue of all such persons as he knew in their life; extended from A.D. 1627 to A.D. 1674. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 44. (London,1849).
23. Firth, C.H. (ed.), ' Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford. From the MSS. of Dr. William Knowler ', in Camden Miscellany Vol. IX. (London,1895).
24. Foster, J. (ed.), Alumni Oxonienses, being the matriculation register of the university 1500-1714. 4 vols. (Oxford,1891/2).
25. Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), The Fortescue Papers. Consisting chiefly of letters relating to state affairs, collected by John Packer, secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Camden Society. New Series. (London,1891).
26. Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1628-1660. (Oxford,1889).
27. Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), ' Letters Relating to the Misson of Sir Thomas Roe to Gustavus Adolphus 1629-1630 ', in Camden Miscellany Vol. VII. Camden Society New Series Vol. 14. (London,1875).
28. Gardiner, S.R. (ed.), ' Speech of Sir Robert Heath, attorney-general, in the case of Alexander Leighton, in the star chamber, June 4, 1630 ', in Camden Miscellany Vol. VII. (London,1875).
29. Goodman, G, The Court of King James I., ed. J.S. Brewer. (London,1839).
30. Gough-Nichols, J. and Bruce, J. (eds.), Wills from Doctors' Commons. A selection from the wills of eminent persons proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1495-1695. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 83. (London,1865).
31. Hacket, J, Srinia Reserata: a Memorial offered to the great Deservings of John Williams D.D. (London,1692).
32. Heylyn, P, Cyprianus Anglicus, or the History of the Life and Death of the most Rev. and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury... (London,1668).
33. HMC 2, Third Report, appendix. (London,1872).
34. HMC 3, Fourth Report, appendix. Pt. I. (London,1874).
35. HMC 6, Seventh Report, appendix. Pt. I. (London,1879).
36. HMC 21, Eleventh Report, appendix VI. (London,1887).

37. HMC 10, Tenth Report, appendix I. (London,1885).
38. HMC 23, Twelfth Report, appendix I, II. (London,1888/9).
39. HMC 23, Twelfth Report, appendix IV. (London,1888).
40. HMC 45, Buccleuch (Montagu House) MSS. Vols I and III. (London,1899,1926).
41. HMC 77, Lord De l'Isle and Dudley. Vol. VI. (London,1966).
42. HMC 78, Mr Reginald Rawdon Hastings. Vol II. (London,1930). Vol. II.
43. HMC 36, Marquess of Ormonde New Series. Vol. I. (London,1902).
44. HMC, 55. Various Collections. Vols V, VII and VIII. (London,1909,1913,1914).
45. Holles, G, Memorials of the Holles family, 1493-1656., ed. A.C. Wood. Camden Society Third Series Vol. 55. (London,1937).
46. Howell, J., Familiar Letters on Important Subjects, Wrote from the Year 1618 to 1650. By James Howell, Esq., Clerk of the Privy Council to King Charles. (Aberdeen,1753).
47. Howell, T.B. (ed.), A complete collection of state trials and proceedings for high treason and other crimes and misdemeanors from the earliest period to the year 1783. (London,1816). Vol. III.
48. Jansson, M and Bidwell, W.B (eds.), Proceedings in Parliament, 1625. (Yale,1987).
49. Keeler, M.F. et al (eds.), Proceedings in Parliament, 1628. 6 vols. (Yale,1977-83).
50. Larkin, J.F. (ed.), Stuart Royal Proclamations,1625-1646. (Oxford,1983).
51. Laud, W., The Works of William Laud, D.D., ed. W. Scott and J. Bliss. 7 vols. (Oxford,1847-60).
52. Lee, M. (ed.), Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain. 1603-1624. Jacobean Letters. (New Jersey,1972).
53. List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, from the earliest times to A.D. 1831, compiled from documents in the PRO. List and Index Society. No. 11. Krause reprint (New York,1963).

54. Loomie, A.J. (ed.), Ceremonies of Charles I. The Note Books of John Finet 1628-1641. (New York,1987).
55. Luders, E. et al (eds.), The Statutes of the Realm, from original records and authentic manuscripts. 11 vols. (London,1810-28). Vols I, II & IV.
56. McClure, N.E, (ed.), The Letters of John Chamberlain. 2 vols. (Philadelphia,1939).
57. McGowan, A.P. (ed.), The Jacobean Commissions of Enquiry 1608 and 1618. (Navy Records Society,1971).
58. Moore-Smith, G.C. (ed.), ' Extracts from the papers of Thomas Woodcock, ob. 1695. ', in Camden miscellany. Vol. XI. Camden Society Third Series Vol. 13.
59. Notestein, W. et al (eds.), Common Debates, 1621. (New Haven,1935).
60. Ogle, M.A. and Bliss, W.H (eds.), Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library. Vol. I. (Oxford,1882).
61. Ormsby, G, (ed.), The correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., lord bishop of Durham, together with other papers illustrative of his life and times. Surtees Society. Vol. 52. (London,1868).
62. Pett, P., The Autobiography of Phineas Pett, ed. W.G. Perrin. (Navy Records Society,1918).
63. Petrie, C, (ed.), The letters, speeches and proclamations of King Charles I. (London,1935).
64. Powell, G.H., (ed.), Memoirs of Robert Cary, Earl of Monmouth. (London,1905).
65. Proceedings in Parliament, 1626. (New Haven,1977-83).
66. Return of the names of every member returned to serve in each parliament. Vol. I. (London,1878).
67. Roberts, G. (ed.), The Diary of Walter Yonge, esq. Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, written at Colyton and Axminster, co. Devon. From 1604-1628. Camden Society Old Series. Vol. 41. (London,1848).
68. Rushworth, J., Historical Collections. Abridged and Improved. Vol. I. (London,1721).
69. Rymer, T. (ed.), Foedera. 10 vols. (Hague,1737-45).

70. Sainty, J.C. (ed.), Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642. BIHR. Special Supplement No. 8. May 1970.
71. Sainty, J.S. (ed.), Officers of the Exchequer. List and Index Society Special Series. Vol. 18. (London,1983).
72. Schofield, B (ed.), The Knyvett Papers, 1620-1644. Norfolk Record Society Vol. XX. (1949).
73. Searle, A. (ed.), Barrington Family Letters 1628-1632. Camden Society Fourth Series. Vol. 28. (London,1983).
74. Seddon, P.R. (ed.), The Letters of John Holles 1587-1637. Thoroton Society. 3 vols. (1975-86).
75. Snow, V.F. and Young, A.S. (eds.), The Private Journals of the Long Parliament. (Yale,1987).
76. Spedding, J. (ed.), The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon. 7 vols. (London,1862-1874).
77. Squibb, L., ' A book of all the several officers of the Court of Exchequer together with the names of the present officers, in whose gift, and how admitted. With a brief collection of the chief heads of what every officer usually doeth by vertue of his office according to the state of the Exchequer at this day January 1641 ', ed. W. Hamilton-Brown, in Camden Miscellany. Vol. XXVI. Society Fourth Series. Vol. 14.
78. Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, Strafford's Letters and Despatches., ed. W. Knowler, 2 vols, (London,1739).
79. Thompson, C. (ed.), Sir John Borough's notes of Proceedings in Committees of the House of Commons 27 February - 23rd March 1626. (Wivenhoe,1988).
80. Venn, J. and Venn, J.A. (eds.), Alumni Cantabrigienses. A biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900. (Cambridge,1927).
81. Walton, I., The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert and Robert Sanderson. (London,1962).
82. Whitelocke, B., Memorials of the English Affairs from the beginning of the Reign of Charles I. to the Happy Restoration of King Charles II. (Oxford,1853).
83. Wordsworth, C.F. (ed.), The Coronation of Charles I., 1626. Henry Bradshaw Society. Vol. II. 1892.

## Secondary Sources.

1. Adamson, J.S.A., ' The baronial context of the English Civil War ', pp. 83-110, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), The English Civil War. (London,1997).
2. Alexander, M.V.C., Charles I.'s Lord Treasurer. Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland. 1577-1635. (Plymouth,1975).
3. Andrews, K.R., Ships, Money and Politics. (Cambridge,1991).
4. Asch, R.G. and A.M. Birke (eds.), The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650. (Oxford,1991).
5. Ashton, R., James I. by his contemporaries. An account of his career and character as seen by some of his contemporaries. (London,1967).
6. Aylmer, G., ' Charles I.'s Commission on Fees, 1627-1641 ', pp. 58-67, in BIHR. Vol. 31. 1958.
7. Aylmer, G., ' Office Holding as a factor in English History, 1625-1642 ', pp. 228-240, in History. Vol. 44. 1959.
8. Aylmer, G., The King's Servants. The Civil Service of Charles I. (London,1961).
9. Barcroft, J.H., ' Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office ', in R.W. Reinmuth (ed.), Early Stuart Studies. (Minneapolis,1970).
10. Barnard, E.A., ' Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor and Thomas Bayly his son ', pp. 99-132, in Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion. 1928-1929.
11. Barnes, T.G., ' Cropping the Heath: the fall of a Chief Justice, 1634 ', pp. 331-343, in BIHR. Vol. 64. 1991.
12. Barnes, T.G., Somerset 1625-1640. A County's Government During the Personal Rule. (Cambridge, Massachusetts,1961).
13. Barraclough, G., ' The Earldom and County Palatine of Chester ', pp. 23-59, Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Vol. CIII. (Liverpool,1951).
14. Bell, H.E., An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards and Liveries. (Cambridge,1953).
15. Bickersteth, J, and Dunning, R.W., Clerks of the Closet in the Royal Household. Five Hundred Years of Service to the Crown. (Stroud,1991).

16. Birch, T., The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I. Compiled chiefly from his own papers, and other manuscripts, never before published. (Dublin,1760).
17. Boggis, R.J.E., A History of the Diocese of Exeter. (Exeter,1922).
18. Boswell, E., ' The Seventeenth Century Register of the Lord Chamberlain ', pp. 27/8. in BIHR. Vol. 7. 1929/30.
19. Carlton, C, Archbishop William Laud. (London,1987).
20. Carlton, C, Charles I: The Personal Monarch. (London,1983).
21. Carr, J.A, The Life and Times of Archbishop Ussher. (London,1895).
22. Cheyney, C.R, (ed.), Handbook of Dates For Students of English History. (London,1978).
23. Coate, M., ' The Duchy of Cornwall: its History and Administration ', pp. 135-153, TRHS. Fourth Series. 1927.
24. Cogswell, T., ' England and the Spanish Match ', pp. 107-133, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642. (London,1989).
25. Cogswell, T., ' Phaeton's Chariot: the Parliament men and the continental crisis in 1621 ', pp. 24-46, in J.F Meritt (ed), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641. (Cambridge,1996).
26. Cogswell, T., The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624. (Cambridge,1989).
27. Cogswell, T., ' The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I. and the People of the 1620s ', pp. 187-215, in JBS. Vol. 29. 1990.
28. Condon, M.M., ' Ruling Elites in the Reign of Henry VIII, pp. 109-142, in C. Ross (ed.), Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England. (Gloucester,1979).
29. Corbett, J.S., England in the Mediterranean, 1603-1713. (London,1917).
30. Coward, B., The Stuart Age. A History of England 1603-1714. (London,1980).

31. Cuddy, N., ' The Revival of the entourage: the Bedchamber of James I., 1605-1625 ', pp. 173-225, in D. Starkey et al. (eds.), The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War. (London,1987).
32. Cust, R., ' Charles I., the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628 ', pp. 25-50, TRHS. Sixth Series. Vol. 2.
33. Cust, R and Hughes, A., ' Introduction: after Revisionism ', pp. 1-46, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642. (London,1989).
34. Cust, R and Hughes, A., ' Introduction: ~~continues and discontinuities~~ in the English Civil War ', pp. 1-30, in R. Cust and A. Hughes eds . The English Civil War.
35. Cust, R, The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626-1628 Oxford,1987)
36. Cust, R., ' Wentworth's change of sides in the 1620s pp 63-80, in J F Merritt (ed.), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Stafford, 1621-1641 (Cambridge,1996).
37. Dalton, C., The Life and Times of General Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon. 2 vols. (Sampson Low,1885).
38. Davies, J, The Caroline Captivity of the Church. Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism. (Oxford,1992).
39. Dodd, A.H., ' Wales in the Parliaments of Charles I ', pp. 16-49, Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. 1945.
40. Donogan, B., ' A Courtier's Progress: Greed and Consistency in the Life of the Earl of Holland ', pp. 317-353, HJ. Vol. 19. 1976.
41. Eliot, J.H., ' The Court of the Spanish Habsburgs: a peculiar institution ? ', pp. 5-24, in P. Mack and M.C. Jacob (eds.), Politics and Culture in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Honour of H.G. Koenigsberger. (Cambridge,1987).
42. Elton, G.R., ' Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. III. The Court ', pp. 211-228, TRHS. Fifth Series. Vol. 26. 1976.
43. Evans, D.L., ' Some notes on the history of the Principality of Wales in the time of the Black Prince (1343-1376) ', pp. 25-110, Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. 1925-1926.
44. Evans, F.M.G., The Principal Secretary of State. A Survey of the Office from 1558-1680. (Manchester,1923).



45. Fielding, J., ' Arminianism in the Localities. Peterborough Diocese ', pp. 93-113, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
46. Fincham, K., ' Episcopal Government, 1603-1640 ', pp. 71-90, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
47. Fincham, K., ' Introduction ', pp. 1-22, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
48. Fincham, K. and Lake, P., ' The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I. and Charles I. ', pp. 23-49, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
49. Fincham, K., ' William Laud and the exercise of Caroline ecclesiastical patronage ', in Journal of Ecclesiastical History. Forthcoming.
50. Fisher, N.R., ' The Queenes Courte in her councill chamber at Westminster ', pp. 314-337, in EHR. Vol. 108. 1993.
51. Foss, E., The Judges of England; with sketches of their lives, and miscellaneous notices connected with the courts at Westminster, from the time of the conquest. Vol. VI. (London,1857).
52. Fulton, T.W., The Sovereignty of the Sea. An Historical Account of the Claims of England to the Dominion of the British Seas, and of the Evolution of the Territorial Waters: with special references to the Rights of Fishing and the Naval Salute. (Edinburgh and London,1911).
53. Gardiner, S.R., The History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols, (London,1883).
54. Grunfelder., J.K., Influence in Early Stuart Elections 1604-1640. (Ohio,1981).
55. Gruenfelder., J.K., ' The Lord Wardens and Elections, 1604-28 ', pp. 1-23, in JBS. Vols. 15-16. 1975-77.
56. Gunn, S., ' The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England ', pp. 59-90, in TRHS. Sixth Series. Vol. V.
57. Guy, J., ' Court and Culture in the Last Decade ', pp. 1-64, in J. Guy (ed), The Reign of Elizabeth. (Cambridge,1995).
58. Guy, J., Tudor England. (Oxford,1988).
59. Hamilton, E., Henrietta Maria. (London,1976).

60. Hamner, P.E.J., ' Peers, Patronage at Court, Faction and the Earl of Essex ', pp. 65-86, in J. Guy (ed.), The Reign of Elizabeth.
61. Harris, N., Observations on the offices of Secretary of State, Lord Privy Seal, and Lord Chamberlain of the King's household; with Remarks on the Great Seal of England. (London,1837).
62. Havran, M.J., Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington. (London,1973).
63. Hervey, M.F.S., The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel " Father of vertu in England ". (Cambridge,1969).
64. Hibbard, C.M., Charles I. and the Popish Plot. (University of North Carolina,1983).
65. Hibbard, C.M., ' The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642 ', PP. 393-414, in R.G. Asch and A.M. Birke (eds.), The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650. (Oxford,1991).
66. Hill, C., Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution. (Oxford,1980).
67. Hirst, D., Authority and Conflict in England. 1603-1658. (London,1986).
68. Hirst, D., The Representative of the People ? Voters and Voting in England under the Early Stuarts. (Cambridge,1975).
69. Holdsworth, William., A History of English Law. Vol. I. (London,1938).
70. Hume, H., ' The Sheriff as a Member of the House of Commons ', pp. 361-377, JMH No. 3. 1929.
71. Huntley, F.L., Bishop Joseph Hall 1574-1656. A biographical and critical study. (Cambridge and Ipswich,1979).
72. Huxley, G., Endymion Porter: The Life of a Courtier 1587-1649. (London,1959).
73. James, G.F. and Sutherland-Shawe, J.J., ' Admiralty Administration and Personnel, 1619-1714 ', in BIHR. Vol. 14. 1936/7.
74. Jones, F., ' The Historical Background to the Investiture ', pp. 24-38, in Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. Part I. 1970.
75. Jones, W.J., Politics and the Bench. The Judges and the Origins of the English Civil War. (London,1971).

76. Kearney, H.F., Strafford in Ireland, 1633-1641. (Manchester,1959).
77. Kenny, R.W., ' Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham ', in JMH. Vol. 39. 1967.
78. Kishlanksky, M.A., Parliamentary Selection. Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England. (Cambridge,1986).
79. Kopperman, P.E., Sir Robert Heath 1574-1649. Windows on an Age. (Bury,1989).
80. Lake, P., ' Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective, pp. 252-283, in J.F Meritt (ed.), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641. (Cambridge,1996).
81. Lawrence, W.T., Parliamentary Representation of Cornwall, being a Record of the Electoral Divisions and Boroughs of the County from 1295-1885. (Truro,1924).
82. Loades, D., The Tudor Court. (London,1986).
83. Lockyer, R., Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592-1628. (Harlow,1981).
84. Lockyer, R., Tudor and Stuart Britain 1471-1714. (London,1966).
85. Llanelwy, E.S., The History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, General, Cathedral and Parochial. 3 vols. (Oswestry,1908).
86. Loomie, A.J., ' The Spanish faction at the Court of Charles I., 1630-38 ', pp. 37-49, in BIHR. Vol. 59. 1986.
87. Macinnes, A., Charles I. and the making of the covenanting movement, 1625-1641. (London,1991).
88. Mason, T.A., Serving God and Mammon. William Juxon, 1582-1663. Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury. (Newark,1985).
89. Matthews, D., Toby Matthew. (London,1950).
90. Maxwell-Lyte, H.C., The Great Seal. Historical notes on the use of the Great Seal of England. (London,1926).
91. Meritt, J.F., ' Introduction: The Historical Reputation of Thomas Wentworth ', pp. 1-23, in J.F Meritt (ed.), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641. (Cambridge,1996).

92. Mitchell, W.M., The Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the House of Commons 1603-1629. (New York,1957).
93. Morgan, I., Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain. (London,1957).
94. Nicholas, D., Mr Secretary Nicholas 1593-1669. (London,1955).
95. Noonkester, M.C., ' Charles I. and Shrieval Selection, 1625/6 ', pp. 305-310, BIHR. Vol. 64. October 1991.
96. O'Day, R., ' The Ecclesiastical Patronage of the Lord Keeper, 1558-1642 ', pp. 89-110, in TRHS. Vol. 23. 1973.
97. O'Day, R., The English Clergy. The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558-1642. (Leicester,1979).
98. Oman, C., Elizabeth of Bohemia. (London,1964).
99. Oppenheim, M., A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy and of Merchant Shipping in relation to the Navy. Vol. MDIX-MDCLX. (London,1896).
100. Ottley, R.J., Lancelot Andrewes. (London,1894).
101. Peck, L.L., Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England. (London,1990).
102. Peck, L.L., ' Court Patronage and Government Policy: The Jacobean Dilemma ', pp. 27-46, in Guy Fitch and Stephen Orgel (eds.), Patronage in the Renaissance. (Princeton,1981).
103. Peck, L.L., ' For a King not to be bountiful were a fault ', pp. 31-61, in JBS. Vol. 25. 1986.
104. Peck, L.L., ' Peers, Patronage and the Politics of History ', pp. 87-108, in J. Guy (ed.), The Reign of Elizabeth. (Cambridge,1995).
105. Pogson, F., ' Making and maintaining Political Alliances during the Personal Rule of Charles I: Wentworth's Associations with Laud and Cottington ', pp. 51-73, in History. Vol. 84. January 1999.
106. Powell, D.X., ' Sir James Whitelocke's Extra-Judicial Advice to the Crown in 1627 ', pp. 737-741, HJ. Vol. 39. 1996.
107. Powicke, F.M. (ed.), Handbook of British Chronology. (London,1961).
108. Prestwich, M., Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts. (Oxford,1966).

109. Pugh, R.B and Crittal, E. (eds.), The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A History of Wiltshire. (London,1957).
110. Pulling, A., The Order of the Coif. (London,1897).
111. Quinn, D.B. and Ryan, A.N., England's Sea Empire. (London,1983).
112. Quintrell, B.W, Charles I., 1625-1640. (Harlow,1993).
113. Quintrell, B.W., ' Charles I. and his navy in the 1630s ', pp. 159-179, in The Seventeenth Century. Vol. 3. 1988.
114. Quintrell, B.W., ' The Church triumphant ? The emergence of a spiritual lord treasurer, 1635-1636, pp. 81-108, in J.F Meritt (ed.), The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641. (Cambridge,1996).
115. Redworth, G., ' Of Pimps and Princes: three unpublished letters from James I. and the Prince of Wales relating to the Spanish Match ', pp. 401-409, in HJ. Vol. 37. 1994.
116. Reeve, L.J., Charles I. and the Road to Personal Rule. (Cambridge,1989).
117. Reid, R.R., The King's Council in the North. (London,1921).
118. Reidy, M.F., Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Preacher. A study in seventeenth century religious thought. (Chicago,1955).
119. Robertson, J.C., ' Caroline Culture: Bridging Court and Country ? ', pp. 388-416, in History. Vol. 75. 1990.
120. Rodger, N.A.M., The Admiralty. (Suffolk,1979).
121. Russell, C., Causes of the English Civil War. (Oxford,1990).
122. Schreiber, R.E., ' The First Carlisle. Sir James Hay, first Earl of Carlisle as Courtier, Diplomat and Entrepreneur, 1580-1636 ', Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. Vol. 74. 1984. Part 2.
123. Schreiber, R.E., The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635. (London,1981).
124. Seddon, P.R., ' Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset ', pp. 46-68, in Renaissance and Modern Studies. Vol. 14. 1970.
125. Sharpe, K., ' The Image of Virtue: the Court and Household of Charles I., 1625-1642 ', pp. 226-260, in D. Starkey et al. (eds.), The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War. (London,1987).

126. Sharpe, K., The Personal Rule of Charles I. (London,1992).
127. Shepherd, R., ' Court Factions in Early Modern England, pp. 721-743, in JMH. Vol. 64. 1992.
128. Skeel, C.A.J., The Council in the Marches of Wales. A study in local government during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. (London,1904).
129. Slaughter, T.P., Ideology and Politics on the Eve of the Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II. (Philadelphia,1984).
130. Smith, D.L., ' Catholic, Anglican or Puritan ? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the ambiguities of religion in early Stuart England ', pp. 105-123, TRHS. Sixth Series. Vol. 2. 1992.
131. Smith, D.L., ' The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I. ', pp. 257-287, in JBS. Vol. 30. 1991.
132. Smith, D.L., ' The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Politics of the Sixteen-Twenties ', pp. 37-53, in BIHR. Vol. 156. 1992.
133. Smuts, R.M., ' Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England ', pp. 86-112, in R.M. Smuts (ed.), The Stuart court and Europe.
134. Smuts, R.M., Court culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England. (Pennsylvania,1987).
135. Smuts, R.M., ' The Puritan Followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s ', pp. 26-45, in EHR. Vol. 93. 1978.
136. Soden, G., Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester 1583-1656. (London,1953).
137. Somerville, R., Office Holders in the Duchy and County Palatine of Lancaster from 1603. (London,1972).
138. Starkey, D., ' Intimacy and innovation: the rise of the Privy Chamber,1485-1547 ' pp. 71-118, in D. Starkey et al. (eds.), The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War. (London,1987).
139. Starkey, D., ' Introduction: Court History in Perspective ', pp. 1-33, in D. Starkey et al. (eds.), The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War. (London,1987).
140. Steed, C.A., ' The Council of the Marches in the Seventeenth Century ', pp. 19-27, in EHR. Vol. 30. 1915.

141. Stephen, L. and Lee, S. (eds.), Dictionary of National Biography. 63 vols. (London,1885-1900).
142. Stone, L., ' The Electoral Influence of the Second Earl of Salisbury, 1614-68 ', pp. 384-400, EHR. Vol. 71. 1956.
143. Strong, R., Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance. (London,1986).
144. Strong, R., 'Not in front of the citizens ', in Country Life. October 1990.
145. Swensen, P.C., ' Patronage from the Privy Chamber: Sir Anthony Denny and Religious Reform ', pp. 25-44, in JBS. Vol. 27. 1988.
146. Tawney, R.H., Business and Politics under James I. Lionel Cranfield, as Merchant and Minister. (Cambridge,1958).
147. Thompson, C., ' Court politics and parliamentary conflict in 1625 ', pp. 168-192, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642.
148. Thompson, C., ' The Origins of the Parliamentary Middle Group ', pp. 71-86, in TRHS. Fifth Series. Vol. 22. 1972.
149. Thompson, C., ' The reaction of the House of Commons in November and December 1621 to the confinement of Sir Edwin Sandys, pp. 779-786, in HJ. Vol. 4. September 1997.
150. Thompson, Mrs, The Life and Times of George Villiers. Duke of Buckingham. From Original Sources. (London,1860).
151. Trease, G., Portrait of a Cavalier. William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle. (London,1979).
152. Trevor-Roper, H., Archbishop Laud 1573-1645. (London,1988).
153. Trevor-Roper, H., ' William Dell ', pp. 377-379, in EHR. Vol. 52. 1947.
154. Tyacke, N., ' Archbishop Laud ', pp. 51-70, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
155. Tyacke, N., Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism. c. 1590-1640. (Oxford,1987).
156. Tyacke, N., ' Puritanism, Arminianism and counter-revolution ', pp. 136-159, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), The English Civil War. (London,1997).

157. Wedgwood, C.V., The King's Peace. 1637-1641. (London,1970).
158. Wedgwood, C.V., The King's War. 1641-1647. (London,1970).
159. Wedgwood, C.V., The Trial of Charles I. (London,1964).
160. Wedgwood, C.V., Thomas Wentworth. First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641: A Re-evaluation. (London,1964).
161. Welsby, P.A., Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626. (London,1894).
162. White, P., Predestination, Policy and Polemic. (Cambridge,1992).
163. White, P., ' The via-media in the Early Stuart Church ', pp. 211-230, in K. Fincham, (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642. (London,1993).
164. Williams, E.C., Anne of Denmark. Wife of James VI. of Scotland and James I. of England. (London,1970).
165. Williams, G., The Welsh Church from Conquest to Reformation. (Cardiff,1976).
166. Willson, D.H., James VI. and I. (London,1956).
167. Williamson, J.W., The Myth of the Conqueror. Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of Seventeenth Century Personation. (New York,1978).
168. Wilson, J.S., ' Sheriffs Rolls of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries ', pp. 31-45, in EHR. Vol. 47. 1932.
169. Winney, M and Millar, O., English Art, 1625-1714. (Oxford,1957).
170. Yardley, E., Menevia Sacra. (London,1927).
171. Young, A., Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments. (London,1987).
172. Young, M.B., ' Buckingham, War and Parliament. Revisionism Gone too far ', in Parliamentary History. Vol. 4. 1985.
173. Young, M.B., ' Illusions of Grandeur and Reform at the Jacobean Court: Cranfield and the Ordnance ', pp. 53-73, in HJ. Vol. 22. 1979.
174. Young, M.B., Servility and Service. The Life and Work of Sir John Coke. (London,1986).
175. Zagorin, P., ' Did Strafford change sides ? ', pp. 149-163, in EHR. Vol. 101. 1986.