INTRODUCTION

The newsletters which are reproduced in this volume are retained in the Westminster Diocesan Archives (in the A Series, volumes XVI–XIX; the B series, volumes 25–27, 47, and 48; and the OB series, volume I/i).[1] They were penned by English Catholic clergymen and laymen during the first half of the 1620s. At this time, these writers, and indeed many others, expected that sweeping political changes would occur in the wake of the twists and turns of the Stuart court's dynastic marriage negotiations abroad. The present series of letters begins at the point when, in late 1621, with the parliament on the verge of dissolution, the English secular clergy dispatched an agent to Rome in order to persuade the papal curia that this was the right moment to appoint a bishop to exercise direct and local episcopal authority over English Catholics. The secular clergy's efforts to secure episcopal power for one of their number generated a stream of correspondence between them over the next few years. Their letters dealt both with their frenetic lobbying in Rome in order to secure their suit and also with the course of events in England and on the Continent as the Stuart court tried to construct a dynastic alliance which would supply a bride for Prince Charles.[2]

I have no intention in this introduction of using this material to construct a full narrative of the negotiations during 1621–1625 for the failed Anglo-Spanish treaty or for the successful Anglo-French treaty. This can be done much more effectively by exploiting the ministerial and diplomatic correspondence retained in official, and particularly foreign, archives.[3] The point of this volume is to demonstrate, as far as possible, how the English Catholic community's understanding of

[1] AAW, B 25–26, and B 47 have no regular foliation. There are two sets of numbering for the documents in B 26. The first set ceases with B 26, no. 50. In the second set, B 26, no. 50 is also numbered B 26, no. 53. However, rather than regarding B 26, according to the first set of document numbers, as unnumbered after B 26, no. 50 (as does Allison, RS), I have used the second set of numbers in B 26 for documents after no. 50/53.

[2] In the footnotes to the text of these newsletters I have tried to identify individuals where there is any uncertainty about their identity (for example, if they are mentioned via an alias), though this is done only on the first occasion that they are thus mentioned in each letter. I have not, however, for reasons of length, supplied detailed biographical information about such individuals unless it is directly relevant to the newsletter in which they are cited.

[3] See e.g. Adams, PC; Cogswell, *BR*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these diplomatic manoeuvres can be integrated into our account of mainstream politics during this period. I wish to show how Catholics attempted to negotiate with the Stuart regime and with the papal court in order to achieve some of their own aims for the reform of the English Catholic community and to attain a (perhaps quite broad) measure of tolerance for the Stuarts' Catholic subjects. I also want to indicate how Catholic interventions of this kind became part and parcel of contemporary politics.

Many of these letters do not contain a great deal of information or material which cannot be garnered from other sources.[4] They are important, however, because they reveal a crucial (Catholic) component of 'public-sphere' politics, in other words the range (and means and modes of expression) of opinions and discourses which were deployed in reaction to the Stuart court's highly controversial attempts to secure the future of the dynasty through a marriage for Prince Charles. In the often fraught conditions of the late Jacobean polity, Catholics, like certain Protestants, availed themselves of the opportunity to agitate and lobby for public and official approval and confirmation of their particular glosses on and attitudes to the questions raised by royal foreign policy.[5]

Historians have occasionally noted that King James, while theologically a Calvinist, showed himself 'sympathetic to Catholics';[6] and, indeed, both before and after his accession in England, many English Catholics argued that they were loyal supporters of the Stuart cause and dynasty. But the relationship between the king and his Catholic subjects was far from stable. At various points earlier in his reign James had shown complete ruthlessness in dealing with Catholic dissent, even while he argued publicly that he would tolerate those who were of a 'moderate' disposition, Catholics as well as puritans. After he came to England, James had, to many Catholics' way of thinking, soon reneged on promises which he had made to them while he was still in Scotland. During the years 1610–1614, his regime showed itself determined to punish Catholic disobedience. As was made clear by the marriage which he secured for his daughter, Princess Elizabeth, with the Calvinist Frederick V, elector palatine, James was

[4]Several of these letters were printed, in part or whole, in Mark Tierney's edition of Charles Dodd's *Church History* (TD, IV, V). Antony Allison also used them in his essays published in *RH* on English Catholicism in the early 1620s.

[5]For recent analysis of the issue of the public sphere in the context of English history, see P. Lake and S. Pincus, 'Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), pp. 270–292; P. Lake and M. Questier, 'Puritans, papists, and the "public sphere" in early modern England: the Edmund Campion affair in context', *Journal of Modern History*, 72 (2000), pp. 587–592.

[6]G. Bernard, 'The Church of England *c.* 1529–*c.* 1642', *History*, 75 (1990), p. 194.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

still prepared at this point to pose as a leading light of the pan-European 'Protestant cause' (the long political tradition of alliance between European Protestants, which operated on the principle that a shared religious position on certain central doctrinal issues underwrote a more general common interest among them).

Catholics were pessimistic about their own prospects in the wake of the palatine marriage. Toleration seemed as far away as ever. Nevertheless, the failure of the 1614 parliament allowed the Spanish ambassador, the count of Gondomar, to play upon James's fears and suspicions of 'popularity' and of the unquiet parliamentary spirits which had, it seemed, wrecked the session. Their attitudes were, the Spaniard claimed, very different from the loyalism of James's Catholic subjects.[7] During the 1614 débâcle, critics of royal government pointed to the maladministration of the fiscal measures which were supposed to discipline Catholic separatists. Gondomar argued, however, that if concessions were made to Catholics they might show their gratitude by seeking to ensure that some of the crown's revenue requirements were satisfied.[8] It was impossible, of course, that Catholics' generosity could even begin to relieve the king's financial wants. But Gondomar was deploying a version of the arguments which were being advanced not only by English Catholics themselves but also by officials within the central administration whose duties included the regulation and fiscal exploitation of the legal penalties for Catholic separatism.[9] There was, here, an identifiable link and likeness to Gondomar's other claim, namely that James could seek to augment his sovereign authority through the financial and political implications of an Anglo-Spanish dynastic union. In both cases, the crown's fiscal and other political difficulties could be resolved, or so it was argued, without the king being held to ransom, as it were, by his own subjects. In March 1615, the king's ambassador in Madrid, Sir John Digby, received a treaty proposal for such a union. Digby subsequently became an ardent supporter of the project.[10]

The mid-Jacobean regime suffered from a series of horrendous public-relations disasters, the most notable of which was the Overbury scandal. The resulting censures of the regime were compatible with, if not directly informed by, standard contemporary anti-popish

[7] Redworth, *PI*, p. 15.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] M. Questier, 'Sir Henry Spiller, recusancy and the efficiency of the Jacobean exchequer', *HR*, 66 (1993), pp. 257–258, 261–262.

[10] Redworth, *PI*, pp. 15–16, 148 n. 14. Digby advised the king in early 1618 that, since the Spaniards had made their demands concerning religion explicit and were 'likewise resolved to satisfye' him 'in temporall regards and poynt of portion', he (Digby) was 'of opinion that the calling of a parliament wilbe in no kynde usefull': PRO, SP 94/23, fo. 5v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discourse.[11] Then, after 1618, the onset of the troubles in Europe, generally referred to as the 'Thirty Years War', confronted the Stuart court with a number of near-insoluble quandaries and problems.

Bohemia had challenged the authority of the emperor Matthias, arguing that promises made as the result of disputes settled in 1609 and 1611 had been broken; and it sought aid from the Dutch and from the German Protestant princes.[12] James's difficulties were made considerably worse by the decision of his son-in-law, the elector palatine, to accept the Bohemian crown from those who had rebelled against imperial authority and had then deposed Archduke Ferdinand of Austria.[13] In October 1619, Henry Erskine observed in Paris that there was 'great gladness', especially among the Huguenots, at the elector's acceptance of the Bohemian crown, and 'no less gladness that our kings Majestie' would 'draw his shourd in his auld dais in the king of Bohemia his defence'.[14] European Protestants looked to James to play the champion of the European Protestant cause, a role which he no longer wanted. These events and the Jacobean regime's reaction to them transformed the political status of Catholics within the Stuart realms, not least because they allowed Catholics of various kinds to engage in a series of public debates about royal policy.

Of course, according to many historians, by the early 1620s English Catholicism had become politically inert. Protestant fears of popery therefore had little to do with actual Catholics in England. Such people, it is usually assumed, were excluded from public life and distracted by factional disagreements among themselves. Catholics could hope for no more than that perhaps, one day, they might be granted a modicum of tolerance and partial relief from the penal statutes, certainly not a full legal toleration in the sense of a parliamentary repeal of those statutes.[15] When Protestants identified a popish conspiracy to subvert true religion and monarchical authority, they were, it is said, really referring to two things. The first of these was the trials and tribulations of the Protestant cause in Europe and the willingness of the Stuart court to discard much of the Elizabethan tradition of enmity towards Spain. The second was the dislocation caused within the English Church as, or so it seemed to some contemporaries, a strain of doctrinal thought (sometimes referred to as 'Arminianism') started to challenge the supposedly dominant

[11] A. Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2002).

[12] G. Parker, *The Dutch Revolt* (London, 1988), p. 262; Pursell, *WK*, ch. 2.

[13] J.V. Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1974), pp. 103–113; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 45, 49–50; Adams, PC, pp. 280–282.

[14] *HMCMK*, p. 93.

[15] I am grateful to Pauline Croft for discussion of this point.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

species of Calvinist belief and practice which had been inherited from the Elizabethan era.[16]

Yet the glaring fractures in English and British politics that were created by royal foreign policy in some respects actually revitalized the Catholic issue because, inevitably, that issue both affected and was informed by the conduct of royal negotiations with the court in Madrid. As Simon Adams has made clear, by the early 1620s there were serious arguments both for and against a Spanish alliance. For those who believed that the Spanish branch of the Habsburgs did not aim at global dominance, it seemed reasonable to treat the current European political crisis as a set of territorial disputes and not as part of a massive ideological confrontation between the forces of light and darkness.[17] (This, of course, was a difficult argument to sustain once Spanish troops were used in the invasion of the Palatinate.) Those who feared the burgeoning power of Spain could point instead to the need to maintain Protestant coherence and unity, and in particular the safety and security of the United Provinces, something which was now an immediate and pressing issue because the Truce of Antwerp was set to lapse in April 1621.[18]

James did not veto all military action to secure the return of the elector palatine's territory. But he absolutely would not countenance being dragged into the conflict between Spain and the United Provinces, in part because it would redound to the benefit of the French state. In any case, for James to wage a land war against the Habsburgs was financially impossible. Inevitably, there was an alignment between the financial retrenchers within the Stuart regime and those who had ideological reasons for supporting a Spanish marriage, including some who were or could be classed as papists. (Their critiques of the regime's war effort, once hostilities commenced, turned out to be largely correct.[19])

Here, naturally, was fertile ground for those who wanted to claim, and had always claimed, that English Catholics were part of a wider popish conspiracy. Each proposal, in the course of the negotiations with the Spaniards, to grant a measure of toleration to James's Catholic

[16]See N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists* (Oxford, 1987). For the type of Arminianism in the Low Countries which served as a reference point for the English variety, see J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 480–482, 486–525.

[17]For a discussion of the meaning of 'Spanish party' or 'Spanish faction' in mid- and late Jacobean politics, see C.H. Carter, 'Gondomar: ambassador to James I', *HJ*, 7 (1964), pp. 193–194; CRS, 68, pp. xiv–xix.

[18]For the failure of the archdukes' regime to secure an extension of the truce, see P. Arblaster, *Antwerp & the World: Richard Verstegan and the international culture of Catholic reformation* (Louvain, 2004), pp. 138–139.

[19]Adams, FP, pp. 148–151.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subjects could be represented as part of an attempt to fragment the political coherence of the realm and to make it ungovernable. The Spanish court tried to insist on a full legal toleration for James's Catholic subjects as a condition of any Anglo-Spanish marriage treaty, and was backed up by Rome's refusal of a papal dispensation for the marriage until evidence of such a toleration was forthcoming.

It is worth asking, therefore, how far English Catholics were part of these political equations. To what extent were they a coherent component of a pan-European 'Catholic cause', diametrically opposed to the Protestant one? How did they perceive the increasingly frenetic manoeuvres of James and his closest, though often mutually hostile, counsellors as they tried to solve the contradictions into which the king's apparent half-heartedness about European religious divisions had plunged them all? Was the Spanish match the summit of Catholics' hopes? Was its failure the end of their aspirations and dreams? Was the marriage treaty with the House of Bourbon, seemingly so much less concerned with matters of religion, for them no more than a damp squib in this regard? Did it signal the end of Catholics' political ambitions? It would not be difficult to fashion an argument that this was yet another occasion when the devious and unscrupulous French let down their English co-religionists as, arguably, they had done during the Anjou marriage negotiations in 1579–1581.[20]

In fact, as the crown searched – sometimes desperately – for support, a number of different Catholic parties and factions were able to pose as the bulwarks of the monarchy, the regime, and the state, of order, security, and authority. They stood against a (supposed) puritan and popular threat, which was expressed through carping criticism of James's prerogative, particularly as it was used to make foreign-policy decisions.

It is impossible, unfortunately, to estimate what fraction or proportion of 'public opinion' Catholics represented (even assuming that we could arrive at a working definition of Catholicism which would satisfy most historians of the period). But we can glean from surviving clutches of Catholics' correspondence, and especially their newsletters, the extent to which they were capable of intervening in contemporary politics, and of spinning and glossing specific events, just as their enemies tried to spin and gloss such events against them.[21]

[20] See J. Bossy, 'English Catholics and the French marriage, 1577–81', *RH*, 5 (1959–1960), pp. 2–16.

[21] See Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 20f. for the mechanisms of contemporary news culture. For the translation and transmission of English newsletters to the curia, via the secular clergy's agent in Rome, see *NAGB*, introduction; *Letter 34*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Catholic accounts of the intentions of James's regime were a valuable source of information for foreign diplomats in London; and the Stuart court could and did use Catholics, including the writers of some of these newsletters, to push forward its dynastic negotiations abroad. The flow of news generated by Catholics thus became a means by which they could insert themselves and their agenda into the political process and, into the bargain, ingratiate themselves with the regime in London. Some Catholics, for example, searched for and recorded every sign that the Jacobean regime really meant to allow Catholics the freedoms for which they regularly petitioned. In Rome, John Bennett reported, in a letter of May 1622 to William Bishop (the leading secular priest and future bishop of Chalcedon), that he had 'putt certayne clauses' of Bishop's most recent letter and enclosures into Latin and had given them to Cardinal Ottavio Bandini. Bandini 'was very glad of the newes and the next day, being congregacion day for the Holy Office, read [. . .] publickly' the information conveyed to him by Bennett, 'and he tould me after that it gave much content, specially that clause wherin it was sayd that his Majesty had taken order for the quiete of Catholiques'.[22] This was the sort of news which would make the Roman curia favourably inclined towards the Stuart court and more likely to grant a dispensation for the proposed Anglo-Spanish dynastic union.

The problem was that news was not always favourable. A certain amount of spinning might have to be done in order to make it palatable to its eventual recipients. 'Nowe', said Bennett, in the same letter, 'the same newes makers saye that our king hath sent souldioures to the Palatinate and his banner is there display[e]d against the emp[e]ror but this we assure ourselves by other lettres to be false, yet this doth serve there turne to putt doubtes and lettes for the present'.[23] A week later, Bennett informed his brother Edward that he had received two of his letters (which brought better tidings) and 'your newes I putt in Latyne' and showed it to 'these greate men' in Rome 'whoe were very glad therwith'.[24] Catholic news reports could, therefore, from time to time, acquire the capacity to influence the regime's foreign-policy agenda. Equally, the regime calculated that Catholics might well be relied upon to tell inquisitive foreign ambassadors and their masters abroad what the regime wanted them to hear, since it would be in the Catholics' interests to see that James's present foreign-policy objectives were realized.

[22] AAW, B 25, no. 55.
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] AAW, B 25, no. 57; see also AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 605 (cited in *Letter 8*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dynastic Matches and Religious Politics

In recent years, a self-consciously 'revisionist' account of the early 1620s has claimed that conflict between crown and parliament during this period did not cause the kind of political instability which Whiggish narratives once described and celebrated. And yet, even while we might want to accept substantial parts of the revisionists' analysis, what is clear is that, as Peter Lake points out, in spite of the theoretical extent of the royal prerogative over the Church and foreign policy, 'James I was [. . .] unable even to arrange the marriage of his son' to a Spanish infanta 'without rousing a storm of protest from his subjects'. The expression of traditional anti-popish tropes and opinions (in response to royal policy-making) came to represent 'a real limitation on the crown's autonomy'.[25]

In the years after the Overbury scandal, there was, as Simon Adams has described in some detail, a revival of the 'puritan' political faction at court (grouped around the earl of Pembroke, Sir Ralph Winwood, and the earl of Southampton), just as the Howard family's star appeared to go into steep decline.[26] That faction's victory, however, was a pyrrhic one. There arose 'two mutually antagonistic factions on the council, one committed to rapprochement with Spain and the other to political puritanism, whose struggles for supremacy were to form the underlying framework of politics for the remainder of the reign'. The 'puritan core wished to institute major changes of policy, summon a parliament, and reform the finances', but those who had been temporarily allied with them were satisfied with the earl of Somerset's disgrace after his implication in Sir Thomas Overbury's murder. In addition, the earl of Arundel had gravitated back to the other Howards by 1619, following the fall of the earl of Suffolk.[27]

As Adams also observes, 'the decision to seek a Spanish marriage [. . .] saw the emergence of a new element in the Spanish faction, together with the Howards and the Catholic sympathisers, a party which in part represented' a throwback to the realpolitik of the earl of Salisbury up to 1612. Lord Chancellor Bacon was in the forefront here, supported by Lord Digby (ennobled in November

[25]P. Lake, 'Anti-popery: the structure of a prejudice', in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London, 1989), p. 87. For the different sets of negotiations for dynastic alliances entered into by the Stuart regime during the period up to 1621, see A. Thrush, 'The French marriage and the origins of the 1614 Parliament', in S. Clucas and A. Davies (eds), *The Crisis of 1614 and the Addled Parliament* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 25–35; *idem*, 'The personal rule of James I, 1611–1620', in T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 84–102.

[26]Adams, PC, ch. 7.

[27]*Ibid.*, pp. 247–249.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1618). Their motivation can be ascribed to their hostile attitudes towards the French and the Dutch, and a belief that a Spanish match would be commercially advantageous. At least as far as Bacon was concerned, it would also underpin some of James's more absolutist claims about the nature of monarchical authority.[28] Many of those who supported the Spanish marriage alliance in fact had no investment in Catholicism as such. As Adams remarks, 'the legends of bribery and secret Catholicism connected with the "Spanish faction" have tended to obscure much of the significance of support for an alliance with Spain'.[29] Some of the match's exponents regarded the Catholic issue as a positive obstacle. Even those who did subsequently turn out to have an ideological investment in it, such as the secretary of state, Sir George Calvert (who converted to the Church of Rome in 1625 and was evidently sympathetic to Catholicism long before that), were quite happy to mislead and hinder resident Spanish diplomats when they agitated for concessions to be made to English Catholics. For Adams, 'the attitude taken to the Roman Church by such important members of the Spanish party' as Calvert, and also by Sir Richard Weston and Sir Francis Cottington, in the early 1620s was 'far from clear'. Arguably, such people were primarily influenced by a belief that the Habsburgs represented 'social order and monarchical legitimacy and stability in a world threatened by Dutch and presbyterian republicanism'.[30]

It was natural that the opposition to the proposed Anglo-Spanish treaty would seek to appeal to a wider public when it found itself forced onto the defensive in court and council.[31] One means of gathering support was through parliament. Inevitably, a parliamentary solution to the crown's foreign-policy and financial difficulties would have Hispanophobe characteristics. Divines such as George Abbot assumed that parliament would always function as a bulwark against popery:[32] parliament had traditionally served as a forum for voicing demands that rigour should be used against English papists. It was obvious to all that a visible harshness towards Catholics, so visible that not even the most myopic foreign ambassador could miss it, would serve as a means to hinder a Catholic dynastic marriage for the Stuart heir. James's belief in the free exercise of his prerogative inevitably led him to raise parliamentary hackles in both 1621 and 1624 when he showed

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 250–251.
[29] Adams, FP, p. 140.
[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 140–141.
[31] For an excellent account of how the criticism of the regime's foreign policy was voiced in the pulpits, see J. Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge, 2003), ch. 2.
[32] Lake, 'Anti-popery', p. 91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

himself unwilling to allow the rigorous enforcement of the law against Catholics.

As we shall see, both Spanish and French negotiators used the issue of toleration to test and determine how enthusiastic the Stuart regime was about the proposed treaties, and whether those, including Catholics, who might be regarded as having most interest in the success of the negotiations – and the defence of whatever polity emerged from them – would be given access and influence. Would, for instance, known Catholics be allowed onto the privy council? This would serve as a sure indication of how committed the Stuarts would be to the non-domestic clauses of whatever alliance was concluded, for example the military guarantees made to their new ally, who was, supposedly, making an equal commitment to them (which, in the early 1620s, meant assistance with the resolution of the question of the Palatinate).

Sir Basil Brooke, a prominent Catholic, drew up a position paper on this subject, apparently for the eyes of a Spanish diplomat. He claimed that 'the Spanishe party and the Catholike party [in England] are one and the same thing', so that the advancement of 'Spanish designes dependant on the amity with England will consist principally in advancing the Catholicke party'. It was vital, then, that the oaths of supremacy and allegiance should, for them, be set aside. Brooke added that 'it is not desired (for the present) that offices of importance should be conferred upon Catholikes, but only [that] the disabilities and incapacities of Catholickes to serve in offices be taken away, leaving the disposicion of offices wholly in his Majesties pleasure'. Brooke envisaged the entry of Catholics to parliament as a means of overthrowing the penal legislation. He thought Protestants' 'tender consciences', opposed to the royal supremacy, might be enlisted for this project.[33] William Bishop speculated in early 1623 about which English Catholic noblemen might be admitted to the privy council.[34]

To many observers, both Protestant and Catholic, it seemed certain that, if the negotiations were to proceed successfully, the ideological composition of the regime itself would be fundamentally altered, as would the character of the English Church. Another Catholic advice paper, written when it seemed that the marriage negotiations were about to succeed, anticipated not just that the marriage would be a means to protect Catholics but also that moderate Protestants would support the marriage proposals. The less moderate ones,

[33]BL, Additional MS 21203, fo. 12r; cf. Redworth, *PI*, pp. 41–42. Brooke's commercial interests predisposed him to be hostile to the Dutch, who had complained in early July 1619 about a patent, held by him from the crown, 'for the makeing of steele [. . .] and prohibiting the importacion of forraine steele': *APC, 1619–1621*, pp. 2–3, 77–78.

[34]AAW, B 25, no. 82 (cited in *Letter 7*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

identified as 'puritans', would be astounded and downcast when the marriage worked inevitably to undermine the cause of pan-European Protestantism. The moderates – the ones who appeared to be favourable to, and sometimes even praised, Catholic modes of worship – would, of necessity, be approached by the crown in order to push through the Anglo-Spanish treaty.[35]

This statement of English Catholic opinion argued that 'the nature and disposition of these two nations, English and Spanish, doe tend and incline unto mutual friendship, as it were by a natural propension'; furthermore 'they have seldome or never had enmities for anie cause till the difference of religion did separate them'. Anglo-Spanish amity would spawn a universal peace, or at least peace in northern Europe, for 'it is evident that England only being quiet from warres, France, Germanie and Flanders have much prevailed in restraining rebels and establishing sure peace, which certainely, whiles England was in armes, for more than 40 yeares last past could never be performed'.

One imagines that this is not how some of those old enough to remember the 1580s and 1590s would have seen it. This document claimed, however, that it was only malice, self-interest, and the love of conflict which had led German and Dutch heretics and 'English puritans' to do 'all they can [. . .] to breake of[f] that treatie' and to persuade the prince to marry a Protestant and to risk conflagration in Europe. For

> we have lately seene how fatal and almost deadly to the Christian world hath beene the mariage of the Ladie Elisabeth [. . .] with the prince palatine, and how greate tumults the [. . .] prince palatine and his consorts (all relying upon the authoritie and power of the king of England, by reason of the foresaide mariage) have raysed in Bohemia, Germanie, Hungarie and other neighbour countries.

Within James's own realm, if the Spanish marriage were to fail, the 'puritans' would 'persequute and rage against us English Catholiques much worse than ever before'. A papal endorsement of the match would assuredly prevent this. But the success of the match would greatly increase the Catholic faith in Britain. This was because 'all English men who are not Catholiques are either indeed true heretiques, to witt the puritans, or doe professe them selves to be Protestants, for feare of the severe lawes, being in hart Catholiques'. Or, through 'licentiousnesse', they are of no religion at all. The number of the puritans 'is verie small' while the 'number [. . .] of the second

[35] BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 291r–294r; AAW, B 25, no. 39. This document, which seems to have been drawn up by, or on behalf of, the English Catholic secular clergy, argued that the papacy should grant a dispensation for the proposed Anglo-Spanish marriage; it was sent to Rome for curial perusal there, and appears to have been written in late 1622.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sort' is 'verie great', even if the entirely uncommitted were more numerous still. The marriage would impel those Protestants inclined to moderation 'presently to the Catholique Church, and ecclesiasticall discipline', while many of those inclined to puritanism through ignorance would rapidly be disabused. Indeed, 'by the connivencie' of 'a fewe months and some small suspension of penall lawes' in 1622, 'a great number be alreadie united to the Catholique Church in so much that manie, of whom before there was verie litle or no hope, nowe have reconciled themselves to the Catholique Church, for which the puritans [. . .] alreadie dayly doe complaine'. The process of national conversion would be assisted, furthermore, by the good and transformative effects which the prince of Wales's bride would have on him. Even if he did not convert to Catholicism, the children of the marriage would undoubtedly be 'trained and accustomed to Catholique pietie'. Then, across Europe, the Protestant dominoes would start to fall: 'other neighbour countries which have taken their false doctrine from our infection [. . .] when Catholique religion shall be restored unto us [. . .] will feele the holesome fruict thereof, with great benefit of soules'.

Inevitably, too, the prevailing definitions of appropriate religious demeanour and inclination, as well as of what constituted true loyalty to the Stuart dynasty, would start to change. This would certainly happen when the king moved to silence the puritan slurs on his government, reined in the rapacious officials who enforced the law against Catholics, and took 'into his privie councell more moderate men', ones who were 'better affected to Catholique religion'. James had already punished some puritan preachers and 'by quips and jeasts [. . .] he hath made them contemptible'. Also 'he sendeth abroade preachers who speake modestly of Catholique matters, and such as sometime doe affirme the reall presence of our Saviours bodie in the Blessed Sacrament'. These men taught 'the worship of the holy crosse to be approved by all antiquitie' and they commended 'to the people other points and mysteries of Catholique faith'. Such preachers were the ones whom the king advanced to 'ecclesiasticall dignities'. Recently,

> one of the chiefest of their bishops, famous among them for his learning [Lancelot Andrewes, one assumes] did celebrate their service somewhat like the exteriour forme of a Masse, and imitated the consecration and elevation and other ceremonies of the Masse before all the people, looking and admiring thereat, so that many thought the Masse it self to be brought againe in practise.

If anyone doubted that all this was by the king's command, it was necessary only to observe the termination of the 1621 parliament (an inevitable step 'when he could not remove' the puritans 'from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their purpose') to know that the king positively endorsed these developments.[36]

Of course, this was special pleading. Andrewes is unlikely to have thought that he was celebrating the Roman Mass, while those who objected to the Anglo-Spanish dynastic negotiations were not exclusively puritans. Yet signs of change had been evident during the spring and summer of 1622, when distinctly (on some accounts) moderate Protestant divines, rather than seasoned godly polemicists, were chosen to engage in debate with the noted Jesuit evangelist John Percy (better known by his alias of Fisher) in order to persuade the countess of Buckingham to pledge her allegiance to the Church of England.[37] In addition, Catholics knew what they were doing when they warned against the quasi-republican dangers represented by the Bohemian party in England.[38] The secular clergy advised that 'our northerne sectaries, Germans, Flemmings, French and English puritans doe all endevour by their united forces that the succession of the crowne of England should be derived unto the palatine and his children'. They thought that this could not but encourage James and Charles both to seek alliance with Spain and to allow the Catholics to 'encrease in power and number, upon whose strength the safegarde of themselves and their succession doth relie', and to ensure 'that the strength and power of the puritans [. . .] may be diminished'.[39]

The certainty that some measure of toleration for Catholics would be stipulated by the Spaniards and by the papacy as an essential prerequisite for a Catholic dynastic union for Prince Charles was central to the debates within the Catholic community about reform and particularly those about the alleged need for more ecclesiastical hierarchy within the community in order to regulate both clergy and laity. The agitation for a grant of toleration to James's Catholic subjects was therefore integral to the campaign at Rome to secure an award of episcopal authority to an English priest who would reside and exercise his authority in James's English realm. Indeed, from the time of the appellant controversy at the turn of the century, a number of Catholic clergymen had argued that the papacy should put the English Catholics' house in order by reinstating a hierarchy there.[40] They declared that this would not only increase the true faith but

[36] BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 291r–294r.

[37] See *Letter 14*; and below, p. 30.

[38] For the popularity of Frederick and Elizabeth in English politics, something which 'provided the Spanish faction with one of their more useful propaganda weapons: the claim that the palatines and their English allies were aiming at the succession and even the overthrow of James', see Adams, PC, p. 291.

[39] BL, Harleian MS 1583, fo. 295r; cf. *Letter 22*.

[40] See *NAGB*, introduction and *passim*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also restrain hot and unbridled Catholic spirits of the kind who most offended and provoked the regime and state.

The opponents of a reinstated episcopal jurisdiction – mostly members of the religious orders and their lay sympathizers and patrons – claimed that the time was not right for such a development in a still manifestly heretical country where such jurisdiction could not be properly exercised and where its inevitable failings would weaken the faithful. The appointment of such a prelate, they said, would enrage the authorities against the Catholics and would bring down on the faithful a more grievous persecution than that which they were already suffering.

One typical position paper on the topic, written in the mid-1630s either by a Jesuit or by someone who sympathized with the Society of Jesus, argued that, even if a newly appointed English Catholic bishop should 'imploy himself onely upon ministring the sacrament of confirmation and making chrisme and holy orders and the lyke, we hould it [. . .] to be very unfitte and unsaufe'. For even the bishop's exercise of this spiritual function would be 'commonly very publique, and bothe the bishoppe must have diverse servants and officers about him, and many are assembled to receve that sacrament'. Wherever the bishop resided it would be impossible to maintain adequate security. Of course, many argued that the king was himself tolerant and irenic, 'very mercifull and full of goodnesse'. However, 'many inferiour magistrates and bishoppes and judges are full of their zeale against us'. Furthermore, while Catholics might enjoy a de facto toleration (by means of compounding for their forfeitures), 'yet wee have noe certeynty at all that the same kinde of moderation shall [. . .] last'. For 'the lawes are still in force against us for performing any act of our owne religion'. Trouble could flare up at any time 'as upon some difference with a pursevant or the offending of any Protestant officer'; and 'the offence which is taken nowe maye be punished even to our undoing a dozen or twenty yeares hence'. Even if the king were inclined to interfere in the judicial process, he would often have to refrain 'bicause he cannot doe it [. . .] without publique notice; the which he is carefull to avoyde and so the Catholique is forced to sufferre, though it be even against the kings owne will'.[41]

There were suspicions, too, about exactly how far the new bishop would restrict his activities to the realm of the spiritual. The writer of the same memorandum feared 'howe easy it wilbe for a bishoppe, whoe commeth in limitted and restrayned at the first, to enlarge perhappes his commission, or else to erre in the execution therof, through some passion or other'. Even if the bishop were not at fault,

[41] ARSJ, Anglia MS 36/i, fo. 11r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his grandiloquent exposition of his own ecclesiastical authority would induce 'the great jealousye of the Protestant bishoppes', who would 'persecute both the sayd bishoppe himself and all such others as they shall discover to have relation to him'.[42]

Here the Jesuits publicly paraded their concern for the health and safety of all English Catholics. More privately, and far from inaccurately, some Jesuits said that their enemies wanted to get their hands on this kind of authority in order to exercise an unnatural and damaging dominion over English Catholicism, and primarily over their own enemies in the religious orders and among those orders' lay patrons. It was not, however, a great leap from this observation to a more general (and, to some, definitely offensive) thesis that those who entered the religious orders had a superior spiritual vocation themselves and were less inclined to interfere in politics to the detriment of the wider Catholic community.

By contrast, the leading secular clergy proponents of a restored hierarchy argued that, notwithstanding all the outward appearances of royal and parliamentary hostility to any such thing, an English Catholic bishop (a prelate who would not have 'that compleat authority which other bishopps have and may exercise over all that are in their diocesse' – in other words, a spiritual man, and one without temporal political power and pretensions) would not be offensive to the English state in the way that, as so many assumed, the meddlesome Jesuits were. One of the secular clergy's position papers on the topic, written during Charles's reign, argued that, 'considering [...] his Majesty hath no small number of subjects in his realmes of Great Brittane who professe the Catholick Roman religion', it was necessary for the good of the whole commonwealth for them to have spiritual direction and sacramental ministration. The writer stressed how

> the state useth to distinguish betweene priest and priest, and betweene Catholick and Catholick, houlding some more disinteressed than others, and of a truer zeale towards their king and country. There seemeth to be noe question but that the king and state, upon due consideracion, will judg[e] it much safer and more conducing to their ends that the said Catholicks and priests should bee subject to a spirituall superiour of their owne profession, residing ordinarily within the realme, than permitted to live confusedly without any setled governement or subordination amongst themselves.[43]

[42] *Ibid.*, fo. 11v.

[43] AAW, B 27, no. 105 ('Reasons to induce the court of Rome to beleeve that a Catholick bishop in England will not bee offensive to the king and state'). The writer of this paper argued that 'the king and state doe very well know that episcopall governement is the naturall and ordinary governement of the Catholick Church in all places, and that it belongeth to the integrity of Catholick religion to include discipline noe lesse than doctrine and governement togeather with beliefe'. It had always been a maxim of the English state's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The rhetoric of the Catholic community's proponents of augmented hierarchal authority shared some of the resonances of the style of ecclesiology in the Church of England which historians now seem to call 'avant-garde' conformity. It is worth noting that, throughout this period, a certain section of the English Catholic community tended to recall James's words at the Hampton Court conference (and particularly the phrase 'no bishop, no king').[44] Certain Catholics' accounts of the Jesuits' attempts to prevent Rome's appointment of a Catholic bishop to govern in England were undoubtedly intended to resonate within the context of rumours that puritans still aspired to destroy the religion established by law in the English Church, and particularly that there was a dark lay conspiracy to appropriate the wealth of the Church through the agitation of malign clerical cat's-paws. Even the secular clergy's complaints about the prominence and influence of Catholic laymen (meaning the patrons of the religious orders) mimicked the style and arguments of conformists within the Church of England who sometimes glanced unfavourably at the power of the laity over the Church.

In October 1624, as the seculars were still waiting for Rome to nominate a successor to the recently deceased William Bishop, George Fisher wrote a long exhortatory letter to his friend Thomas More in Rome, in which he warned of the evil effects of the regulars' lay patrons' interference in the election of a new bishop.[45] It had become known that Rome was consulting quite widely on who should replace Bishop; among those contacted were leading lay Catholics, some of whom tended to side with the regulars. Some seculars complained bitterly about the 'motions and conceipts of particular persons, and those lay people too'. They even feared that Bishop's successor might be a member of one of the religious orders, or one of their clerical sympathizers, thus prostituting the newly established episcopal authority to the control of lay patrons of the religious, particularly of the Jesuits.[46]

There was here, however, an opportunity to construct an image of Catholic loyalism which was not phrased in the distasteful and embarrassing terms of the recent debate over the oath of allegiance (a

proceedings against Catholics that they were not punished 'for any point belonging meerely to religion'. So, 'upon this sole consideracion, it might happily be presumed that the king and state will take noe offence to see the Catholicks of England governed according to the ordinary principles of their owne religion, and to live under the same forme of discipline, which is usually observed by all other their Catholick brethren through out the whole world': *ibid.*

[44]See, e.g., Questier, *C&C*, p. 439.

[45]AAW, B 47, no. 156.

[46]AAW, B 26, no. 50 (cited in *Letter 45*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

debate in which the Jesuits had been all too prominent) but, instead, of the arguments about how far an episcopal Catholic system of Church government in England would coincide with and underpin the purposes of the Jacobean state. In the 1620s, and even more in the 1630s, some Catholics argued that a Catholic bishop, tolerated by the state, would commend obedience to monarchical authority and would compel it from Catholics in England as a matter of conscience. He would preserve Catholics in 'peace and good order among themselves' and also 'in perfect obedience to the king and in a generall good temper of mind towards the state'.[47] Bishop Richard Smith's supporters asserted that 'the wisest and most moderate of the Protestant clergy are so farr from being offended or thinking it straunge to see Catholickes governed by a bishop of their owne, as they rather much wonder that the matter hath bin formerly so long neglected'.[48]

Of course, this is not the same as saying, and should not be taken to signify, that those of a conformist cast of mind in the Church of England all positively sympathized with Catholics on religious or political grounds. William Laud was, from time to time, genuinely hostile towards the Church of Rome.[49] Yet this does not mean that we should ignore the convergence, at various points, of the ideological agendas of these lobbies within the two Churches.[50] Contemporaries could easily perceive the common ground in the ecclesiological arguments and rhetoric which were deployed, on the one hand, by avant-garde conformists and, on the other, by certain sorts of Catholics.

As for King James, his attitude towards the papacy was arguably rather inconsistent, though undoubtedly he did not think it was. At times he had claimed to regard the pope as Antichrist: he had done so very publicly during the course of the controversy over the oath of allegiance. But at other times he had declared himself ready to accept the pope as the patriarch of Western Christendom.[51] In February 1621, Gondomar wrote that, in a conversation with James about how far the

[47] AAW, B 27, no. 105; *NCC*, *passim*. It was claimed that King James, perceiving the benefits of having a Catholic hierarchical authority within his English realm, gave 'tacite way to the restoring of this episcopall governement': AAW, B 27, no. 105.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] See, e.g., Russell, *PEP*, p. 164.

[50] See M. Questier, 'Arminianism, Catholicism and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', *HJ*, 49 (2006), pp. 53–78.

[51] As Adams points out, even James's *Premonition* of 1609, defending the 1606 oath, was not entirely straightforward in its identification of the pope as Antichrist. Richard Montagu was able to claim, at the York House conference in 1626, that James's description of the papacy in that publication did not actually mean what godly Protestants generally took it to mean: Adams, FP, p. 148.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

king could move towards détente with Catholicism and the papacy, James had said that he would recognize

> the pope [...] as his universal head and of all Christianity in the spiritual and ecclesiastical, and that there might be appeals to the pope from all of the bishops in his dominions provided that the pope did not mingle in the temporal jurisdiction of his states, especially in the removal and deposition of kings at his pleasure.

He had, he said, called the pope Antichrist in his published tracts on the oath of allegiance only because of the pope's temporal ambitions, and, 'were he not so acting, he would hold the pope as the universal head'.[52] A formal letter from James to Gregory XV, written on 30 September 1622, addressed the pope warmly, stressed the compatibility of their faiths, and urged him to join with James in an attempt to put an end to 'these calamitous discords and bloodsheds which for these late years by-past have so miserably rent the Christian world'.[53]

Even after the Spanish match had failed, James still publicly described the new pope, the recently elected Urban VIII, as a 'marvailous good prelate, wise, myld and judicious'.[54] John Jackson, perhaps the most outspoken monarchist among the secular clergy newsletter writers, added a postscript to a dispatch written by his friend Thomas More that 'owr k[ing] saieth that this pope is more than a scholler, v[i]z a statesman also, for if he were onely a scholler he shold doe well enowgh'.[55] In some senses, then, the Catholic activists in the religious politics of the early 1620s were simply following a royal lead.

The Anglo-Spanish Negotiations and the 1621 Parliament

Negotiations for a Catholic European dynastic match for Prince Charles had continued, on and off, from the middle years of James's

[52] CRS, 68, p. 146.

[53] G.P.V. Akrigg (ed.), *Letters of King James VI & I* (London, 1984), p. 384; W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 313–314. The letter also supplied diplomatic credentials for the Roman Catholic priest George Gage.

[54] *Letter 46*. Of course, in early 1624, the Stuart court (in the course of negotiations with the Bourbon family for an Anglo-French marriage treaty) had every reason to persuade the French that it was not riddled with anti-popery.

[55] AAW, B 26, no. 10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reign.[56] Once Gondomar had indicated, in early March 1617, that the Spanish court had sought its own theologians' approval for a treaty, Digby was dispatched to Spain in order to contract a dynastic marriage alliance.[57] Then, as we have noted, there occurred the revolt against Ferdinand and against Habsburg rule in Bohemia, situated next to the elector palatine's territory of the Upper Palatinate, which meant that James's son-in-law had a considerable interest in intervening in this dispute, and James himself was virtually under an obligation to reaffirm his support for Europe's Protestants.[58] In turn, if the Bohemian question were to be resolved, the Spaniards would have more freedom to renew the pressure on the Dutch, following the end of the Truce of Antwerp.[59] This might make the Dutch more ready to negotiate with James when it came to questions of competition in trade matters.[60] Yet, as Adams argues, James's dilatory response to the crisis, in the form of Viscount Doncaster's embassy to Frederick in May 1619, meant that James, in effect, 'abdicated the leadership' of the European Protestant cause.[61] The political dominance of *dévot* opinion in France at this point meant that no aid would come to the Bohemian cause from the French court, even though some Huguenot leaders offered their assistance to James if he would command a Protestant alliance against the Habsburgs.[62]

During the summer of 1619, however, negotiations were conducted in order to secure some sort of armistice. Initially, the Bohemian rebels had proved remarkably successful against imperial troops, though the defeat near Budweis in early June of the roving military entrepreneur and warlord Count Ernst von Mansfelt temporarily handed the

[56] T. Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', in Cust and Hughes, *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, p. 111, citing S.R. Gardiner, *The History of England, 1603–1642*, 10 vols (London, 1883–1884), II, pp. 216–258, 314–369, III, 37–106; Thrush, 'Personal rule'.

[57] Thrush 'Personal rule', p. 94; TD, V, pp. 115–116; Albion, *CI*, pp. 16f.; McClure, *LJC*, p. 64; Bodleian Library, Tanner MS 74, fos 92r–93r. According to John Chamberlain, Digby departed 'having alredy apparelled all his followers *alla Spagnuola*'. He carried 'with him a troupe of notorious Catholiques, which is not so well digested [*sic*] of divers that heretofore hoped and promised themselves better of him': McClure, *LJC*, p. 82.

[58] Pursell, *WK*, pp. 48–53. When Christoph von Dohna, Frederick V's agent, came on embassy in late 1618, arriving in early 1619, James agreed to the renewal of his treaty with the German Protestant Union. This, as Adams points out, made some believe, wrongly, that 'he would in time come to the assistance of the Bohemians': Pursell, *WK*, p. 54; Adams, PC, p. 278; A. Courtney, 'Court politics and the kingship of James VI & I, c. 1615–c. 1621' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2008), p. 176.

[59] Parker, *The Dutch Revolt*, pp. 263–264; Pursell, *WK*, p. 134.

[60] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 24. Maurice of Nassau had been anticipating a possible Anglo-Dutch alliance, following the end of the Truce of Antwerp in 1621, by trying to put an end to extant colonial disputes: Adams, PC, p. 288.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advantage to the imperialists.[63] Frederick then, in late September 1619, accepted the Bohemian crown, contrary to James's publicly expressed wishes and the advice of some of his own supporters. On 16/26 August, the estates of Bohemia had voted for Frederick to be their king, and he was crowned in Prague on 25 October/4 November.[64] Meanwhile, Ferdinand was himself elected to the imperial throne on 18/28 August, ironically with the vote of Frederick's representative at the election in Frankfurt. (The emperor Matthias had died in March 1619.) This was one reason for Ferdinand's deposition by the Bohemians in the same month: they did not know of his election but were anticipating it.[65] The Spaniards now had a reason for supporting Ferdinand because, by a treaty in 1617, he had agreed that, if Spanish support for his imperial candidacy were forthcoming, he would, with other concessions, cede Alsace to his Spanish cousins. In turn, this would facilitate their forthcoming renewal of hostilities against the Dutch.[66]

Despite the intervention of Bethlen Gábor, who marched on Vienna in October 1619, the Bohemian cause faltered. The army which they had dispatched against the imperial capital was, with the Hungarians and their other allies, compelled to fall back.[67] James's son-in-law was expelled from Bohemia and, gradually and painfully, from his own domain of the Palatinate. Imperial forces conquered Bohemia, while troops from Flanders, at the direction of Ambrogio Spinola, marquis of Los Balbases, took the Lower Palatinate on the Rhine. Troops provided by the Catholic League (set up in 1609 to confront the Union of German Protestants) and raised through the agency of Maximilian I, duke of Bavaria, subsequently acquired the Upper Palatinate. The battle of the White Mountain was fought outside Prague on 29 October/8 November 1620. The actual military confrontation was short, but the rebels were forced from their positions back into the city. Frederick and Elizabeth fled their capital almost immediately, and Prague fell soon thereafter.[68]

[63]Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 26–31; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 49, 56, 58–59, 81.

[64]Pursell, *WK*, p. 85.

[65]Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 5, 6; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 54, 58–59, ch. 3, *passim*.

[66]Schreiber, *FC*, p. 25; *CCE*, p. 126; M.S. Sánchez, 'A house divided: Spain, Austria, and the Bohemian and Hungarian successions', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25 (1994), pp. 887–903; Pursell, *WK*, p. 47.

[67]G. Parker, *Europe in Crisis 1598–1648* (Brighton, 1980), pp. 164–166; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 81, 107, 108.

[68]Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 18–19; Parker, *Europe in Crisis*, pp. 167–169; Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War*, p. 129; B. Pursell, 'War or peace? Jacobean politics and the parliament of 1621', in C. Kyle (ed.), *Parliaments, Politics and Elections, 1604–1648*, Camden Society, 5th series, 17 (Cambridge, 2001), p. 149; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 33, 104, 115, 141; PRO, SP 77/14, fo. 239r. An embassy led by Sir Richard Weston and Sir Edward Conway in July 1620 had tried,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Increasingly, the Anglo-Spanish match became a necessity for James, who could not now hope to influence the situation in central Europe in any other way, particularly as he came under pressure from the elector's supporters to intervene militarily in his favour.[69] The Spaniards were, it appeared, potentially amenable to the restitution of the elector palatine's territories – Roger Lockyer argues that the Spaniards 'recognised that Frederick must either be restored or compensated' – but they could not, on their own, hand back the Lower Palatinate since they did not have exclusive possession of it.[70] At the same time, the apparent incoherence of James's policy allowed others, particularly the Franco-Bohemian faction, to make a bid for influence which they would not otherwise have; and it seemed to give the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, extraordinary sway over the king. Ironically, therefore, the eruption of godly pro-palatine sentiment augmented the power of those whom contemporaries identified as part of a Spanish faction in English politics.[71]

In order to make the Habsburgs negotiate with him, James had to have popular (and ultimately parliamentary) backing for a war. But, in making a pitch in this way to belligerent godly Protestant public opinion, he risked convincing people that he really intended to fight, which was not the case.[72] Predictably, therefore, James faced serious problems when the 1621 parliament assembled, in the wake of the crown's recent inadequate attempt to raise revenue via the device of a loan, the news of Frederick's defeat at the battle of the White Mountain, and, also, Louis XIII's military campaign against the Huguenots (itself a response to the war in Germany which would prevent foreign interference as the French court moved to crush Huguenot resistance).[73]

unsuccessfully, to avert the invasion of the Lower Palatinate: PRO, SP 77/14, fos 163r–164r; Pursell, *WK*, p. 110. Some bastions held out against Spinola in the Lower Palatinate until September 1622: Schreiber, *FC*, p. 49. For the imperial–Spanish treaty in February 1620 concerning the joint conquest of Frederick's territories, see Zaller, *1621*, p. 11. For the Spanish strategic incentives, objectives, and strategy in invading the Lower Palatinate, see Pursell, *WK*, pp. 105–106, 115; Zaller, *1621*, p. 16; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 21, 22; and, for the geography of the Palatinate, see Pursell, *WK*, p. 23; Redworth, *PI*, p. 11.

[69]For the Bohemian faction in English politics, see Adams, PC, pp. 285–288.

[70]R. Lockyer, *Buckingham: the life and political career of George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham 1592–1628* (London, 1981), pp. 125–126; Adams, PC, p. 303; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 18–19. For the strategic considerations raised for the Spaniards by their successful invasion of the Rhineland Palatinate, see J.H. Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares* (London, 1986), p. 205; Pursell, *WK*, p. 106.

[71]Adams, PC, p. 304.

[72]Russell, *PEP*, p. 87; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 107; Adams, PC, p. 304; Courtney, 'Court politics', p. 99.

[73]Zaller, *1621*, pp. 30–31; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 138–139; Adams, PC, pp. 305–307, 312.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The 1621 parliament has been the subject of quite intense modern historiographical controversy. Some scholars have wanted to argue that the Commons had no intention of seizing the initiative in foreign policy from the crown, and were even prepared to follow the crown's lead,[74] whereas the traditional narratives have always stressed that, during the session, a serious ideological and constitutional conflict arose between crown and parliament. There was certainly sufficient expression of Hispanophobe sentiment there, and also of other traditional styles of anti-popish invective, notably during the Edward Floyd case. Some of this invective demanded the rigorous enforcement of the law against Catholic nonconformity: new recusancy legislation was introduced, which passed both Houses in May 1621. The belief in some quarters that the proper prosecution of Catholic nonconformity was being corrupted, deflected, and undermined expressed itself in attacks on the veteran and allegedly crypto-Catholic exchequer official Sir Henry Spiller. At the same time, there was agitation over monopolies and other varieties of corruption.[75] Buckingham, who had conspicuously become alienated from the leading members of the Bohemian party and was threatened by the corruption investigations directed against monopolies, 'faced the opening of the session as an ally of Gondomar'.[76]

For much Protestant public opinion, both in and outside parliament, James's response in the period up to the end of the first sitting of 1621 was hardly encouraging.[77] Those of a Hispanophobe temperament would not have been reassured by the sight of circulating Catholic pamphlets, notably those written by Richard Verstegan in reply to Thomas Scott.[78] The regime certainly attracted adverse criticism as it moved against those (the earl of Southampton, Sir Edwin Sandys,

[74]Russell, *PEP*, p. 87.

[75]Zaller, *1621*, pp. 41, 42, 43, 53–59, and *passim*. For the Floyd case, see Russell, *PEP*, p. 117; Zaller, *1621*, p. 104. For the draft recusancy legislation, see Zaller, *1621*, p. 132; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 54–55; McClure, *LJC*, p. 379. For Spiller, see Questier, 'Sir Henry Spiller', p. 256. Spiller, together with Sir Lewis Lewkenor, had taken command of a force of three hundred men in December 1620 in order to guard Gondomar's residence, following the revelation of an alleged plot to murder him and his entourage: *CSPV, 1619–1621*, pp. 501–502. Spiller's expertise was crucial in the drawing up of the pardons for recusants in the summer of 1623: PRO, SP 14/151/27.

[76]Adams, PC, p. 306.

[77]Zaller, *1621*, pp. 43–44; McClure, *LJC*, p. 345.

[78]See A.F. Allison, 'A group of political tracts, 1621–1623, by Richard Verstegan', *RH*, 18 (1986), pp. 128–142; P. Lake, 'Constitutional consensus and puritan opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish match', *HJ*, 25 (1982), pp. 805–825. Russell argues that the Commons's anti-Spanish emotionalism was formal and traditional rather than strongly ideological: Russell, *PEP*, pp. 119–120. But, for the enthusiastic puritan reception of Scott (as well as other anti-popish writers and preachers), see, e.g., *DSSD*, pp. 125–126, and *passim*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and John Selden) who had opposed it during the first sitting.[79] From within the regime, people such as Thomas Murray and George Hakewill continued to agitate surreptitiously against the marriage proposals.[80]

Digby had gone on embassy to Vienna in May 1621 to try to broker a cease-fire with the emperor. The infanta-archduchess Isabella, established by her father, Philip II, as autonomous ruler with her husband the archduke, Albert (d. July 1621), of the Spanish Low Countries, had already assented to this proposal after Digby had visited Brussels in March to ask for a suspension of arms. This had resulted in a withdrawal of some of the Spanish troops in the Lower Palatinate and a three-month cessation of military activities. But Digby's embassy in Vienna failed, not least because of Frederick's utter intransigence and the provocation offered both by Mansfelt's troops in the Upper Palatinate sallying across the Bohemian border and by Gábor's military operations near Vienna. Digby, though hardly an enthusiast for Frederick's cause, was forced to conclude that a military defence of the Palatinate was required, even though the German Union of Protestants had recently dissolved itself. Digby himself contributed to the successful, though temporary, protection of Frankenthal by Mansfelt's troops.[81] He returned to London in October 1621 and called for the reinforcement of the soldiers, led by Sir Horace Vere, who had been recruited for the Palatinate in early and mid-1620.[82] Digby's account of the Habsburgs' intentions

[79]For the proceedings against Southampton, Sandys, and Selden (which involved Sir Henry Spiller and another crypto-papist, Sir John Weston), and also against the earl of Oxford, see Zaller, *1621*, p. 139; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 122–123, 133; PRO, SP 14/121/136; Adams, PC, p. 315; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 384–385. Emily Rose has made a convincing case that the action taken against Southampton, Sandys, and Selden was motivated by the question of tax revenues generated by the Virginia Company rather than by opposition to the regime's foreign policy, although it seems likely that the two sets of concerns were, in practice, connected: E. Rose, 'Betting on the New World' (forthcoming). I am very grateful to Dr Rose for allowing me to read her work in draft.

[80]PRO, SP 14/122/46, 88; Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS D 853, no. 13 (George Hakewill, 'The Wedding Ring: or, a treatise touching the unlawfulness [. . .] of Protestants marriages with papists, devided into three parts [. . .]'); McClure, *LJC*, pp. 393, 394; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 107.

[81]Adams, PC, pp. 319–320; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 134–135, 136, 140–144, 149–150; *Letter 1*. For the constitutional implications of Archduke Albert's death, see *CGB*, I, pp. xvii, 29, 101.

[82]Adams, PC, pp. 300–302; Redworth, *PI*, p. 25; PRO, SP 77/14, fo. 300r; *CSPV, 1619–1621*, pp. 262, 291–292, and *passim*; Pursell, *WK*, p. 109. For the attempts to raise funds for the elector palatine, see Adams, PC, pp. 296–299. English Catholics contributed financial aid to the imperial cause (though some were more enthusiastic than others) as a counterweight to the funds which were being raised by the Bohemian party: see McClure, *LJC*, p. 326; PRO, SP 15/42/22; *CSPV, 1619–1621*, p. 479; Zaller, *1621*, p. 19; Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also meant that James was forced to recall parliament.[83] However, as Adams comments, there had been a minor 'purge of the Bohemian party' earlier in the year, and the replacements of the dismissed ministers 'were to form the core of the Spanish faction of the 1620s'.[84]

Parliament reassembled in November 1621.[85] James relied on Digby, Calvert, John Williams, and Sir Lionel Cranfield to put the line to the parliament that the forces currently defending the Palatinate should be kept in being, and that nothing should be done to forestall the proposed dynastic treaty with Spain.[86] However, there was a distinct mismatch between the moderate rhetoric of councillors such as Cranfield and Digby – who announced that the Habsburgs seemed merely uncooperative, making it advisable to prepare for military action – and the bloodcurdling calls to arms of speakers such as Sir Robert Phelips, who demanded war against Spain.[87] In the provinces, there were overt displays of anti-popish zeal.[88] The Commons was saturated with demands for effectual punishment of Catholic nonconformity – of a piece with the calls for military endeavour abroad – notably as a result of Sir George Goring's famous intervention in the lower House on 29 November. All of this culminated in the petition of 1 December, read in the Commons on 3 December, the king's vitriolic response, the declaration of 8 December, the royal replies of 11 and 17 December, and, finally, the protestation of 18 December, leading to

[83]Adams, PC, p. 320. Via a seizure of imperial correspondence, it was established that – as was already expected – Ferdinand intended to allocate the Palatinate and the electoral title that went with it to Maximilian I of Bavaria (the title was formally conveyed to him in February 1623) as the price of Maximilian's services. Thus, as Adams says, 'any hope for a negotiated settlement now rested on a successful defence of the Palatinate, and financial support from England was vital if Frederick's army was to survive the winter' (Adams, FP, p. 162). See also Pursell, *WK*, p. 150; M. Lee (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603–1624* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1972), p. 307; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 110, 126; *CSPV, 1619–1621*, p. 115; Pursell, ESP, p. 708; *HMCMK*, pp. 149, 150; *CGB*, I, pp. 51, 90, 274, 281, 295, 300; Redworth, *PI*, p. 71; *Letter 1*.

[84]Adams, PC, p. 322.

[85]See Zaller, *1621*, p. 144. There has recently been a debate about whether James, advised by Buckingham, called the parliament specifically with the intention of sabotaging it. But the consensus seems to be that he proposed to dissolve it only if it proved uncooperative, and did so when, as Alexander Courtney comments, 'the Commons went further' than Sir George Goring suggested in his motion that the House should petition the crown over foreign policy. See B. Pursell, 'James I, Gondomar and the dissolution of the parliament of 1621', *History*, 85 (2000), pp. 428–445; cf. Redworth, *PI*, pp. 28–30; Courtney, 'Court politics', pp. 121–122.

[86]Adams, PC, pp. 323–324; Zaller, *1621*, p. 145; *CGB*, I, pp. 116–117.

[87]Zaller, *1621*, p. 146; Adams, PC, pp. 324–326.

[88]See, e.g., PRO, SP 14/123/115, 116.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the dissolution.[89] The regime again reacted harshly against its critics once the members had dispersed.[90]

This, then, was the immediate political context for the dispatch of the new Roman Catholic secular clergy agent, John Bennett, to Rome. His agency initiated the writing of the series of newsletters reproduced in this volume. He was charged with securing a replacement for the recently deceased archpriest William Harrison, and with ensuring that the man appointed should have episcopal authority.[91] But Bennett had another purpose as well. His pass to travel, dated 12 September 1621, was obtained from the secretary of state, Sir George Calvert. It specifically said that 'this bearer John Bennett, gentleman, is upon spetiall occasion concerning his Majesties service to make his repaire into forraigne partes'.[92] Francisco de Jesús noted the terms of Bennett's licence and observed that, although 'publicly, it was given out that' Bennett 'had come in the name of the English clergy to assist in soliciting the dispensation', this was itself a 'pretext', for Bennett was in fact acting as a personal envoy from James. Once at Rome, Bennett claimed that 'the king was well inclined towards the Mass, which was news which had much influence upon all who heard it'.[93]

By October 1621, Gondomar was corresponding with Bennett from London, and William Bishop was communicating with Diego de Lafuente in Rome. Lafuente had been sent back to Spain by Gondomar to expedite the marriage. He had then, on the Spanish

[89]Zaller, *1621*, pp. 150–151, 152–153, 165, 172; Adams, PC, pp. 326–328; PRO, SP 14/124/27; Redworth, *PI*, p. 34; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 132–133, 134–135; J.P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 29, 43–48; TD, V, p. 119; Adams, FP, pp. 163, 164; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 58; Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI & I*, pp. 377–380; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fos 166r–168v, 170r–172r. Cf. C. Russell, 'The foreign policy debates in the House of Commons in 1621', *HJ*, 20 (1977), pp. 289–309; R. Cust, 'Prince Charles and the second session of the 1621 parliament', *English Historical Review*, 122 (2007), pp. 432–437. For the timing of the proclamation of the dissolution, see Courtney, 'Court politics', pp. 121–124. See also J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), for T. Cogswell's essay ('Phaeton's chariot: the parliament-men and the continental crisis in 1621') and C. Russell's essay ('Sir Thomas Wentworth and anti-Spanish sentiment, 1621–1624').

[90]Cogswell, *BR*, p. 163.

[91]TD, V, p. 83. It was initially suggested that the best candidate was Gondomar's chaplain, Diego de Lafuente, who was involved in the shuttle diplomacy at this time to secure the necessary dispensation from Rome for the proposed Anglo-Spanish dynastic marriage: see *CSPV, 1619–1621*, p. 458; Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 161–162; *Letter 1*; see also *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 403.

[92]AAW, A XVI, no. 63, pp. 221–222; BL, Additional MS 37028, fo. 41v.

[93]Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 168–169; *CGB*, I, pp. 57–58, 87. Sir Henry Wotton remarked, however, that, after Gregory XV had set up the congregation of cardinals for considering the issue of the dispensation for the marriage, 'no Englishman of any fashion (if he be one of their Catholics) can come thither, but they baptize him straight an ambassador': L.P. Smith (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1907), II, p. 222.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

court's orders, travelled to Rome in order to obtain the dispensation.[94] Before Gondomar left London for Spain in mid-1622, with a promise from Prince Charles that, when Gondomar judged fit, he would travel to Madrid to secure the marriage treaty, Gondomar was approached by the patrons of the secular clergy, especially Lady Elizabeth Dormer, to whom the Bennett brothers were chaplains.[95]

Bennett then proceeded to engage with those who opposed the establishment of an English Catholic hierarchy, notably George Gage, as he and they presented their credentials and arguments to the relevant curial committees in Rome.[96] With the backing of cardinals such as Bandini, Bennett managed to persuade the curia to change its mind about the appointment of a bishop for the English nation.[97] In June 1622, it was decided, in principle, that an episcopal appointment should be made for England and Scotland.[98]

The Toleration of 1622 and the Papal Dispensation

For Catholics, any sign that they were likely to obtain toleration was evidence that the king had decided to drive hard for a 'Spanish' solution to his difficulties. Even before the beginning of the second sitting of the 1621 parliament, it looked as if the regime might be moving in this direction. As William Bishop noted on 14 December 1621, 'before the beginning of the parlement the lay Catholikes in prison were sett' at liberty 'on their own bands', and the times were 'very calme'.[99] As early as February of that year, Gondomar had thought that, although the situation in Ireland was bad, there was a kind of toleration – at least an unofficial one – in England: 'each day [. . .] countless persons are being converted and [are] declaring themselves Catholics during the lull in persecution', and the same was true in Scotland. Furthermore, James had done 'many [. . .] generous acts on behalf of the Catholics without permitting any harassment or

[94] TD, V, p. 120; AAW, A XVI, no. 91, pp. 397–398; CRS, 68, p. 144. For the setting up of the papal commission to study the dispensation issue, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 158.

[95] *Letter 4*; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 392, 399–400; Redworth, *PI*, p. 45. Another patron to whom the seculars sued for assistance was the archdeacon of Cambrai, François de Carondelet. He came to England for a time in the service of the ambassador Carlos Coloma. In mid-August 1623, Carondelet sought to be appointed almoner to the infanta, if she should come to England: PRO, SP 14/151/4. He defended Matthew Kellison when Kellison was attacked for his book *The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince*: AAW, A XVII, no. 6, p. 21 (cited in *Letter 27*).

[96] Questier, *C&C*, pp. 394, 397–398; Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 164.

[97] Questier, *C&C*, pp. 397–400.

[98] TD, V, p. 87; and see below, p. 31.

[99] *Letter 1*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

annoyance to any one'.[100] The Flanders nuncio had commented in August that it seemed certain there would be a successful conclusion of the Anglo-Spanish treaty, and 'on constate déjâ, en Angleterre, un commencement de tacite liberté de conscience; la Messe se dit plus librement que de coutume et l'inquisition contre les Catholiques a presque pris fin'.[101] Late in the year, Richard Broughton, a leading secular priest, published his *English Protestants Plea*, provocatively dedicated to parliament;[102] in it, he declared that the parliament was riddled with anti-monarchical puritanism.[103]

The animosity between James and the parliament seemed to augur well for Catholics, though informers against them were still active in January 1622.[104] Royal favour was being shown to leading members of the community such as Lord Vaux: with the earl of Argyll, Vaux was allowed to raise troops for Spanish service in Flanders.[105] The Vaux family became the target of local Protestant hostility in Northamptonshire, not least because Lord Vaux appeared to be

[100] CRS, 68, pp. 144–145.

[101] See *Letters 1, 6*; *CGB*, I, pp. 46, 52, cf. p. 57.

[102] Edward Bennett remarked on its appearance in the third week of December: *Letter 2*.

[103] Richard Broughton, *English Protestants Plea, and Petition, for English Preists and Papists* (Saint-Omer, 1621), p. 4.

[104] *Letter 3*.

[105] *Letters 3, 5, 13*; *APC, 1621–1623*, p. 191. In early February 1622, the Venetian diplomat Girolamo Lando observed that, in order to facilitate the levies of troops for the earl of Argyll, 'orders were issued to the ports of the realm to allow English recusants' as well as others 'to pass without the customary examination and oath'. Lando also said that rumours were being spread that the levies were to be deployed against the Turks: *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 233. For Argyll's recent attempts to recruit a regiment of Scottish soldiers for Habsburg service, see PRO, SP 94/23, fo. 241v. He had returned in April 1620 from a visit to Spain and, William Trumbull recorded, 'he magnifieth and extolleth to the skyes the courteous entertainment and liberallityes of Spaine' and also the 'sollid counsells and resolutions taken there to pursue the warres in Germany': PRO, SP 77/14, fo. 78r. By the end of December 1621, Argyll's regiment was 'augmented to 20 companyes of Englishe and Scottishe, each company of 200 or 150 at the leaste, for the leavying [. . .] whereof into these countryes there is requyred the terme of 4 or 6 monethes': *ibid.*, fo. 577r; cf. PRO, SP 77/15, fo. 32r. In March 1622, Argyll called Trumbull to his house in Brussels and relayed to him news of a conspiracy, reported by Richard Verstegan (who was standing by), in which two assassins (one Burgundian and one Italian) were to be sent from the United Provinces to England 'to laye violent handes' upon the king and prince of Wales, and to kill Gondomar. For the 'particulars' of this conspiracy, Verstegan 'alleaged one Dr [Thomas] Wright as his author, an Englishe preiste' in Antwerp: *ibid.*, fo. 52r–v. In the autumn of 1623, the nuncio del Bagno reported that Argyll had shown him two letters from William Alexander, James's master of requests for Scotland, in which it was claimed that, 'depuis les négociations du mariage Anglo-Espagnol', the king 'désire accommoder Protestantisme et Catholicisme', an assertion which was taken seriously in Rome: *CGB*, I, pp. 349, 359, 369. For Argyll's conversion to Catholicism (which he announced in 1618), see *ODNB*, *sub* 'Campbell, Archibald' (article by John Callow); Thomas Scott, *Vox Populi. Or newes from Spayne* (np, 1620), sig. C2r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recruiting a Catholic army.[106] On 25 January/4 February 1622, Henry Clifford understood that 'a brother of my Lord Vaux was committed to the common gaole in Northampton by two precise justices of peace who presented him the othe of allegeance which he refused to sweare, but he is freed out of prison and, as I am advertised, the justices [are] putt out of commission'.[107]

Actually, the record of these Catholic-cause warriors was rather patchy. Joseph Mead recorded on 27 April 1622 that some of the men enlisted in Lord Vaux's companies had pulled out, 'utterly refusing to serve against the Hollanders, complaining they were cozened, being taken up to serve in the Low Countries, which they conceived to be all under the Hollanders'.[108] Nevertheless, it appeared that the king had allowed Catholic soldiers to set sail (though hardly with his blessing, according to Lando) to help the Habsburgs to crush the cause of European Protestantism.[109]

It was at this point also that Archbishop Marc'Antonio de Dominis, who had arrived in England in late 1616 in a blaze of anti-popish publicity, departed for Rome, evidently with the intention

[106]Many of those enlisting in Vaux's and Argyll's regiments were prominent Catholics: for example, Sir Edward Parham. He was the dedicatee of Richard Verstegan's tract of 1623 entitled *A Toung-Combat, lately happening, between two English Soldiers; in the Tilt-boat of Gravesend. The one go-ing to serve the King of Spayn, the other to serve the States of Holland* (Mechlin, 1623), pp. 3–6; see also Allison, 'A group of political tracts', pp. 139–140. Among the others were Sir William Tresham, Roger Tirwhit, John Timperley, Thomas Bedingfield, Henry Gage, Sir Edward Easton, and Sir Richard Huddlestone. Vaux obtained his licence to embark on 8 April 1622, and warrants for his captains came on 10 April. There were supposed to be 8,000 men in all, divided between Vaux and Argyll: G. Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden* (London, 1953), pp. 431–433; PRO, SP 77/15, fos 92v, 137r, 161r; PRO, SP 77/16, fo. 113r. For those officers who were nominated by Gondomar, see A. Loomie, 'Gondomar's selection of English officers in 1622', *English Historical Review*, 88 (1973), pp. 574–581 (I am grateful to Alexander Courtney for this reference). For the attempt to convert to Catholicism those recruits who were not Catholic, see *CGB*, I, p. 199.

[107]AAW, A XVI, no. 96, p. 410. The Vaux family was one of the victims of John Gee's humour in his *New Shreds of the Old Snare* (London, 1624), pp. 3–6.

[108]Birch, *CTJI*, II, pp. 306–307; see also *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 386. William Trumbull, in early June 1622, reckoned that Argyll's outfit numbered only 1,200 men: PRO, SP 77/15, fo. 177r. In mid-August, having admitted that it had started with 1,400 or 1,500, Trumbull claimed that desertions were rife and that it was now reduced to fewer than 600. From Vaux's regiment, likewise, there were 'at leaste 600 runne away': *ibid.*, fos 237v, 242v, 246v, 282v; PRO, SP 77/16, fo. 13v; see also *Letter 76*.

[109]*APC, 1621–1623*, p. 191; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 307. One of Vaux's first objectives was the besieged town of Bergen-op-Zoom, which the imperial commander Spinola was trying, unsuccessfully, to reduce: Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, pp. 432–433; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, p. 483; *CCE*, pp. 91, 93, 96; see also PRO, SP 77/15, fos 200r, 231r, 282r, cf. fo. 238r. Sir Dudley Carleton commented bitterly, at the end of August 1622, on the presence of both Vaux's and Argyll's levies 'in the ennemyes camp before Berghen': BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 245v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of influencing Rome's opinions about the grant of the dispensation.[110] The Spaniards had allegedly had a hand in his new-found enthusiasm for the papacy. In mid-February 1622, John Chamberlain understood that de Dominis had permission to go to Rome, and now 'pretends auncient acquaintance and familiaritie with this pope, and that the kinges of Spaine and Fraunce have undertaken for his securitie'. Gondomar was 'saide to be the cheife architect in this busines' and the wily Spaniard had 'inchaunted' the archbishop 'into this fooles paradise'.[111] The new pontiff, Gregory XV, was supposedly more moderate than his predecessor. De Dominis had said, when he was summoned to appear at Lambeth before George Abbot and others on 30 March, that 'now there is a goode pope whose eares are open to heare and redresse what is amisse'. The archbishop's return seemed to indicate that good relations between the Court of St James and the Holy See were going to be firmly established, even though, after the accession of Maffeo Barberini as Urban VIII in August 1623, de Dominis was treated with much less sympathy in Rome.[112]

Most contemporary accounts, both Catholic and Protestant, of de Dominis's motives were extremely disdainful. John Hacket summarized them when he described him as both exceptionally greedy and also theologically confused.[113] But de Dominis claimed that there was a significant body of Protestant opinion in England which favoured reunion with Rome. He had had discussions with, among others, Richard Montagu about the points which their Churches held in common.[114] There was evidently a connection between the kind of reports which the secular clergy were sending to Rome about the rise of 'moderate' opinions within the Church of England and de Dominis's own account of the possibility of healing confessional divisions there

[110] PRO, SP 14/128/97, 103; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 263, 493, 494; *CGB*, I, p. 148; R. Ferrini and E. de Mas (eds), *Lettere a William Cavendish (1615–1628)* (Rome, 1987), pp. 146, 218, and *passim*.

[111] McClure, *LJC*, pp. 423–424; N. Malcolm, *De Dominis* (London, 1984), ch. 12; Ferrini and de Mas, *Lettere a William Cavendish*, p. 175. The nuncio in Flanders understood, in January 1622, that Philip IV had recently dispatched a substantial financial gift to de Dominis: *CGB*, I, p. 148. For the earl of Kellie's scepticism about Rome's intentions towards the archbishop, see *HMCMK*, p. 144.

[112] McClure, *LJC*, p. 431; *DSSD*, p. 64; Richard Neile, *M. Ant. De Dominis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his Shiftings in Religion* (2nd edition, London, 1624), pp. 79f.; Ferrini and de Mas, *Lettere a William Cavendish*, pp. 282–283.

[113] Hacket, *SR*, part I, sig. O2r–4r.

[114] A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: the Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 347, 352, 353, 359–360; Ferrini and de Mas, *Lettere a William Cavendish*, p. 176.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

('wind-mills of union to concord Rome and England, England and Rome', as Hacket put it).[115]

By the middle of 1622, when the Jesuit John Percy was invited to debate theological matters at court in the presence of, and actually with, the king (though Percy's efforts attracted the derision of several Catholic secular clergymen),[116] it was also known that some kind of official toleration was imminent.[117] John Colleton, who already enjoyed a form of unofficial liberty, had secured a formal warrant on 31 March to allow him to reside with Gondomar.[118] A lobbying campaign for the liberation (without, in the case of the priests, the obligation of exile) of Catholics in prison had been running since late 1621. Anthony Champney passed the news to John Bennett in a letter of 30 May/9 June 1622 that 'the warrant for the deliverie of the lay prisoners was under the broad seale some dayes before' Champney's informant had

[115]Hacket, *SR*, part I, sig. O3v.

[116]See *Letters 5*, *14*, *54*.

[117]The three days of debate (24–26 May) were occasioned by the rumours concerning the countess of Buckingham's decision to convert to Rome. See John Percy, *True Relations of Sundry Conferences had betweene Certaine Protestant Doctours and a Iesuite called M. Fisher* (np, 1626). The audience on the first day included Buckingham, his mother the countess, Buckingham's wife (Katherine Manners), and, it seems, the king. It was significant that it was William Laud, Francis White, and John Williams who were chosen to argue with the Jesuit, and not, for example, one of the equally theologically qualified clients of Archbishop Abbot, such as Daniel Featley. See T.H. Wadkins, 'The Percy–"Fisher" controversies and the ecclesiastical politics of Jacobean anti-Catholicism, 1622–1625', *Church History*, 57 (1988), pp. 153–169; Francis White, *A Replie to Iesuit Fishers Answere to Certain Questions propounded by his most gratious Ma[jes]tie* (London, 1624); Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 171–173. Williams was a confidant of the countess and a client of Buckingham, through whose influence he had aimed at and acquired high office: Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 137–138; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 88. For Francis White's Arminian tendencies, see Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 174–180, 222–223, although White was well regarded by, for example, the puritan Simonds D'Ewes: *DSSD*, *passim*.

On 25 May, James was the principal disputant against Percy. According to the count of Tillières, James took Francis White's place after White had failed to convince the countess: PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 47v. This day's conference did not find its way into print: ARCR, II, no. 603; T.H. Wadkins, 'King James I meets John Percy, S.J. (25 May, 1622.): an unpublished manuscript from the religious controversies surrounding the countess of Buckingham's conversion', *RH*, 19 (1988), pp. 146–154. On 26 May, the main Protestant disputant was William Laud and the topic for discussion was the compatibility of the Roman and English Churches: Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 342–344; William Laud, *An Answere to Mr Fishers Relation of a Third Conference betwene a Certaine B. (as He Stiles Him) and Himselfe* (London, 1624). For James's subsequent admonition to Percy not to put anything in print, see *Cabala*, p. 75; ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 166r. Buckingham himself had shown interest in the arguments which Jesuit debaters, such as Percy, were using at this time in order to make converts: see Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS D 853, fo. 172r (Richard Corbet to the marquis of Buckingham [date uncertain]). In mid-October 1622, Williams sent Buckingham 'a copie of the conference' which Williams had 'procured' from Percy 'without his privity, onely to make his Majestie and your lordship merrie': *Cabala*, p. 75.

[118]PRO, SP 14/128/100; cf. *APC, 1621–1623*, p. 184.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

left London 'and, as he sayd, was presently to be put in execution'.[119] On 8 June 1622, Joseph Mead remarked that 'all the Jesuits and priests, which were in prison at London and elsewhere, were this week set at liberty'. It was said that 'their number was 400', although 'they were under bail to be forthcoming when they should be called for'.[120] In Madrid, five weeks later, Sir Walter Aston recorded that, while the elector palatine's and Mansfelt's recent activities had caused no little irritation in the Spanish court, it had nevertheless 'been extreamly well taken heere by this king' that James had 'been pleased to conferr' his 'grace' on 'divers Romish Catholicks that weare prisoners in England'. They were now known to be 'at liberty upon the instance of the conde of Gondomar'.[121]

The negotiations by the secular clergy's agent for a grant of episcopal authority proceeded in Rome exactly in tandem with the haggling over the dispensation and the prospect in England of a royal grant of toleration to Catholics. Almost inevitably, the conflict between the secular clergy and their opponents within the religious orders soon included accusations by each side that the other's lobbying at Rome threatened to impede both the dispensation and toleration and must logically mean that ill-intentioned Catholics were actually trying to hinder the progress of the marriage and the treaty. On 8/18 May, Bennett wrote that 'our [Catholic] opposites' were still spending their time 'in spreading tales' in order to disrupt both the episcopal suit and the dispensation necessary for the success of the match.[122]

A week later, Bennett announced (rather too optimistically as it turned out) that the dispensation 'is indeed agreed upon, and here will be no difficulty made, if there be no let elsewhere'.[123] At the end of July 1622, Bennett recorded that 'about the midst of June, I had a decree [. . .] for a bishop' and, 'if I would have been importunate, I could have got more, as I verily think'. At last the nomination of the man who would be invested with episcopal authority was 'in deliberation'.[124] The different factions within the community were now directly in competition with each other in order to show that they, rather than their opponents, had pursued the path which most closely tallied with

[119] *Letter 5*.
[120] Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 313.
[121] PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 147r; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 172–180.
[122] TD, V, p. ccxxxv.
[123] *Ibid.*, p. ccxxxvii. For the letter of 13 June 1622, from the secular clergy via John Bennett to the curial committee of cardinals considering the dispensation, urging how beneficial the grant of the proposed dispensation would be to English Catholics, see BL, Additional MS 37028, fo. 41r.
[124] TD, V, p. ccxlv.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the king's wishes and would guarantee royal tolerance for the Catholic community.[125]

As Thomas Cogswell puts it, so determined was James to secure the Anglo-Spanish treaty that acceptance of it became 'the litmus test of loyalty, a test which many, notwithstanding their own best efforts, failed'. Among those who passed the test with flying colours were Catholics. Some kind of toleration was the logical political reward for them. James reversed a whole generation's expectations and assumptions by ordering the lord keeper, John Williams, to suspend, by formal letters, the branches of the statutes which defined and punished Catholic recusancy and also, in certain cases, the section of the 1606 act which had promulgated the Jacobean oath of allegiance.[126]

James's letter to Williams, authorizing the order to the judges, explained the grounds of this grant. James regarded it as fit that, in the light of the marriage, his Catholic subjects 'should be treated and used with all clemencie and mildnes'. James said that

> because wee will give example to other princes to extend the like grace and favour to such of theire subjectes as are of the religion which wee ourselfe professe, wee have resolved to mitigate the severitie of those lawes which doe inflict on them anie penalties in respect of theire religion.

He hoped that these Catholics would be encouraged to show themselves loyal 'towardes us and our milde and mercifull governement'. James intended 'to grant pardons and dispensacions to such of our subjectes and Romishe Catholiques as, within the space or terme of five yeares next ensueinge the date hereof, shall desire the same, according to the tenor and forme of a pardon and dispensacion heereunder written'.[127] Catholics such as Arthur Pitts argued that James's wise, principled, and irenic statesmanship 'should move his Holinesse to hasten the consecration of the bishop with authority to drawe all us that be abrode to retourn to their country'.[128] Indeed, Catholics would do all that they could to play up the king's action as genuinely irenic rather than purely a matter of practical politics. On 30 September/10 October, John Bennett wrote from Rome to his brother Edward that 'my lord keeper his letter I putt in Latin, and gave it to these greate men, which they were well pleased with. Our

[125] *Letter 7*.

[126] Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', p. 118; *Letter 7*. For the king's efforts to extend the toleration to Scotland and Ireland, see PRO, SP 14/150/113.

[127] AAW, OB I/i, no. 79, fo. 150r–v; Dodd, *CH*, II, p. 439. Williams's toleration letter was publicized by the British embassy at Brussels, as the nuncio there reported on 10/20 August 1622: *CGB*, I, pp. 238–239.

[128] AAW, A XVI, no. 145, p. 563.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adversaryes would fayne have made the matter doubtefull, for they would not that this court should conceave well of his Majesty.'[129]

Many Protestants were, unsurprisingly, very suspicious of James's actions and motivation. Williams felt compelled, on 17 September 1622, to assure John Murray, first Viscount Annan (who had informed Williams the day before of the 'offence taken by many people' in England and Scotland at Williams's letter) that the tolerance offered was only temporary. Catholics would be rearrested if they tried to take political advantage of the king's clemency. Toleration of papists did not mean toleration of popery. It was hardly a toleration at all: 'a toleration lookes forward to the tyme to come', but 'this favor' looks 'backward to the offences past'. Thus, 'if any papist now set at liberty shall offend the laws again, the justices may, nay must, recommitt him and leave favour and mercy to the king, to whom they properly belong'. If people were to read the writs to the judges they would find that the 'papists are not otherwise out of prison than with their shackles about their heels' and 'sufficient sureties and good recognizaunces to present themselves again at the next assizes'. If the 'lay papists do wax insolent with this mercy, insulting upon the Protestants, and translating this favour from the person to the cause', Williams was sure that the king would return them to their 'former state and condition, and renew his writ no more'. Lastly, Williams believed that his own letter to the judges had been misconstrued. It 'recited four kinds of recusants only' who were

> capable of his Majesties clemency, not so much to include these as to exclude many other crimes [. . .] as using the function of a Romish priest, seducing the king's liege people from the religion established, scandalizing and aspersing our king, Church, state, or present government, all which offences (being outward practises, and no secret motions of the conscience) are adjudged by the laws of England to be meerly civil and political

and therefore excluded from the scope of those writs. The king was and always would be a true Protestant.[130] Significantly, the letter from Williams to Annan, which was intended for circulation, was obtained by Catholics and appeared in print.[131]

[129] AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 605. (For the Latin version of Williams's letter retained in AAW, see AAW, A XVI, no. 128, pp. 511–514.)

[130] Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 92–93; TD, V, pp. ccxcvi–ccxcix; PRO, SP 14/133/20; BL, Additional MS 22591, fos 222r–223r; cf. *CSPD, Addenda 1580–1625*, p. 646.

[131] ARCR, II, no. 920; *A Letter Writt[en to] the L. Viscunt Anan, Decl[aring the] Nature and Reason of the late [Clemency] extended to the Lay-Recus[ants in] England* (np [printed secretly in England], 1622); BL, Additional MS 34727, fo. 43r (for which reference I am very grateful to Alexander Courtney). See also Shami, *John Donne*, p. 106.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Directions on preaching were also issued in August 1622.[132] The king's letter to Archbishop Abbot that ordered the enforcement of the directions was dated 4 August, only two days after Williams's toleration directive was sent out. Inevitably, the toleration inflected public understanding of the directions.[133] On 15 September, John Donne preached a sermon at Paul's Cross which explained and justified the directions and also the king's command that there should be an end to many of the punitive restrictions in force against Catholics.[134] Catholics could soon observe the prohibition of anti-Catholic preaching starting to bite.[135] On 12 October 1622, Thomas Locke reported to Sir Dudley Carleton that the Catholics in Ireland were also hoping for a toleration.[136]

The correspondence of the secular clergy, and in particular a long account by one John Hazell, an agent and go-between for those interested in acquiring the proffered immunity, set out in detail how tortuous a process this was.[137] William Bishop, however, had, on 22 August/1 September 1622, dashed off a missive to Bennett in Rome with a copy of the lord keeper's letter. Optimistically, he commented 'now doth our king begin to do some thing for the Catholikes'. Inevitably, thought Bishop, 'the next point wilbe a releasement of the penalties of the lawes against recusants' – in other words, an overturning of recusants' convictions; and Bennett immediately translated it to show to the relevant cardinals.[138]

Of course, the regime had no desire to implement a full legal toleration, although Buckingham insisted to Gondomar, in the context of an appeal for the Habsburg troops in the Palatinate to be called off, that 'priests and recusants' were 'all at liberty', and 'all the Roman Catholics [were] well satisfied and, which will seem a wonder unto

[132]The directions were issued in response to Hispanophobe sermons preached at Paul's Cross in the wake of the collapse of the defence of the Palatinate: Adams, PC, p. 331; Shami, *John Donne*, ch. 4; *Letter 11*; K.C. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor* (Oxford, 1990), p. 245. As Fincham notes, 'sermons were to be based squarely on the Articles of Religion and the Homilies, and preachers were to avoid contentious topics, especially the power and exercise of temporal authority, and the technicalities of predestinarian theology': *ibid*. See also Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 32–33; *idem*, 'England and the Spanish match', pp. 118–119.

[133]Shami, *John Donne*, p. 106.

[134]Chamberlain sarcastically observed that Donne's sermon was supposed to reassure his audience of the king's 'constancie in the true reformed religion, which the people (as shold seeme) began to suspect'. For the court's strategy in appointing Donne to preach on this occasion, see Shami, *John Donne*, pp. 12, 102–138 (esp. pp. 107–108, 111f.); Adams, PC, pp. 331–332.

[135]*Letter 22*. Cf. Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', p. 119.

[136]PRO, SP 14/133/49. See also G. Redworth, 'Beyond faith and fatherland: "The appeal of the Catholics of Ireland", c.1623', *Archivum Hibernicum*, 52 (1998), pp. 3–23.

[137]*Letter 6*.

[138]AAW, A XVI, no. 136, p. 541; TD, V, p. cclii; *Letter 7*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

you, our prisons are emptied of priests and recusants and filled with jealous ministers for preaching against the match'.[139]

Bishop Williams had been extremely unwilling to grant immunity to recusants in as full a form as was eventually, under pressure, conceded to them. As we have seen, he had a great deal of difficulty justifying it to Protestant sceptics such as Viscount Annan. As a result, stories and rumours circulated among Catholics which claimed that 'persecution' had not ceased. This allowed the Jesuits to argue that an episcopal appointment, as proposed by the secular clergy's leadership, would be unwise at this time. Such opinions were vigorously refuted by some secular clergy, who declared that instances of persecution were becoming the exception rather than the rule (though there was no objective test to measure at what precise point signs of tolerance constituted a real and irrevocable toleration, nor whether accounts of sporadic localized anti-popery showed that persecution persisted).[140] This situation was exploited by the secular clergy leadership. They used it to persuade the Stuart regime not to hinder their attempts to secure the grant of episcopal jurisdiction to one of their number (because such hindrance could be interpreted at Rome as persecutory) and also to refute and discredit the Jesuits' assertions and the regime's own worries – voiced at Rome through the agency of the Spanish ambassador in England, Carlos Coloma – that the secular priests' ambitions were a direct threat to royal authority over the English Church.[141]

[139] Redworth, *PI*, p. 42; *Cabala*, p. 233. Buckingham's letter to Gondomar is undated but the reference to Protestant preachers evidently locates it after the issuing of the directions on preaching, although (as noted above) the release of Catholic clergy from London prisons had begun earlier in the year.

[140] See, e.g., *Letter 15*.

[141] See *Letter 8*. John Hacket noted that Catholic agitators had 'put a paper into my lord of Buckingham's hands' to 'assist them for the erection of titulary popish praelates in this kingdom': Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 94. Hacket claimed that the agitators 'did not hope to obtain' their request. But even the approach 'would make the council table odious' and 'contribute much to embitter the subjects and to raise divisions'. According to Hacket, Buckingham consulted Williams. Williams (echoing almost exactly the arguments put forward by some members of the religious orders against the institution of English Catholic bishops) 'damned the project' because it would 'set all the kingdom on fire and make his Majesty unable to continue those favours and connivencies to peaceable recusants'. It would also deprive the crown of the exclusive right to invest bishops; and 'it is a far greater mischief in a state (I mean in regard of the temporal, but not of the spiritual good thereof) than an absolute toleration', because, as a result of the institution of a Catholic episcopate, 'this invisible consistory shall be confusedly diffused over all the kingdom'. Inevitably, many of the king's subjects would, 'to the intolerable exhausting of the wealth of the realm, pay double tithes, double offerings and double fees'. (Ireland and its widespread poverty, he said, were a demonstration of precisely this.) Williams also argued that, 'if the princes match should go on, this new erected consistory will put the ensuing parliament into such a jealousie

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A number of people, however, were willing to heed the admonitions which came from the Society and its patrons: Sir George Calvert and Sir Francis Cottington were clearly sympathetic to their warnings.[142] As part of this campaign against the secular clergy's programme, someone had also denounced Matthew Kellison's *The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince*. This book, first published in 1617, was a reply to the regime's apologist Thomas Preston's *Theologicall Disputation* of 1613. Kellison's tract vigorously endorsed the doctrine of the indirect power of the papacy to depose temporal rulers.[143] In November 1622, the secular priest Joseph Haynes had to approach Lord Keeper Williams in order to put the seculars' case on these matters to him directly.[144]

Full toleration (in other words, suspension of the penal law in its entirety) was, of course, not implemented. What the regime was prepared to concede was something akin to what the more moderate members of the English Catholic community had been demanding in 1603 – in other words, a relaxation of the law by direct grant from the crown. Nevertheless, the constraints on the crown's freedom of manoeuvre had allowed an admittedly rather divided and fractious Catholic coalition to extract a visible form of toleration from the king. No wonder, then, that certain preachers, notably Richard Sheldon, were so bold as to express their horror at such developments. Sheldon, a royal chaplain (and former seminary priest), had publicly renounced Rome in 1612. He had also published justifications of the 1606 oath of allegiance and had thus become a living symbol of what many Protestants would have regarded as an appropriate fusion of godly Protestant conversion and support both for the royal supremacy and for James's own reading of his sovereignty against the claims of the papalists. On 1 September 1622, however, Sheldon preached

and suspition, that it is to be feared that they will shew themselves very untractable upon all propositions'. James ordered Williams to inform Coloma of the proposed hierarchy. This resulted in the diplomat's warning delivered at Rome against the project to appoint a bishop: *ibid.*; see also *Letter 24*. Sir George Calvert, at the king's direction, had instructed Lord Digby in Madrid, via a letter of 16 August 1622, to try to prevent the dispatch into James's dominions of 'titularie English bishops': BL, Additional MS 48166, fo. 155r.

[142] See *Letters 20*, *25*.

[143] See *Letters 25*, *27*; Matthew Kellison, *The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince. Or, a treatise of ecclesiasticall, and regall authoritie* (Douai, 1617). A second edition (of 1621) incorporated material which replied to Preston's attack on the first edition, Thomas Preston, *A New-Yeares Gift for English Catholikes* (London, 1620); see ARCR, II, nos 470, 471, 657. Kellison had originally written the book in 1614, and its printing had been delayed by the refusal of the bishop of Saint-Omer's approbation: P. Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age* (London, 1978), pp. 105–106; ARCR, II, no. 470. See also J.P. Sommerville, 'From Suarez to Filmer: a reappraisal', *HJ*, 25 (1982), pp. 525–540; Allison, RS, pp. 154–155, 176–177.

[144] TD, V, p. ccliv; Questier, *C&C*, p. 400; *Letter 24*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an inflammatory sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he lambasted those who compromised with Rome. Sheldon's sermon brought him immediate disgrace, though he had tried to cover himself – and to justify his assault on Rome and the papacy – by citing James's own defence of the oath of allegiance in his *Premonition* of 1609.[145]

The Prince's Journey to Spain

George Gage had left Rome on 18/28 July 1622 carrying the text of the dispensation issued by the Roman curia. It had been made more stringent than James expected, so Gage was subsequently dispatched back to Rome via Madrid.[146] In late August, Lord Digby, who had arrived at the court in Madrid in early June, expressed concern at what was going on: 'I have here lett them knowe that I conceave this hath not beene the right way, for that, by the articles, the dispensation is to bee procured merely by the industry of the king of Spayne'. James, by contrast, should not become embroiled in argument with the papacy: 'whatsoever the pope should have pretended, he should have made the king of Spaine the meanes of it'.[147]

In November, Gage came through Paris. He informed his secular clergy critics there, in no uncertain terms, that his manner of dealing was the one which would produce results. James was determined to force the marriage through and would do Catholics 'all the favour that can be reasonably demanded of him'. But, if the project failed, 'he must needes deale by way of parlement', in other words, sue to the 'puritans'. The Catholics would suffer grievously in consequence. So, if the Catholics had any common sense, they 'must labour that the match be not hindered', by which Gage clearly made an oblique reference to the seculars' project to obtain episcopal authority for one of their number.[148]

In Madrid, Digby argued that there was a potential and radical disjuncture between the aims of the Spaniards, on the one hand, and the pope and English Catholics, on the other. The Spanish court's

[145] M. Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534–1642* (Toronto, 1958), p. 244; Shami, *John Donne*, pp. 108–109; Richard Sheldon, *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1625).

[146] *Letters 7, 12*; TD, V, p. 124; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 452, 458, 460–461; Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 176–184; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 412, 485, 490; *HMCMK*, p. 139; PRO, SP 94/25, fos 166v, 199v.

[147] PRO, SP 94/25, fos 199v–200r; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 350. At this stage, Digby could not ascertain what the terms of the dispensation were, since Gage, 'at his going from Rome, either omitted to write unto me or else his letters have miscarried': PRO, SP 94/35, fo. 200v; see also BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 122v.

[148] *Letter 22*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

purpose was to 'mainetaine [. . .] peace' and to secure advantages for 'both theise estates'. The clauses of the treaty governing religion were purely to secure Spanish honour in a mixed dynastic union. But, 'for the pope, it is without question that as a temporall prince he desireth not so strict a conjunction betwixt' the 'two crownes' but 'approveth of the match only for the good and advantage which he thinks may therby bee procured to the Catholique cause'. This, Digby believed, was the aim of English Catholics as well. He advised the Spanish negotiators to bring pressure on the pope, if need be, to make the terms of the dispensation more accommodating (though, in the event, during the following year the Spanish court persuaded the papacy to make the wording of the dispensation more severe).[149] Digby was livid when, by mid-September, he learned of 'theise unexpected and indeede impossible demands of the pope'. He claimed that the Spaniards were highly offended that Gage had gone straight to England without returning first to Madrid. On 3/13 October, the count-duke of Olivares made Digby believe that Philip IV would 'induce the pope to content himself with those conditions which shall bee esteemed fitting and reasonable'.[150] The earl of Kellie thought that Philip IV was as irate as James at the way in which the dispensation had been presented in London.[151]

At this point, however, it appeared – at least outwardly – that the marriage still had some chance of succeeding. Even the recent taking of Heidelberg in September 1622 by imperial forces (where a number of English troops, led by Sir Gerard Herbert, had been cut down)[152] had stalled the Anglo-Spanish negotiations only briefly.[153] Digby was told in October that the Spanish court had positively disapproved of the siege but could not prevent it, despite all the negotiations during the summer at Brussels, in which Sir Richard Weston had tried to secure an armistice. Digby credited his Spanish hosts with 'integrity and uprightnes' when letters were, though with little prospect of any success, sent off from Madrid to the archduchess Isabella for dispatch to the Habsburg commanders in the Palatinate, telling them to halt the advance of their troops there. (The count of Tilly replied that he would not obey any such order without a direct command from the emperor; and Isabella herself thought it impossible that the Spanish

[149] PRO, SP 94/25, fos 201r–202r; and see below, p. 49.
[150] PRO, SP 94/25, fos 214r, 216r, 223r–v, 242r; see also *Letter 13*.
[151] *HMCMK*, pp. 139–140.
[152] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 20; Pursell, *WK*, p. 184; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 467, 469–470; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 312–313; PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 244r; *CGB*, I, p. 79; *Letter 13*.
[153] *Letters 15*, *17*, *18*, *22*. For the subsequent loss of Mannheim and Frankenthal, see *Letter 15*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

king should want to commit himself 'contre la Ligue Catholique et les Catholiques d'Allemagne, du côté des Protestants'.)[154]

Draft articles for the marriage were, despite heated arguments between Lord Digby (now the earl of Bristol) and the junta appointed to oversee the negotiations, drawn up in November/December 1622 and sent from Madrid to London.[155] Gage appeared briefly in Madrid on his way to Rome and, much to Bristol's satisfaction, posed as an out-and-out loyalist. He 'behaved himself very discreetlie here [. . .] and hath freelie told' the Spaniards 'that all good and discreete Catholikes' in England 'do so much relie uppon the goodnesse and sinceritie of the king['s] and princes promises that they desire no further securitie than their words' alone.[156]

In England, by early 1623, the leading opponents of the marriage, notably Archbishop Abbot, were being publicly and embarrassingly thwarted at every turn. Even Abbot's attempt to dismiss Catholic musicians from Prince Charles's service had failed.[157] Routine searches of the London prisons, designed to disrupt the activities of the Catholic clergy who remained incarcerated there, were thwarted by royal command.[158]

For some time, in fact, there had been an alternative (though unworkable) set of proposals to resolve the question of the Palatinate. According to this scheme, the elector's son and heir would be brought up at the imperial court and would contract a marriage with the emperor's younger daughter, while Charles himself would marry the emperor's elder daughter, Maria Anna. (For Olivares, says Glyn

[154]PRO, SP 94/25, fos 264v–265r, 266r, 360r; PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fos 148v–149r; Adams, PC, p. 330; Pursell, *WK*, p. 184; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 24–28; *CCE*, pp. 105–106, 111, 112.

[155]Redworth, *PI*, p. 177; Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 332; PRO, SP 94/25, fos 312r–315v.

[156]PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 325r. See also Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 130.

[157]William Harewell reported in February 1623 that 'the prince of Wales his musitions <did hether to> sing a solemne Masse at the Sp[anish] embassadours on Christmas day, for the which, being complained of by the bishop of Canturburie and some other sticklers like himselfe, they were dismissed the princes service'; but Charles, said Harewell, when informed of the ambassador's reaction, 'entertained them againe, restoring them to their former place': AAW, A XVII, no. 6, p. 22. The Venetian ambassador, Alvise Valaresso, said four musicians had been sacked (while Jean Beaulieu and Sir George Calvert put the number at two, and Calvert said that one was English and the other was an Italian). They had then been reinstated. Although the 'prince seemed very determined upon their exclusion [. . .] the king interposed his authority': *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 555, 558; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 7v; CRS, 68, p. 185. The musicians had assisted 'with there voyces and musicke' at the Midnight Mass for Christmas: CRS, 68, p. 185; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 164r–v. Coloma requested, though unsuccessfully, that they should offer their services again at Easter: PRO, SP 14/139/111; PRO, SP 14/140/20; see also *NCC*, p. 68.

[158]*Letters 27*, *29*; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 573, 578.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Redworth, this would have served to resolve the difficulties posed at the Spanish court by the draft Anglo-Spanish treaty.)[159]

It was now that Charles and Buckingham undertook their journey to Madrid. The hardly impartial French ambassador, the count of Tillières, thought that the whole country heard the news 'avec admiration, crainte et désespoir [...] non seulement le simple peuple, mais les plus grands, non seulement les puritains et les Protestans mais aussy les Catholiques'. It does seem to have caused consternation among some of the Spanish diplomatic service and the Hispanophile members of the English privy council, and indeed it was hardly welcome to the earl of Bristol.[160] Hispanophobe European sentiment condemned the journey as utter folly.[161] Sir Edward Conway commented, in a letter of 29 March which followed Buckingham to Spain, that 'a thousand conjurers could not have raised soe many severall spiritts as that journey of yours did; all the affeccions and passions of mankinde' were 'commenting upon it', though many critical voices were silenced 'when you had safely passed France' and even more 'upon the knowledg[e] of your good reception at the court of Spaine'.[162]

Many historians have concluded that the journey to Spain was idiotic. But some contemporaries, including English Catholics, saw it differently. William Harewell interpreted what has since become the stuff of ridiculous romance as 'one of the greatest pointes of pollicie that the king hath yet shewed for the securing of himselfe and his sonne'.[163] As Thomas Cogswell points out, Charles Emmanuel of Savoy saw the venture as a daring political manoeuvre to cut

[159] AAW, A XVII, no. 6, p. 22 (cited in *Letter 25*); *CGB*, I, pp. 274, 280, 282; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 69–72; Pursell, *WK*, p. 169; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 130; PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 135v; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 161r; PRO, SP 94/25, fos 277v–278r.

[160] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 173r, 221v; Adams, PC, p. 334; Redworth, *PI*, ch. 8. Hacket argued that it would have been virtually impossible for any privy councillor, apart from Buckingham, to advise this course, because it was such a high-risk strategy. Secrecy, therefore, was a way of protecting those who would have been reluctant to endorse it publicly: Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 114.

[161] See, e.g., *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 575, 576.

[162] BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 332r. For the range of reactions in France to Charles's appearance there, see Sir Edward Herbert's report to James on 4/14 March 1623, and the letter of the same date written by James Hay, earl of Carlisle: PRO, SP 78/71, fos 66r–v, 69r–70r. Herbert argued that it was only the 'Jesuited' party which wanted to detain Charles in France (in order to force him to convert or, if he refused, until he had renounced the Stuart claim to the French crown): *ibid.*, fo. 66r; for Tillières's account of Herbert's report, which claimed that 'la faction des Jésuistes' also wanted to force Charles to wed Henrietta Maria, see PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 190r–v. Herbert also noted that the proposals for a marriage between Henrietta Maria and the infante of Spain, Don Carlos, were being renewed at this point: PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 67r.

[163] *Letter 27*; see also *Letter 28*; cf. Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 48–49.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through the verbiage and tedium of endless delays in negotiation and to establish once and for all whether the Spaniards were serious about resolving the Palatinate issue at the same time as the celebration of the marriage.[164] Buckingham was, as Simon Adams notes, already 'suspicious of Bristol and wished to force the issue one way or another'. This explains the extension of his patronage at this time in 'a puritan direction' towards those who were regarded as opponents of the match, including Conway, Sir Horace Vere, the earl of Oxford, and Sir Robert Naunton, either to restrict opposition to the proposed treaty or to prepare 'a party in the event of a breach with Spain'.[165]

The rationale which, according to Sir Balthazar Gerbier, Buckingham himself advanced for the journey was 'to putt the Spaniards to it once for all to know what satisfaction they were like to have in the businesse of the Palatinatt [. . .] and to discover whether the ambassadors had entertayned the king with reallities or no'. Charles was in no danger in Madrid 'because of the queene of Bohemia and her numerous issu resyding in Holland'.[166] Among modern commentators, Robert Cross avers that the journey to Madrid was not 'a farce' but 'a serious attempt to bring some closure to the negotiations'.[167]

Some of the Spaniards also thought the Stuarts' strategy was annoyingly astute.[168] The French court evidently felt compelled by it to come to an accord with the Huguenots, since it appeared that an Anglo-Spanish alliance was very close.[169] Hispanophiles on the Continent celebrated the prospective union in advance.[170] There was a degree of courtier sentiment in England which professed to believe, even if only to flatter Buckingham, that the journey was a stroke of genius. Sir Humphrey May rejoiced on 23 April 1623 that the course taken by Charles and Buckingham had 'much disappointed the censorious wisedome' of carping armchair critics in England 'who were prepared to be wise accordinge to the event, and if anything but well had happened would have said that they did forsee it'. Rather presciently, May observed that 'so unhappy ar all greate men in all greate actions' for they 'ar never justified in their enterprises by the prudent motives and reasons by which they were induced to undertake them but by their successes'. Nevertheless, May was convinced that

[164]Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 60–61.

[165]Adams, PC, pp. 333–334. For Buckingham's enmity towards Bristol, noted by Tillières in a dispatch of 24 April 1622, see PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 30r–v.

[166]BL, Additional MS 4181, fos 17v–18r; Adams, PC, p. 334; Redworth, *PI*, p. 65.

[167]R. Cross, 'Pretense and perception in the Spanish match, or history in a fake beard', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 37 (2007), p. 572.

[168]Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 202.

[169]Adams, PC, pp. 332–333; though cf. PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 87r–v.

[170]Arblaster, *Antwerp & the World*, p. 145.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'this match wilbe a happy meanes to compose the miserable fractures of Christendome and restore peace againe unto it and that it will conduce somwhat to allay the cruell hatred and detestations and prosequutions that ar on all sides amongst Christians', even though May emphasized that he was a firm adherent of the Church of England.[171]

The Spanish court was seriously divided on the issue of whether to proceed with the negotiations once Charles had arrived in Spain. While, for Gondomar, it served as a ticket to dizzying heights of influence, only a minority of the council of state was really in favour. Olivares certainly was not.[172] The anticipated dowry, though a crucial element of James's calculations and, in effect, a massive European subsidy, was surely never likely to be handed over without major concessions by the Stuart court. It is difficult to see how any amount of diplomatic double-speak would ever have got round the fact that Charles was probably not going to show himself in the religious colours which the Spaniards would ultimately have required in order to proceed with the treaty. The furious negotiating over the papal dispensation suggests that they did not actually expect him to convert to Catholicism, although there was a body of opinion in Europe which affected to believe that he would.[173] Indeed, the earl of Bristol, as he reported on 3/13 December 1622, had had it made clear to him how generous the Spaniards thought that they were already being towards the Stuart family. Gondomar had urged Bristol to tell Prince

[171] BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 358r–359r.

[172] Pursell, ESP, p. 713; Cross, 'Pretense', pp. 569–570. For an assessment of Gondomar as 'one of the best-informed and most well-connected men' in the Spanish court, see Cross, 'Pretense', p. 570.

[173] For Ranier Zen's note, on 5/15 April 1623, that the Jesuit general Muzio Vitelleschi was spreading rumours that King James was near death and that Charles 'will readily become a Catholic, and so that kingdom will return to the obedience of the Catholic Church', see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 632. For the conversion issue, see Redworth, *PI*, pp. 89–95; Cross, 'Pretense', p. 567. Redworth argues that the short-lived conferences in Madrid about religion were the product of misunderstanding, and he describes Charles as 'a contented, even smug, Anglican'. The connections between smugness and Anglicanism are, of course, well established. But it is at least arguable that such encounters were part of an elaborate diplomatic duel, and provided a language whereby the two sides could test out, via religion, each other's intentions concerning the match. Through Charles's and Buckingham's attendances at the conferences arranged to discuss religion, and their appearances at ceremonial religious occasions, both sides were able to make, in effect, quite belligerent public statements about their intentions without exposing the arcana imperii of international treaty negotiations to public scrutiny. (For Buckingham's aggressiveness at this point towards the Spaniards, see Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 210–211, 225–226.) Rumours in France, retailed for example by Louis XIII to Sir Edward Herbert in April 1623, that Charles was on the verge of converting to Catholicism in Spain and had 'given monney to the Jesuits', were clearly no more than a gloss on the irenic front adopted, from time to time, by the English royal party in Madrid: PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 121r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Charles 'what difficultye' Philip IV 'had overcome in satisfying his people for the matching of a daughter of Spayne with a prince of a differing religion', and with such a large dowry ('a thinge unheard of in Christendome'). For all the advantages that the Stuarts would reap through the marriage, 'there was nothing required [. . .] but the ease and quyett of your owne subjects that the infanta might not live to see a persecution for the religion she professed'.[174]

Olivares's line, and an entirely reasonable one, was that English and Spanish interests should, under normal circumstances, not be in conflict. The marriage therefore only made sense if it brought them closer together, and it appeared to him that this would probably not happen via the proposed dynastic union. The problem was that James wanted things from it which the Spaniards would not deliver: 'if a necessary consequence of the conclusion of the marriage should be to introduce a contrariety of interests in this friendship where there has hitherto been a community, the opening of the negotiation has been pernicious and its conclusion will soon be worse'. What Olivares meant was that, if James engaged in war against the empire, the result would be either that the Spanish Habsburgs would have to fight the Viennese branch of the House of Austria, or that Spain would be compelled to remain neutral (thus risking disgrace for not supporting the European Catholic cause), or, of course, that Spain would simply turn against the English altogether.[175]

Many contemporary commentators could hardly be blamed, therefore, for their scepticism even while Charles was in Spain and while a fleet was being fitted out to go to bring him and the infanta home; and they were proved right in the end. Philip III had, before his death, it turned out, instructed his son not to contemplate concluding the marriage.[176]

On the other hand, this should not conceal the fact that other observers, even those who were not enthusiastic Catholics, thought for a time that the marriage really would take place. (Although Olivares insisted that the king of Spain would not go to war with the emperor, Glyn Redworth points out that the Spaniards had a genuine incentive to rein in the rampant forces of the duke of Bavaria, as well as to prevent a strengthening of Anglo-Dutch amity.[177]) Brennan Pursell argues, extremely convincingly to my mind, that it is wrong to assume

[174]PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 310r.

[175]Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 224, 194–195; Thompson, *HA*, p. 8; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 134; see also PRO, SP 94/25, fos 275v–276r; PRO, SP 94/29, fo. 157r–v.

[176]Redworth, *PI*, pp. 66, 67, 68; Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 192, 321–322; PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 269r.

[177]Redworth, *PI*, pp. 56–57; PRO, SP 78/71, fos 31r, 32r; PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 15r; PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 239v; *CGB*, I, p. 90. Bristol claimed on 8/18 October 1622 that, at a recent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that 'the Spanish monarchy had never been serious about the match' (the view set out by Gardiner in his account of the Spanish marriage negotiations), even though there were profound disagreements among the Spanish monarchy's advisers. Pursell suggests that the Spaniards did not set out simply to dupe the Stuart court but had a very different idea from Prince Charles about the way in which the linked issues of the Palatinate and the proposed marriage should be handled. If anyone was to blame for the negotiations' failure it was Charles himself. This, rather than the Spaniards' allegedly 'pathologically mendacious' nature or the, again alleged, political insight of the duke of Buckingham in worming out Spanish lies, was what caused the negotiations to break down.[178] Although Philip IV had indeed been instructed by his father to prevent the marriage under anything except the most propitious circumstances, Pursell claims that, by late 1622, the young king 'seemed to be warming to the idea' and certainly had enough motivation to prevent the elector palatine and his wife succeeding Prince Charles should he die childless.[179]

Moreover, Robert Cross has recently argued that, while Paul V may have had ideological objections to the marriage, Gregory XV evidently did not. Cross rejects the idea that 'talk of anything less than Charles's conversion' was 'simply Gondomar's wishful thinking'. He suggests instead that, 'at the time, virtually everyone in the Spanish government and Church seemed to think that the match would require merely a deal involving toleration of English Catholics (be it *de facto* or *de jure*) and that the prince's conversion would not be a necessary condition'.[180]

The point is that there was no reason for contemporaries necessarily to conclude, as the negotiations progressed, that they were mere window-dressing. In the politically contingent circumstances of 1622–1623 this was, at least in the context of English and British domestic

audience, Philip IV had said that James's demands concerning the Palatinate would be met, if necessary, by the deployment of Spanish military force against imperial troops: PRO, SP 94/25, fos 243v, 257v; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 131. (On 9 October 1622, the earl of Kellie had noted Cottington's report that 'the king of Spaine hes saide plainlye that, if the emperoure and Baviere will not surrander the pallatinate [. . .] Spinola shall goe as from him to assiste the recovery of it againe': *HMCMK*, p. 140.) For Pursell's reconstruction of the scenario in which, following a submission to the emperor by the elector palatine, it was possible that, if the duke of Bavaria did not accept the emperor's subsequent restoration of the elector (something which a majority of Philip's council of state desired to see), then Habsburg troops might force the duke of Bavaria to comply, see Pursell, ESP, pp. 717–718; see also *CGB*, I, p. 346 (for the nuncio del Bagno's report in August 1623 of Spinola's hostility to the duke of Bavaria).

[178] Pursell, ESP, pp. 699–701, 725–726.

[179] *Ibid.*, pp. 703–704.

[180] Cross, 'Pretense', pp. 566, 567.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

politics, probably just as important as whether the treaty was actually agreed and implemented in the end. As early as March 1623, Secretary Conway could be found making arrangements for the reception and lodging of the prince and the infanta (though, later in the year, Venice's ambassador, Alvise Valaresso, noted that 'the Spaniards hate' Conway 'extremely').[181] In April, Conway believed that the dispensation would soon arrive and 'then hee that supposeth a delay is either desperately envious or a vile almanack maker that out of a false colleccion of the conjunction of the planetts feares us with a fowle day when it prooves faire'.[182] Furthermore, during April and May 1623, absolutely contrary to the elector palatine's wishes, a treaty was hammered out between James and Isabella, a treaty which was also signed by the emperor. It established a period of peace and a cease-fire in which an attempt would be made to work out a final settlement.[183]

The fleet which was now being commissioned to go to Spain to bring the royal party home was to be officered by Catholics: for example, the earl of Rutland (Buckingham's father-in-law) as admiral, and Lord Windsor and Lord Morley as, respectively, vice- and rear-admirals.[184] Tillières described how the fleet was ordered to sail from London rather than from Plymouth 'pour faire croire au peuple que les dicts vaisseaux' were going to bring back the infanta and the prince of Wales.[185] Chamberlain commented on 19 April that there was a whole gaggle of courtiers rushing for Spain. Among them were Lord Kensington and Sir George Goring who

[181] PRO, SP 14/139/63; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 106.

[182] PRO, SP 14/142/34, fo. 70v.

[183] Pursell, ESP, pp. 709–710; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, p. 334; see below, p. 50.

[184] *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 558; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 491, 499; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 8; PRO, SP 94/26, fos 159r, 160r–v; *DSSD*, pp. 131, 138. The news about the fleet was conveyed to Simonds D'Ewes by 'one of Lord Windsors gentlemen': *DSSD*, p. 131. D'Ewes's diary remarks disdainfully on the 'popish' command of the fleet. In mid-June 1623, news had reached him that 'ther had been latelye a mutinie at the ships which weere going for Spaine and lay yett upon the Downes' about the type of divine service to be celebrated on board. It was 'saied my Lorde Morley would have hindred' the recital of the prayer book and 'would have brought inn his damnable Masse instead of it'; and 'the marriners weere soe farr provoked as his lordshipp was verye near throwing over boorde': *ibid.*, p. 141; see also Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 52; Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 407. D'Ewes also noted how the court jester, Archibald Armstrong, mocked the popish lords for the expenditure which they had personally incurred over setting forward the fleet 'in hope of great rewards': *DSSD*, p. 156. See also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 33 (for the claim that Rutland, Windsor, and Morley, departing from the court to their ships, had 'a numerous company composed almost exclusively of Catholics'). The earl of Rutland denied that there had been any 'interruptions and scandalls [. . .] given to inferiour officers and marrinours when theie were att common praier and singing of psalmes': PRO, SP 14/147/84 (fo. 103r), 84. i, 85. For the orders issued to Rutland, see BL, Harleian MS 1584, fos 4r–8v.

[185] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 219r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were religiously quite sound; but others had opportunistically turned Catholic.[186] The liturgical arrangements made for the prince in Madrid were deliberately designed to appear as Catholic in character as possible.[187]

Soon Chamberlain was informing Carleton that the infanta would have 'prerogative and privileges [. . .] more than ever quene of England had'. Coloma 'had ben at St James and Denmarke House to fit and apoint her lodgings with many alterations'. There would be 'a new chappell built in either place, for which order is taken with the surveyor Innigo Jones to have them don out of hand, and yet with great state and costlines'. The Savoy chapel 'likewise shalbe converted to the use of her household'. Diego de Lafuente, Gondomar's chaplain, would be in charge, or any other 'that shalbe as yt were bishop or superintendent over her priests and chaplains'.[188] At the end of May, Chamberlain saw that all the preparations for the infanta's arrival

[186]McClure, *LJC*, p. 491.

[187]Two chaplains, Leonard Mawe and Matthew Wren, had been sent to attend the royal party. They had been instructed to behave in a manner 'agreeable to the puritie of the primitive Churche and yett as neare the Romane forme as can lawfullie be done'. They were to use a room 'decently adorned chappellwise with an altar [. . .] palls, lynnen coverings, demy carpet, 4 surplices, candlesticks, tapers, chalices, pattens, a fine towell for the prince, other towells for the household [. . .] wafers for the communion', and so on. In particular there were to be no 'polemicall preachings'. Lord Keeper Williams arranged for the English liturgy to be translated into Spanish. The translation was made by the convert Fernando de Tejeda, formerly the protégé of Daniel Featley (his tract, *Scrutamini Scripturas* (London, 1624) was dedicated to Williams): CRS, 68, pp. 185, 186; PRO, SP 94/26, fo. 80r; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 126–127; Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 375. (Williams went through the same rigmarole for the French when the marriage between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria was being negotiated; he employed a minister of the French church in Norwich to produce a translation of the prayer book to 'clear the Church of England [. . .] from the gross slanders of fugitives': Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 209.) Simonds D'Ewes remarked that the chaplains selected for Charles's service 'weere choosen as men altogether free from the suspition of being puritans': *DSSD*, p. 128. Disparate rumours about the prince's chaplains (both that they were 'not suffred to come to him' and that 'they had accesse twise a day') filtered back from Spain, and Simonds D'Ewes commented that 'what to beleeve was uncertaine': *DSSD*, pp. 136–137; cf. Albion, *CI*, pp. 36–37. (Leonard Mawe suffered an injury during the course of his journey and never reached Madrid: Redworth, *PI*, pp. 93–94.) For Mawe and Wren, see also Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 46, 48–49.

[188]McClure, *LJC*, p. 494; cf. BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 260r; see also *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 560; PRO, SP 14/143/13, 31; PRO, SP 14/144/42. In mid-May, Calvert was dealing with the layout of the chapels at St James's and Denmark House (formerly Somerset House, which had been Anne of Denmark's residence until 1619): PRO, SP 14/144/42. The infanta would live primarily at Denmark House, but her private chapel would be near St James's palace: Redworth, *PI*, pp. 100–101, 127 (citing M.D. Whinney and O. Miller, *English Art 1625–1714* (Oxford, 1957), p. 27). The proposed chapel would be fifty-five feet long and would have 'width in proportion'. The Flanders agent van Male commented that if 'these three buildings are built according to the drawings of the king's architect then we shall have nothing to complain of': CRS, 68, p. 186. By contrast, in June 1623, the count of Tillières

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were going on apace. Coloma himself had laid the first stone of the chapel being constructed for her at St James's.[189] A newsletter of 30 May to Joseph Mead in Cambridge made a connection between this and the cross which was being restored in the chapel royal, and also the king's direction to the bishop of Winchester that the chapel at Greenwich should be 'new repaired and gilded'.[190]

The public impact of these things was amplified greatly by the dispatch of a formal papal letter, of 10/20 April 1623, to the prince in Spain. The letter was formally presented to Charles on 8/18 May by the nuncio in Madrid. It was much copied, translated, and circulated. In it, Gregory XV enthusiastically addressed Charles, dwelling on his decision to marry a Habsburg:

> whereas you are come to Spayne to the Catholique kinge to desire a marriage with the House of Austria, this your desire wee much commend; and also, upon this present occasion offered, testifie that you appertayne to the speciall care of our papall dignitie. For, since you are resolved to joyne to you in marriage a Catholique mayden, wee may easilie conjecture that those seedes of piety which so happelie florished in the myndes of the Roman kinges may also [. . .] spring up in your hart. Neyther would hee seeke after such a match who hated the Catholique religion and delighted in the oppression of the sea of Rome.[191]

An equally gushing response from the prince to the pontiff followed. It was also much copied and circulated, though the pope died before it reached him.[192] Chamberlain was still fuming, even at the end of August 1623, that

> here goes a letter up and downe in the princes name in aunswer to that [which] the pope sent him three or fowre moneths since, which, yf yt be true, is somwhat

alleged that the chapel which was under construction at St James's palace was 'une maison pour le diable': PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 224v.

[189] McClure, *LJC*, p. 500; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 40. In France it was being said, at the end of May, that Philip IV would 'demand some cautionary touns in England for the securinge of the covenants to be performed' by James (including the recall of James's subjects who were serving with the Dutch and the toleration of those 'who shall come to the infantas chappell'): PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 161r.

[190] Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 400; cf. *Letter 1*.

[191] BL, Additional MS 72286, fos 176v–177r; PRO, SP 14/142/59, fo. 118r; TD, V, pp. 130–132; ARCR, I, nos 1575–1593; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 128–129; *Cabala*, pp. 212–214; *The Popes Letter to the Prince: in Latine, Spanish, and English* (London, 1623). Simonds D'Ewes recorded in his diary for 20 June that he 'had sight of a letter in Lattine which was sent from the pope to the prince which afterwards came into print': *DSSD*, p. 142.

[192] TD, V, pp. 132–134; ARCR, I, nos 1594–1600; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 128–129; PRO, SP 14/147/10, 11; PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 85r–v; *Cabala*, pp. 214–215. For the diplomatic consequences of Gregory XV's death, see Redworth, *PI*, p. 128; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 161; PRO, SP 78/71, fos 208r, 220r, 231v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

straunge, for (besides other passages) yt geves him the title of Holines and most holy father divers times and kisses his Holines feet.[193]

John Hacket admitted that the prince's reply allowed 'some of our hot-heads in England' to make 'it a quarrel and a calumny', although Hacket, and indeed the Stuart regime, could claim with some justice that Charles, within the polite formula of goodwill which his reply adopted, maintained a position of complete ecclesiological independence.[194]

There was undoubtedly an air of triumphalism among Catholics and those who were associated with the 'Spanish' faction. Sir William Monson's son, John, was alleged by the earl of Nottingham to have said in May 1623, in front of a group of twenty or thirty people, that, 'whatsoever the kinges Majestie did shew himselfe, yet he was of theare religion'. Nottingham remarked, if rather inaccurately, that William 'Watson the priest was executed at Winchester for the very same wordes', and he added that John Monson's 'delight' was 'in seeking whome he may perswade'.[195] Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa, who had been recalled from Navarre in March and had been appointed extraordinary ambassador to the Stuart court in London, landed at Dover. He was welcomed with considerable pomp and ceremony, and arrived at Canterbury in June 1623. It was claimed that 'a greate many papists [. . .] declared themselves at Canterbery at the embassadors being there'. One of them 'dranke a health to the confusion of all Protestants'.[196] Chamberlain noted on 28 June that Inojosa went to lodge at Ely House, where Catholics had established a London church for themselves. The Catholics began 'to be very confident and talke lowde of such a toleration as that they expect to have the tenth church of the land'.[197] Such was their exuberance that, in mid-July, Secretary Calvert tried to ensure that the Spanish ambassador would 'labour to prevent all cause of his Majesties displeasure' and to persuade the Catholics to 'behave themselves with that modesty, meeknesse and humility' which they owed to a 'gratious souveraigne'.[198] Conway observed on 17 July that Catholics were making the marriage articles 'as common as the balletts sung in

[193] McClure, *LJC*, p. 513.

[194] Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 128.

[195] PRO, SP 14/145/22, fo. 39r; McClure, *LJC*, p. 500; *CSPD, Addenda 1580–1625*, p. 654; *APC, 1623–1625*, pp. 6–7.

[196] PRO, SP 14/146/87, 88; PRO, SP 14/147/35, fo. 41r; PRO, SP 94/26, fo. 106r. The count of Tillières thought, however, that, when Inojosa arrived in London, 'les honneurs que l'on luy a faicts n'ont aucunement esgalé ceux que l'on rendist' to the former French ambassador extraordinary, the marquis of Cadenet: PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 226v–227r.

[197] McClure, *LJC*, p. 504.

[198] PRO, SP 14/148/124, fo. 153r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the streets, and [. . .] with such inventions and addicions as deforme them past knowledge'.[199]

It was at this point that leading Jesuit polemicists such as John Percy were becoming more visible as they disputed semi-publicly with leading Protestant ideologues such as Daniel Featley.[200] Even in late summer, Valaresso was commenting that one of the 'chief results' of the match was 'the open declaration by many who before were only secret Catholics'. It was believed that, 'since the prince left, about a hundred families have declared themselves, noted down by his Majesty himself'.[201]

The progress of the negotiations at Madrid did not, however, warrant some English Catholics' enthusiasm. George Gage secured the final text of the dispensation at Rome and it was sent off to the nuncio in Madrid, Innocenzo Massimi;[202] but its effect was now vitiated by a change in Spanish policy, the news of which reached Rome just after the dispensation had been dispatched.[203] Whether this was always the Spaniards' intention – namely, to lead the English a merry dance – or whether the new policy was actually the product of the hostility generated, mainly by Buckingham, in Madrid, is a matter for interpretation.[204] Further conditions, drawn up by Cardinal Luigi Ludovisi at Spanish request, were added to those of the extant dispensation and, as Charles Dodd put it, 'by a skilful management of the difficulties that would thus arise, the negotiation might still be protracted'.[205] A theological 'junta' had been set up soon after Charles arrived in Madrid, superseding the earlier and much smaller body which had met in the past to consider the question of the marriage. Buckingham showed considerable irritation when Olivares told him how the junta must necessarily guide the king's conscience; Buckingham informed Olivares 'that it was all a plot to mock and betray them'. Olivares then told Buckingham that it would have been better to leave the diplomacy to Bristol, who had been ready to trust the Spanish court to deal with the papacy about the terms of the dispensation.[206]

[199] PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 113r.

[200] McClure, *LJC*, p. 507. See also Henry Rogers, *An Answer to M^r. Fisher the Iesuite his Five Propositions concerning Luther. By M^r. Rogers, that worthy Oxford divine* (np, 1623).

[201] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 103.

[202] *Letter 28*; Redworth, *PI*, p. 103; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 569; PRO, SP 94/26, fo. 106v.

[203] Redworth, *PI*, p. 103.

[204] For a discussion of this issue, and of the diplomatic reasons why Rome was likely to accede to Madrid's wishes concerning the text of the dispensation, see *ibid.*, pp. 101–104.

[205] TD, V, pp. 135–136; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 623–626; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 20; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 102–104; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 144; Pursell, ESP, p. 710.

[206] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 32, 36, 37; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 148; Redworth, *PI*, p. 108; Pursell, ESP, pp. 710, 711–713. For Lord Rochford's warning to Buckingham in Spain about

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The new conditions did not immediately halt proceedings, but the effects of the procrastination threatened havoc in English domestic and foreign policy.[207] In early June 1623, Sir Edward Herbert warned that, if James should concede by treaty what the Spanish court desired 'before the match betwixt his Highnes and the infanta bee consummated', the Spaniards would 'protracte the tyme with so many and artificiall delayes' that 'all the affaires betwixt your [. . .] Majestie' and Philip IV would 'remaine more than ever in suspense'; and therefore James should insist on the return of Charles with the infanta before 'the least speech of any other busines with the Spaniarde', and particularly of a 'league offensive', which would commit James 'against all your [. . .] Majesties neighbors and antient allyes at once'.[208] In the same month, the Venetian ambassador in Spain commented that, through delay, the Spaniards would 'discover various things and chiefly the strength of the Catholics, who need not longer conceal themselves out of fear'.[209] In other words, while Olivares might well be counselling that the match was not feasible, it was nevertheless crystal clear to some observers what the Spaniards might do if they chose to press the issue, and how they might damage, for example, the relationship between the king and parliament – a relationship which Protestants such as Thomas Scott were proclaiming was essential to preserve the monarchical authority with which they believed James was invested.[210]

The armistice of May 1623 stipulated a cease-fire for fifteen months, during which time, at the direction of the regime in Brussels, negotiations would be conducted at Cologne. Frederick and the prince of Orange were unwilling participants, and the former, who was utterly desperate to see the Spanish match fail, finally agreed only after his adherent Christian of Brunswick was defeated at Stadtlohn in August.[211]

the danger represented by Bristol, who, said Rochford, 'hath a greater [. . .] partie in court than you imagine, in so much that [. . .] were the kinge a newter, he would prevail', see BL, Harleian MS 1581, no. 115, fo. 379v.

[207] For the complexity of the negotiations at Madrid between May and July, see Redworth, *PI*, chs 10–12.

[208] PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 175r.

[209] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 37.

[210] Lake, 'Constitutional consensus', p. 814. An open letter to the king, put about in Archbishop Abbot's name in August 1623, declared that 'this toleration [. . .] which you endeavour to set up by proclamation cannot be decided without a parliament'. The letter asked 'Does your Majesty mean to show your subjects that you intend to arrogate to yourself the entire authority to reverse the laws of the realm at your pleasure?': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 91; PRO, SP 14/150/54–57, 81, 105; *CGB*, I, p. 348; BL, Harleian MS 1583, fo. 89r–v.

[211] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 43, 44, 56–57, 96, 98, 105, 107; *CGB*, I, p. 356; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 247r, 253v; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 201–203; Adams, PC, p. 335.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In spite of the accumulating mistrust, two treaties – one with a public set of articles and the other with a private set – were now drawn up in Spain and were dispatched to London for ratification by James. The public treaty contained the provisions for, among other things, the infanta's clerical entourage and chapel. The private treaty had the more sensitive provisions concerning the extent of the toleration which the crown would grant to Catholics.[212] On 17 July 1623, Sir Edward Conway wrote to Buckingham about the 'great [. . .] distress' caused to James by the 'articles brought' from Spain, by Peter Killigrew, 'upon three poynts'. The first concerned 'the perpetuitie of time for the abrogation of all lawes concerning the Romaine Catholiques in noe time to bee renewed against them, nor any other to bee raised in their place upon any occasion'. Secondly, a guarantee was required from James that the articles 'in favour of Romaine Catholiques' would be 'confirmed by parliament within three yeares [. . .] and sooner if the constitution of affaires would permit it'. The third dealt with the oath to be taken by the privy council. The first, 'a perpetuall imunity', would bring the Catholics 'to a daungerous encrease'; the second was simply impossible to procure; and, as for the third, if the council would not concur, the king's authority might 'receave prejudice' by his councillors' refusal to co-operate. The marriage had, in effect, been negotiated by Prince Charles in Spain. In consultation with specific councillors on the previous Sunday, at which he had voiced his concerns about these issues, James had been advised that the prince's 'wordes and articles must bee made good', that the 'oath by the councell must bee taken', and, in addition, that 'the prince must marry and bringe his lady away with him this yeare'.[213]

Some members of the privy council, notably Lord Zouch, had to be forced to take the oath by which they swore that they would allow the proposed toleration to work, or that at least they would not impede it.[214]

[212]TD, V, pp. 137–138; Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 327–344; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 82–85.

[213]BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 307r–v; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 231r, 235r–236v; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 124–125; TD, V, pp. 138–139.

[214]PRO, SP 14/149/12, 31; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 509–510; *Letter 30*. The dissent on the council over the oath was informed by knowledge of Buckingham's change of opinion about the proposed treaty: Adams, PC, p. 335. Zouch made his opinions known by doggedly sticking to the absolute letter of the law concerning the release of Catholic prisoners, and by trying to prevent the carriage of Catholic books and letters through Dover: PRO, SP 14/153/59; PRO, SP 14/152/42. He had, up to this point, in his capacity as lord warden of the Cinque ports, been zealously administering the oath of allegiance to those passing through the ports, especially those who were known to have been involved in Catholic military activity on the Continent. Zouch bitterly criticized Lord Keeper Williams for agreeing to bail such people (and in particular one who was a soldier serving in one of the companies under the command of Lord Vaux) after they had been arrested: PRO, SP 14/148/31, 31.i–iv; PRO, SP 14/149/19. In July 1623, Zouch informed Conway that he had arrested the Jesuit Thomas

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sir George Calvert, on 18 July, arranged for the attorney-general to draw up a dispensation for the oath of allegiance.[215] On Sunday 20 July, at Whitehall, James 'tooke his oath to observe all the articles agreed upon, which were read by Secretarie Calvert in Latin and lasted almost an howre'. Additional articles concerning the toleration of Catholics were sworn by the king later in the day 'in some private roome apart where', as Calvert had noted a few days before, only the ambassadors were to attend, accompanied by 'some few' of James's 'councell such as his Majesty shall thinke fitt'. Chamberlain had heard only extracts of the articles, but 'one among the rest' was that 'the infanta is to be allowed 24 priests, which are to have as yt were a bishop over them and not to be any way subject to our lawes'. She was also 'to have the education of her children till they be ten yeares old, with many other points concerning her joynter, and favorable toleration toward the Romish Catholikes'. Even at Whitehall, Catholic pride and effrontery had been displayed for all to see. For, complained Chamberlain, 'the ceremonies beeing ended and the antheme sung', when the bishop of London 'began the prayer for the king, the ambassadors confessor or Jesuite (that stood by him within the traverse) clapt on his hat and so continued all the while though the king and ambassador were bare'.[216]

The Spanish diplomats, however, continued to agitate for more speedy and thorough implementation of the toleration clauses than the regime and even genuine supporters of the marriage such as Calvert were prepared to concede.[217] All was clearly not well. Conway's letter

Everard who had come from Calais, disguised as a soldier, with a pass from Sir Edward Parham (sergeant-major of Vaux's regiment): PRO, SP 14/148/57, 57.i–ii.

[215]PRO, SP 14/149/6, 7.

[216]McClure, *LJC*, p. 510; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 187r; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 292r; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 239r–v; *DSSD*, pp. 147–148; *HMCMK*, p. 175; TD, V, p. 139; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 46; Redworth, *PI*, p. 126; Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI & I*, p. 417; Pursell, ESP, p. 714; BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 268r–271r; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 45v; see also PRO, SP 14/149/30; Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 416. According to Jean Beaulieu, 'in the afternoone all the lords of the councell', except the earl of Pembroke and Lord Brooke 'who were both sicke at that tyme', 'tooke oath [. . .] to conforme themselves' to the king's 'will therein': BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 63r. A compromise on the toleration issue was rather hastily arranged with the Spanish ambassadors (on the same day, it appears, as the treaty was signed). On 23 July, Conway reported to Buckingham that the Spanish ambassadors had been leaned on to send word to Spain that 'favour to the Romaine Catholiques was already put in execution'. They 'fayntly accorded', but 'withall prayed to have some actes done which might bee publique and authenticall', to which James seemed to accede: BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 311v.

[217]BL, Additional MS 35832, fos 114r, 116r; PRO, SP 14/149/79; and see below, pp. 57–63. Tillières reported on 13 July that James, speaking to the judges about to go on circuit, had insisted that, as for Catholics, 'ce n'est pas que je les ayme ny la religion qu'ilz professent, au contraire [. . .] j'abhorre plus et l'un et l'autre'; and James instructed the judges to proceed harshly against Catholics 's'ils font quelque scandale': PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 232r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to Buckingham of 23 July carried a postscript: 'the acts of favour are gone this day' for 'the kings signature, which knowne, will create cold swett and feare untill the returne of his Highnes and your Grace'.[218] On 27 July, the marquis of Inojosa penned a letter to Calvert asking, yet again, that he should 'procure the resolution that is to be taken with the Catholiques'.[219] On 29 and 30 July, according to Tillières's secretary, leading Catholics met with the Spanish ambassadors 'pour donner leur advis de la forme en laquelle ilz requerroient du roy de la Grande Bretagne la publication des articles dont il a juré l'observation', and some of these Catholics insisted that it must be by way of a general pardon and proclamation. George Gage, who was present, gave his opinion (which he said was also that of the king) that 'cela estoit impossible'. James 'ne leur accorderoit jamais telle chose qui offenseroit son peuple' and instead 'il falloit trouver quelque autre expédient'. It was concluded 'il faudroit se contenter de la volonté du roy'. Gage proposed, on behalf of Secretary Calvert, that the king 'donneroit un pardon aus dicts Catholicques' under the great seal, and that those who wanted it would have to purchase it.[220]

Almost simultaneously, however, the two sides in Madrid had manoeuvred themselves into irreconcilable positions, although there was a show of consensus in early July as Charles appeared to accept the Spanish court's terms.[221] Charles prepared to leave Spain, though there was further haggling as the news of Pope Gregory XV's death arrived and, therefore, of the need for a new dispensation. Charles actually put his signature to the treaty, even in the face of the absolute refusal of the Spanish court to allow the infanta to leave for England before the following spring.[222]

It had never made sense to the Spaniards simply to restore Frederick to the Palatinate. As we have seen, Olivares's preferred dynastic solution to the Bohemian and Palatinate question was to make the Stuarts deal directly with the Habsburg court in Vienna. In July, even as the Spanish marriage negotiations started to break down completely, the proposal that Charles should marry the emperor's

[218] BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 312v.

[219] PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 127r. Calvert had, according to Carondelet, said that James had ordered 'warrants to bee made as are requisite for the execution of that which is granted in favour of the Roman Catholiques for the time to come, reserving that which concernes the remission of the penalties by-past'. Inojosa was incensed because he had understood that all penalties had been remitted: *ibid.*

[220] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 242r–v.

[221] Pursell, ESP, p. 714; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 158; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 122–123.

[222] Redworth, *PI*, pp. 119–133; Pursell, ESP, p. 715. A letter of 10 August from James had ordered the prince and the duke to return: Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI & I*, p. 424. For Pursell's discussion of whether the infanta Maria herself ever desired or intended to go through with the proposed marriage to Prince Charles, see Pursell, ESP, pp. 719–720.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elder daughter, the archduchess Maria Anna, was renewed.[223] Charles's merely diplomatic assent on 27 June/7 July to all Madrid's conditions (not long before he left the city) also had the effect of preventing this alternative, Viennese dynastic solution favoured by Olivares.[224] Just before Charles departed, the Spaniards put forward again the equally pointless proposal for Frederick's eldest son to be educated in Vienna and marry a daughter of the emperor.[225]

On his journey home, Charles sent orders back to the earl of Bristol in Madrid. Bristol was not to hand over Charles's proxy for going ahead with the marriage, on the technical grounds that assurances were still required that the infanta would not, after the betrothal, be incarcerated in a house of religion. Back in England, further orders were issued that the proxy should not be delivered until the Spaniards rendered satisfaction over the Palatinate; in other words, never.[226]

The Appointment of William Bishop as Bishop of Chalcedon

Before the Anglo-Spanish negotiations began to break down irretrievably, William Bishop had been consecrated in Paris on 25 May/4 June as bishop of Chalcedon. He set off on 18/28 July for his home country, which had also, in some sense, become his new diocese.[227]

[223] Redworth, *PI*, pp. 122–123.

[224] *ibid*. For Charles's departure, see *ibid*., pp. 128–129, 132–136. There is, perhaps, a disparity between Glyn Redworth's evidence of the sophistication of the Stuart court's international diplomacy and his claim both that the journey to Madrid was merely 'foolhardy' and that it was not primarily concerned with the resolution of the Palatinate question: *ibid*., p. 74; cf. Pursell, ESP, *passim*. For Robert Cross, 'despite the importance of emphasizing the match as a distinctive event, Redworth goes too far in portraying the concurrent conflict in central Europe as largely irrelevant to the negotiations between London and Madrid. In fact, most of the key participants at the time saw them as inextricably intertwined': Cross, 'Pretense', pp. 569, 578–579.

[225] Pursell, *WK*, pp. 204–205.

[226] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 17; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 164, 169, 171; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 135–136.

[227] Anstr., I, p. 37; TD, IV, pp. cclxx–cclxxv. Sir Edward Herbert, reporting Bishop's consecration, also commented on the advancement of William Gifford (who, since 1621, had been archbishop of Rheims only at the French king's pleasure) 'absolutely into the charge' of his archdiocese. There was speculation that King James would be persuaded that Gifford's promotion was intended to 'give encouragement to, or draw dependance from, the Englishe Roman Catholiques'. Herbert also commented that some at the French court genuinely feared that this would simply encourage James to take the Huguenots 'into his more particular protection'. But it was Herbert's own opinion that, should Gifford prove capable of winning 'the English Catholiques rather to the Sorbonne than [to] Jesuiticall doctrine', the English state could 'make use of this faction to discover their designes on eyther side'. At that time, the French court had no 'intention or hope to gayne the English Catholiques to their partye': PRO, SP 78/71, fo. 183r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bishop's progress in England can be followed through the newsletters and other documents that he and his officials dispatched to the secular clergy's agent in Rome. Despite his advanced age, Bishop showed considerable vigour in trying to recruit support among Catholics. He set up fledgling hierarchical structures (notably an episcopal chapter) through which his authority might be exercised. He gave rhetorical assurances to the regime that his authority was primarily 'spiritual' and therefore was not a challenge to the royal supremacy. He attempted some measure of reconciliation with the regulars. The Jesuits, however, were unwilling to trust him, perhaps because they knew that proof of Bishop's capacity to heal divisions among the Catholic clergy would itself increase his power.[228]

Bishop's position was, in fact, far from secure. There was doubt within the Catholic community about the wisdom of some of his actions. It was clear that he did not have authority from Rome to do all that he now did, in particular his establishment of an episcopal chapter. He had not, in fact, had ordinary jurisdiction conferred upon him; rather, he had been granted delegated power, to be held and exercised under the authority of the papal nuncio in Paris.[229] But Bishop soldiered on. He attempted to secure the dismissal of the pro-Jesuit Cardinal Giovanni Garzia Millini from his office as one of the cardinal protectors of the English nation; and he tried to ensure a new appointment to that post, first of Cardinal Bandini, and then of Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the new pope's nephew.[230] He petitioned for the appointment of more bishops.[231] He also sought to exploit the 'Fitton' rebellion at the English College in Rome,[232] which became a test case for his new authority. On 15/25 October 1623, a number of students at the college had been expelled by the Jesuit rector, Thomas Fitzherbert. One of these students, Francis Haynes, was a cousin or nephew of one of the inner circle of seculars in London, Joseph Haynes.[233] Another, Anthony Shelley, was a cousin of the Elizabethan martyr Edward Shelley.[234] Peter Biddulph (better known by his alias of Fitton) eventually rose to prominence as secretary of the English episcopal chapter. Ralph Fowler, another of those caught up in the fracas in Rome, was a cousin of both Biddulph and Thomas White (alias Blacklo), the future political theorist and agent in Rome

[228] *Letter 35*; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 406–408.
[229] TD, IV, pp. cclxxxiv–cclxxxvi.
[230] *Letter 31*.
[231] *Letter 32*.
[232] *Letter 33*.
[233] AAW, B 26, no. 21; *Letter 33*.
[234] Anstr., II, p. 291. Shelley had already been involved, while at Saint-Omer, in a dispute with the Jesuit superiors there: *ibid.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the secular clergy;[235] it was no secret that Biddulph was from a Jesuit-oriented gentry household. Another of the rebels, John Faulkner, was a nephew of the Jesuit of the same name.[236] As Dodd relates it, the simmering discontent against the Jesuit administration of the premier English Catholic seminary on the Continent broke out when John Bennett arrived in Rome. The appearance of the secular clergy's agent in the city provided an opportunity for discontented scholars to press their grievances.[237] So the seminary issue became part of the contemporary debate over the governance of English Catholicism at exactly the same time as the other and related questions of authority, hierarchy, and conformity were being fought out at home.[238]

The English critics of the Society of Jesus had been stoking their petitions for years with complaints about how the entire Counter-Reformation in England was distorted and undermined by the insidious manner in which the Jesuits extracted the best students from the seminaries and placed them in their own novitiates. This left the dunces to be ordained as secular clergy and to become a laughing-stock in England, derided by the Catholic gentry, who chose instead to rely on members of the religious orders to satisfy their spiritual needs.[239] Furthermore, the control exerted by the Jesuits and their agents over so many seminaries and schools gave the impression that English Catholicism was so badly fractured and disunited (whereas, the seculars claimed, only a small faction was disrupting the efforts of the rest) that it was impossible to take major decisions affecting and reforming the whole body. A series of visitations led first to the expulsions of the rebel students and then to an arbitration which saw the evicted scholars transferred to Douai.[240] Many secular clergymen

[235] AAW, B 26, no. 54; AAW, B 47, no. 49.

[236] Anstr., II, pp. 99, 100; *NCC*, pp. 66, 102. A cousin of the rebel Faulkner, Thomas Dingley, also joined in the agitation in the college. Dingley was regarded by Thomas Fitzherbert as mad, since Dingley believed, from time to time, that he was the pope and 'hath made us all cardinalls', and he was sent back to England via Douai: PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 210v; see also AAW, B 25, no. 102, for Rant's 'catalogue of our Inglish schollers made madd in the Inglishe colledge in the space of five yeare[s]'.

[237] Among the papers in the possession of the rector of the Jesuit college at Liège in 1637 was 'a malitious manuscript (wanting one sheete) agaynst the superiors and government of the seminarie' at Rome, 'written about 1623 by P. Fitton, J. Faulconer, F. Harris, Ant. Shelley and Ant. Hoskins': ABSJ, Stonyhurst Anglia MS VI, no. 98.

[238] TD, V, pp. 98–100.

[239] Lists compiled by Thomas Rant alleged that, of the forty-seven students who left the college between 1616 and 1623, thirty-three went to the Jesuit novitiate and, as Dodd put it, 'fourteen only, of the most incompetent, were added to the body of the clergy': TD, V, p. 99. Cf. L.J. Hicks, 'The English College, Rome and vocations to the Society of Jesus: March, 1579–July, 1595', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 3 (1934), pp. 1–36; *NAGB*, p. 4.

[240] *Letters 35, 38*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would only have had their suspicions of Jesuit perfidy confirmed if they had seen a letter written in June 1624 by Thomas Fitzherbert to another Jesuit, John Knatchbull, in Brussels. Fitzherbert was clearly pleased by the 'great evacuation we have made of late of the subjects of this colledge'. He urged Knatchbull to ensure that students to fill the ejected rebels' places were sent from the Jesuit college at Saint-Omer. He also said how relieved he was that the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide had withdrawn its threat to have replacements sent from the seculars' own college at Douai.[241]

The Illusion of Toleration, the Failure of the Spanish Match, and the Turn towards France

The desperate attempt to resolve the toleration issue during the summer months of 1623, in order to facilitate the increasingly impossible treaty, had finally exposed how far apart the Spanish and English negotiators really were. On 1 August, Conway reported to Buckingham that James had recently 'made a select comittee' to deal with the mechanics of the toleration. The committee

> fell upon all the poenaltyes and forfeitures and did desire by Mr Secretary Calvert's lettre his Majesties declaracion how farre his Majestie would extend his grace, wheather onely to thinges to come or further to thinges past; and if onely to the tyme and thinges to come they prayed order for actes and warrantes accordingly.

James had to decide whether the toleration would take effect only from the present time or would be retrospective. He desired that, for the 'time to come', the crown would 'confirme and assure the immunityes of the Romaine Catholiques from all those poenaltyes and molestations' cited in the marriage articles. But, as for 'the tyme past' and the 'forfeitures and poenalties setled as part of his Majesties revenue long before the treaty, and fynes sett upon them for contempt', and 'for want of appearance in the high commission court', James 'conceaved himself not bound by the articles [...] but did declare that hee did reserve himself in those points untill some occasion of extraordinary greate joy for the good proceedings in this busines'. Yet the Spaniards evidently found this to be unacceptable. According to Conway, the marquis of Inojosa had immediately demanded 'the present execution of all'.[242] The count of Tillières narrated how the

[241] PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 209r–v; Anstr., I, p. 200.
[242] PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 140r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

day before, on 31 July, Coloma and Inojosa had gone to court, and had obtained promises that 'chasque evesque et autres officiers' would be instructed not to trouble Catholics 'directement ou indirectement pour leur religion'.[243] Conway lamented that the

> pretence of this hasty execution hath raised the Romaine Catholiques to a greate confidence; and caused examination of the advantage and disadvantage of and in the forme and matter of the treaty; here being a visible actuall greate alteration in the auncient face of this goverment, and nothing heard of the temporall conditions or certaynty of the marriage or returne of the prince.

Conway emphasized that, at James's direction, he had ordered Calvert 'with all [. . .] dexterity possible to solicite and gaine of the ambassadors by their lettres to satisfy the king and councell of Spaine of the full satisfaction they have receaved and reall possession the Romaine Catholiques are in of the grace intended them', all in order, of course, to hasten the prince's return. This, it seemed, the ambassadors had more or less promised to do.[244]

Secretary Calvert confirmed on 2 August that the crown's official position was still that Catholics should enjoy 'a pardon for all penalties whatsoever, incurred by vertue of any statute made against priestes and recusantes untill this present, which pardon, to so many as would sue it out, should discharge them of all rentes, debtes and sommes of money due from them as recusantes'. This would put an end to all 'seazures' and 'duties' due from them to the king and also of all 'treasons, fellonies [and] premunir[i]es whereof they may stand guilty' under the law 'for being priestes, harbouring priestes, reconciliation to the Church of Rome', and for 'refusing the oathes of supremacy and allegiance', as well as other offences, so that judges and royal officials would not proceed against them concerning such matters. However, the Spanish diplomats had demanded that, instead of 'pardon[s] and privie seale[s]', there should be a

> proclamation for all, whereby his Majesty shall declare the grace he intendes to the Romane Catholiques in respect of the present conjuncture of his affayres, and that his expresse pleasure is not to have them molested or troubled with any exactions or demaundes of any penalties already incurred, nor by any proceeding against them heerafter

for any reason. For they said that if Catholics sued for pardons they would risk declaring themselves; moreover, it would also be

[243] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 243r.
[244] PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 140v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

very expensive. Calvert had done his best to persuade them that a proclamation was not possible.[245]

During the afternoon of 4 August 1623 a series of arguments took place between the English and Spanish negotiators about the legal security which Catholics would have if James were to proceed by way of 'pardon and dispensacion' rather than via the Spaniards' preferred method of a royal proclamation. Conway wrote to Calvert on the following day that

> wee shewed them the authoritie and inviolable dignitie of a greate seale which his Majestie would make good against himself and his successors and the weaknes of a proclamacion, which was but a suspencion of the lawe, might be made voyde by an other proclamacion and did not bynd a successor.

Furthermore, 'the judges, justices of peace and other inferior officers were the men that did [. . .] molest the recusants, and to them the pardon and dispensacion were to be directed, whereas the proclamacion was only to the vulgar sort of people that had no interest in the busines', or rather had no capacity to understand such things and were susceptible only to 'feare and rumor'. It was agreed that the Spanish ambassadors should have the services of a Catholic lawyer, assisted by George Gage, in order to 'looke into the validitie of the pardon and dispensacion', and the ambassadors then 'lett fall their pretence to a proclamacion', though they made a number of other requests. Conway believed here that they had managed to compromise, particularly over the issue of what would happen in the case of recusants who had compounded for their sequestrated property and had seen those compositions granted to third parties. Inojosa promised to certify the agreement on these issues to the court in Spain.[246]

[245]PRO, SP 14/150/10, fo. 12r–v; PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 152r; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 71r. Cf. Calvert's queries of 24 July 1623 concerning how to execute the king's promise about recusants, i.e. exactly how the extant fines should be remitted, and whether other penalties, inflicted, for example, by high commission, should be discarded: PRO, SP 14/149/38.

[246]PRO, SP 94/27, fos 150r–151r; PRO, SP 14/150/29 (calendared in *CSPD, 1623–1625* under 6 August); PRO, SP 14/150/82; Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI & I*, p. 421. For Conway's much more detailed account of the meeting, which he sent to Buckingham (itself a fuller narrative than the one in the Domestic State Papers series), see BL, Harleian MS 1580, fos 318r–322v; PRO, SP 94/27, fos 152r–155v (in which Conway related that the ambassadors protested 'theire care of the peace of the state' and cited the 'orations they had made to the Romaine Catholiques to receave this grace thankfully as a meere grace of the king': PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 153v). On 6 August, Conway reported that Gage had been with him to arrange another meeting, between the ambassadors, Carlisle, and Conway himself, in order 'to accord upon some limitations of the matters to bee comprehended in the pardon and dispensation'. In return, Inojosa would write 'effectuall lettres [. . .] for the assurance of the full accomplishment of all on his Majesties part and hastening of the match': BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 324r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On 7 August, James Hay, earl of Carlisle, together with Conway, made a declaration that James intended to 'pass a free pardon to all his Roman Catholic subjects, whether priests or laymen, for offences of conscience only; and to include in the marriage treaty a suspension of all penal laws against them'. The same conditions were to apply in Ireland and Scotland as well, as the Spanish ambassadors had specifically required three days before.[247] On 8 August, a statement (counterparts of which were signed by Inojosa, Coloma, and Carlisle) was issued at Salisbury as part of an attempt to placate the Spaniards. It promised that a 'legall authenticall pardon' would pass under the great seal,

> wherein shalbee freely pardoned all those penaltyes, forfeitures and seisures, indictments, conviccions and incombrances whatsoever whereunto the Romaine Catholiques are lyable, and have bin proceeded against, or might bee, aswell preists as others for matter of conscience merely, and for which the rest of his Majesties subjects are not lyable,

though James insisted that grants of sequestrated recusants' property to crown nominees were not reversible. James promised a 'present suspention [...] under his Majesties seale of all those poenall lawes, chardges and forfeitures whereunto the Romaine Catholiques, subjects of his Majestie, have hitherto bin subject'. He guaranteed 'in the same graunt [...] a dispensacion and immunity' to all Catholics, both clergy and laity, from the laws which interfered with the 'exercise of theire [...] religion in their private howses without noise and publique scandall'. Similar, though rather more vague, promises regarding Catholics in Ireland and Scotland were incorporated in the document.[248]

All was not, in fact, settled by this agreement. The Spaniards remained very suspicious about the exact form in which the dispensation for Catholics would be cast.[249] Inojosa was far from happy about what seemed to him like deliberate prevarication concerning

[247] PRO, SP 14/150/47; PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 150v, see also *ibid.*, fo. 179r.

[248] BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 287r–289r; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 179r–v. For Conway's account of the meeting at Salisbury, see BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 326v.

[249] On 13 August, we find Conway fuming that the Spaniards had said that, 'instead of a lawier' (as James had promised them on 31 July to secure the pardons promised to Catholics), they wanted 'to have for [a] councellor the Lord Arundell of Wardour'. The day before, they had badgered Calvert to approach Arundell because, they said, it was 'the dead time of the vacation' and 'all the lawiers' were 'out of towne'. But Arundell's nomination was blocked. Calvert was instructed to inform the ambassadors that it would not 'sort with that privatenes and silence' which the king 'directs and expects this busines should be carryed in, to imploy a baron and peere of the realme': PRO, SP 94/27, fos 171r–v, 214r–v, 215r; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 243r; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 53, 54; PRO, SP 14/151/5; McClure, *LJC*, p. 513; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 389–390.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the toleration.[250] By 18 August, the ambassadors were threatening to inform their masters in Spain that the regime in London was not taking the issue seriously and could not be trusted.[251] They had noticed that the terms of the agreement meant that Catholics were 'exempted' only 'from such lawes and penalties to which the rest of his Majesties subjects are not lyable': this would not shield them from the acts of supremacy and uniformity. Calvert had to beg Conway to resolve this rather glaring deficiency, and James was not best pleased with this aspersion on his integrity. On 19 August, the attorney-general was ordered to rectify perceived defects in the format of James's proposed grant of toleration.[252] Calvert was dispatched to tell Inojosa that James's royal word could be relied upon. Inojosa attributed his spleen to his own 'naturall plainnesse', and said that he would, if necessary, behave in the same way with his own master. Calvert, who was far from unsympathetic towards the Spaniards, still took the opportunity to make a complaint about Philip IV's and the archduchess Isabella's delivery of their congratulations to the duke of Bavaria after his acquisition of the palatine electoral title. Inojosa and Coloma claimed that either it was not true or that it was merely a compliment and that Philip still intended to offer his protection to the elector palatine once a settlement was reached.[253]

After yet another dressing down of Inojosa from James, delivered in writing by Conway on 29 August, a further compromise was struck, in part through the intervention of George Gage. The period until which the toleration would commence was now lengthened from three months, as the Spaniards had understood it would be, to six months.[254] There was something close to desperation, though, in the

[250] Calvert reported on 14 August that the Spanish diplomats were irritated because he had refused to let them see the 'Englishe copie of those articles which were delivered unto them in Spanishe at Salisbury', i.e. the grant of toleration on the basis of which 'pardons and dispensacion' would be given to Catholics: PRO, SP 14/150/105, fo. 168r. A week earlier, Conway had informed the attorney-general that James still wanted to keep recusants 'in awe', and that the relevant warrants authorizing toleration should reflect the king's intention: PRO, SP 14/150/45; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 47. On 16 August, Conway was trying to delay the extension of the same favour to Scottish Catholics: PRO, SP 14/150/113. (There had been a stormy confrontation between two Scottish Catholic clergymen and Inojosa and Coloma in early August over the Spaniards' refusal to intervene on behalf of Scottish Catholics: PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 243v. A Scottish priest saw Inojosa subsequently, on 4 September, 'and spoke strongly to him about the ostentation and worldly aims of Spain in benefiting the religion in London alone, without caring about the provinces and still less for Scotland, just as if they were bastards of the Church': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 111.)

[251] PRO, SP 94/27, fos 215v–216r.

[252] PRO, SP 14/151/5, 6; PRO, SP 94/27, fos 215r, 216r–v, 216v–217r, 218r.

[253] PRO, SP 14/151/27, fos 36v–37r; PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 218r–v.

[254] PRO, SP 94/27, fo. 224r–v; BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 315r–316r; PRO, SP 14/151/61; cf. Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 52–53. For the format of the proposed dispensation whereby Catholics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

crown's efforts to avoid conceding more than was politically necessary. On 30 August, Williams informed the still-absent Buckingham of the roundabout procedural course held with English Catholics, of which mode of proceeding 'there are 20 of the privye counsaile [who] knowe nothinge as yet'. Williams, who wanted a general grant of toleration to be delayed until after the infanta's arrival, explained that it was the perception which mattered rather than whether Catholics actually obtained royal favour. By deciding to grant favour gradually, and by extending tolerance only to individual Catholics, Williams argued that the crown could avoid a hostile public reaction (perhaps even a 'tumult in three kingdoms'). It would also be very difficult to forbid the judiciary 'to execute the lawe of the land', though this was precisely what Williams had done in 1622.[255]

As for the bishop of Chalcedon, Williams understood that he was 'come to London privatelye'. The lord keeper was 'much troubled thereabouts, not knowing what to advise' the king. If the duke were 'shipped (with the infanta) the onely councel were', suggested Williams, 'to let the judges proceed with' the bishop 'presently, hang him out of the waye', and for 'the king to blame' the archbishop of Canterbury 'or my self for it'. But, before the royal party returned, Williams said that he dared not 'assent or connive at such a course'. Williams told the duke, however, that

> it is a most insolent part and an offence (as I take it) against our common law (and not the statutes onely which are dispensed withall) for an English man to take such a consecration without the kings consent, and especially to use any episcopal jurisdiction in this kingdom without the royall assent, and bishops have beene, in this state, put to theyr fine and ransom for doinge so three hundred yeares agoe.[256]

On the same day as Williams dispatched this letter to Buckingham, Chamberlain noted that 'our papists are verie busie and earnest (by the Spanish ambassadors meanes) to have a publike toleration, but yt seemes the king will not allow yt', and indeed 'suspects that our papists (for their owne ends) are the greatest hinderance of the speedie

were to be permitted freedom from vexation concerning Roman Catholic worship in their own houses and exemption from any requirement to attend church or take communion or take the two oaths (of supremacy and allegiance), see PRO, SP 14/151/76, 77. Conway admitted, in his account of the negotiations in the first week of August, that Gage had helped, 'by good interpretation' and 'by bearing witnes to the truth of the allegations concerning formalityes and condition of our state and lawe', to fend off the Spanish ambassadors' demands for a more extensive toleration: BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 321r.

[255] Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 157.

[256] *Cabala*, p. 81. See Ruigh, *1624*, p. 140; BL, Additional MS 34727, fos 47r–48r; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 94.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dispatching the match, and sayes he will make them repent yt, yf he find they continue to crosse him'.[257]

On 4 September, Conway assured Inojosa that the toleration measures agreed with the Spaniards had passed the great seal, though the marriage would have to go through before Catholics could draw any benefit from them. Two days later, Conway reminded Williams that, although James had indeed signed the toleration warrant for releasing imprisoned priests, it was not to be put into effect until certain news arrived from Spain about the betrothal or marriage of Charles and the infanta (and, of course, by this point, it was known that Charles was returning from Spain unwed). This had, unsurprisingly, infuriated the Spanish ambassadors.[258] Nevertheless, a commission was drawn for Williams on 8 September to grant 'pardons and dispensations [. . .] to Catholics, for five years [. . .] on account of the intended marriage between the prince of Wales and the Lady Mary of Spain'.[259]

The Spanish diplomats were being made increasingly aware of their unpopularity in London. Whereas, in general, apprentices had merely shouted ruderies at Gondomar, their coaches were now being stoned when they appeared in public. (In the first week of September, one of their men got into a fight with, and killed, a baker in the Strand.[260]) Inojosa and Coloma knew well enough that diplomatic failure on their part might lead to their own political demise. They were furious that the Spanish council of state was being so tardy, and they badgered James to allow real evidence of the toleration to be seen.[261] In mid-September, Williams was quite candid about the fact that he was deceiving the Spaniards by making them think that the delays were the result of administrative hiccoughs and that the king was himself urging his officials to expedite matters.[262]

[257] McClure, *LJC*, p. 513.

[258] PRO, SP 14/152/4, 19, 20; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 85r–v; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 246r, 247r.

[259] PRO, SP 94/28, fo. 10r; *CSPD, Addenda 1580–1625*, p. 657; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 76; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 137–138.

[260] PRO, SP 14/152/4, 18; Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', p. 125; cf. Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 392.

[261] PRO, SP 14/152/36.

[262] PRO, SP 14/152/46, 46.i, cited in *Letter 30*; see also PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 249r. Though Conway commanded Williams on 7 October 1623 (two days after Charles's return from Spain) to execute the order releasing Catholic clergy from the prisons, a few days later Conway told the lord keeper that James had now directed the requisite letters to bishops and justices to be held back: *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 89; PRO, SP 14/153/39; PRO, SP 94/28, fo. 133r; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 259r; though cf. *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 131; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 166. In fact, subsequently (on 8 November 1623), the exchequer was ordered to suspend recusants' payments of fines due at Michaelmas: PRO, SP 14/154/15. On 6 December, Chamberlain recorded that 'our papists of Cheshire and Lancashire, beeing called upon

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thomas Cogswell has evoked the euphoria which greeted Charles's return from Spain. General celebration spontaneously broke out when, clearly unmarried, he appeared back in the country on 5 October, although his return was being anticipated at least three weeks beforehand. The public rejoicing, the sheer apparent unanimity of opinion that the nation had been saved at the last minute from the jaws of the Habsburgs and of popery, was a sign that 'many saw the passing of the Anglo-Spanish alliance as the advent of an Anglo-Spanish war'.[263]

The new mood was demonstrated by the popular reaction to the 'fatal vespers', the collapse of a building in the gatehouse of the French embassy in Blackfriars in which Catholics had gathered to hear a Jesuit sermon. Official tracts on the incident deployed a rhetoric of moderation;[264] other publications about the event were much less sympathetic.[265] It certainly allowed anti-popish elements in the London crowd an opportunity to vent their frustrations at the rudderless drift in official policy towards Spain and English Catholics. A hostile mob attempted to stone the survivors and even tried 'to set an injured lady afire when she was travelling in her coach as they attempted to fix a broken wheel'.[266] Inojosa complained that, upon this 'tragic event', the 'heretics have begun to build a case to attack the Catholic religion'.[267] François de Carondelet lamented that Bishop George Montaigne had refused burial to the Catholic dead in London churchyards and directed that 'as excommunicates they [should] be

for certain payments and debts to the king for recusancie, had recourse to the Spanish ambassador as their mediator, upon whose motion the king gave order those payments shold be respited till our Lady-day when his pleasure shold be further knowne, but I heare those gentlemen are sent for by pursevants to aunswer their dooings': McClure, *LJC*, p. 530.

[263]Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', pp. 107–111, 126; *idem*, *BR*, introduction, ch. 1; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 248r.

[264]See W.C., *The Fatall Vesper* (London, 1623); Thomas Goad, *The Dolefull Even-Song* (London, 1623); T.H.B.M. Harmsen (ed.), *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare (1624)* (Nijmegen, 1992).

[265]For less moderate Protestant accounts, see, e.g., Thomas Scott, *Boanerges. Or the humble supplication of the ministers of Scotland* (Edinburgh [false imprint; *vere* London], 1624), which strongly implied (p. 26) that 'it was a judgement of God [. . .] to kill a hundred people with the fall of a loft', and warned the parliament of 1624 that 'at Rome there hath been solemne procession, and from Rome letters of discovery, that in England God hath beene so angrie with the hereticks [. . .] that churches and lofts have overwhelmed many of them in their ominous falls'. For D'Ewes's remark in his diary that 'S^{t} Giles Church by Blomesburye fell downe, but a little before, a great parte which had slaine manye, if they had been ther when it fell, which would have been if it had fallen in a sermon time', see *DSSD*, p. 168.

[266]CRS, 68, p. 160.

[267]*Ibid.*, p. 157.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

buried on the refuse pile and that the clothes they wore were to be stripped off'.[268]

Catholics retaliated with allegations that puritans had been responsible for the tragedy.[269] A Jesuit pamphlet claimed that all those who had perished there might be presumed to have died in a state of grace, listening to a Jesuit sermon.[270] The Spanish diplomats used the incident to push on, however vainly, with their suit for official toleration. They argued that the English Catholics, 'being denied safer places for their exercises', were 'constrained to adventure themselves in such dangerous ones'.[271]

With Buckingham's volte-face over the match, support for war was now virtually incompatible with opposition to the duke.[272] His authority at court was almost complete. The downfall of the ministers who had supported the marriage would, eventually, leave him to advise on, if not in effect to make, their successors.[273] For Charles and Buckingham, however, it was also going to be a war where tight control would be kept over strategic objectives. They wanted a limited campaign, in alliance with the Catholic French. They did not intend to invoke a Protestant–Catholic Armageddon.[274]

[268] *Ibid.*, p. 160. Most of the dead were interred in the courtyard of the French embassy, with some thirty being taken for burial to the Spanish embassy at Ely House: Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, p. 82, n. 70.

[269] Joseph Mead was told that John Price, a Catholic doctor who practised in Chancery Lane, had alleged that 'the puritans of Blackfriars' had caused the accident 'by unpinning' of the 'great main beam' underneath the room: Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 427. Daniel Featley likewise recorded the Catholic claim that 'the Protestants at Blacke-fryers, by knocking certaine pins out of the timber, caused that late and lamentable fall of the floar wherin about 200 papists were assembled, and neere a 100 slaine': Daniel Featley, *The Romish Fisher Caught and Held in his Owne Net* (London, 1624), sig. Ar. The rector of St Anne's, Blackfriars, William Gouge (who was a prominent supporter of the elector palatine and his wife), was asked to investigate the allegation that the supports of the room had been deliberately weakened: Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, pp. 53–54; Adams, PC, pp. 316–317. Thomas Knyvett wrote that, although 'it was a most fearefull judgment of God', 'for all this the papists gives [*sic*] out that it was a plott of the puritanes': B. Schofield (ed.), *The Knyvett Letters (1620–1644)* (London, 1949), p. 62.

[270] John Floyd, *A Word of Comfort* (Saint-Omer, 1623); *Relacion de un caso en que murieron muchos Catolicos oyendo la palabra de Dios* (Valladolid, [1623]); ARCR, I, nos 382–383; McClure, *LJC*, p. 520.

[271] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 150.

[272] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 147–149.

[273] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 64–65. For Buckingham's break with Lord Keeper Williams, see *Cabala*, pp. 86–90; K. Sharpe, 'The earl of Arundel, his circle and the opposition to the duke of Buckingham, 1618–1628', in K. Sharpe (ed.), *Faction and Parliament* (London, 1978), p. 221.

[274] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 69f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Recent developments, such as the ceding of the Bergstrasse in the Lower Palatinate ('the prime flower of our sonne in lawe's revenue', as James described it) to the archbishop of Mainz, had made it clear that Spain was not thinking in terms of restitution at all. In December, even the ever-optimistic Bristol had to admit that the Spaniards were preparing for a breach of amity. At the end of the month it was known that the infanta had given up trying to learn English.[275] During November and December 1623 there were proposals from Bavaria entertained in London that the eldest son of the elector palatine should marry the niece of Duke Maximilian. James appeared ready to consider this suggestion, since it would still allow him to avoid entanglement in a military confrontation with the Habsburgs. However, the diplomatic difficulties in the way of a Palatine–Bavarian match proved predictably insurmountable.[276]

Yet, to the bafflement of many, although the treaties with Spain were clearly suspended, James's Hispanophile policy was not actually abandoned.[277] Francophiles such as Sir Edward Herbert had, of course, immediately begun to lobby for an Anglo-French dynastic union. He advised the king in late October 1623 that the Spaniards had been insincere all along and that he should consider the response in France of the 'bons François' and of the Huguenots who rejoiced at the return of Prince Charles from Spain. The Huguenots devoutly wished that 'the same greatnes which the king of Spaine doth so affect over all the worlde [. . .] your [. . .] Majestie would imbrace' instead, 'in beeinge defender of our faithe'.[278] In the first week of November, the count of Tillières anticipated that the English would now turn to France, though he was hardly enthusiastic about the prospect of such an alliance. A week before Christmas, he thought that approaches made to him by Carlisle and Buckingham were 'un artifice de ce roy pour donner subject à l'Espagne de renouer avec luy'.[279] But, as late as 30 December, Conway recorded the king's fury at the 'forged bruite of the princes treating for marriage in France'.[280] Even in January 1624, most observers agreed that the privy council was divided over how to proceed. The court seemed to be reverting to something like

[275] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 26; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 167, 207; PRO, C 115/107/8485; PRO, SP 94/29, fos 10r–v, 27r–v, 106r–108r, 130r–131r, 148v, 189r. For Bristol's continuing diplomatic efforts to broker a deal over the Palatinate and to salvage the marriage treaty, see Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 332–334; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 272v.

[276] Pursell, *WK*, pp. 208–210, 218–221; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 265r; *Letter 41*.

[277] PRO, SP 94/29, fos 209r–212v.

[278] BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 21r–22r.

[279] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 262v, 283v.

[280] PRO, SP 94/29, fo. 190v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

business as usual, namely a complex balancing act of simultaneous negotiation between foreign powers in a seemingly endless search to extract better conditions and political advantage by playing the one off against the other. James had still not given up hope that a deal might be worked out with the Spaniards.[281] The decision to summon a parliament, which (according to Ruigh) was being considered in the second week of November 1623, was regarded, it seems, as a lever to bring the Spaniards to some kind of accommodation, rather than as a forum to break the treaties.[282]

Certainly, there is evidence that English Catholics had not despaired of the Anglo-Spanish alliance. In early October, shortly before Charles disembarked, Tillières remarked that some Catholics were in cloud-cuckoo-land, thinking that Charles was 'grandement amoureux de l'infante' and would persuade James to secure 'sincèrement les points nécessaire à donner fin au mariage'.[283] In early December, Chamberlain conceded that Tillières, who, after the embarrassment of the 'fatall vespers' in the French embassy complex, had transferred to other premises, now 'admitts no more of our Romish Catholikes to his Masse or mattens'. He would 'have no more to do with them for, do them what favor or goode offices he can, yet still he sayes he finds them all Spanish'.[284]

One of James's reactions to the impending return of the prince had been to consider seriously one of the other Habsburg proposals which had been put forward in order to resolve the Palatinate question. During early October, James had made a formal approach to the elector to consider again Madrid's suggestion of a marriage between his son Frederick Henry and the emperor's younger daughter.[285] There was, of course, no possibility that Frederick would assent to it in the form that the Habsburgs demanded, in other words without restoration of the Palatinate to himself.[286] On 20 November, James tried, yet again, and equally unsuccessfully, to persuade the elector to agree to his son being set up in the Palatinate, and that the boy should marry into the Habsburg family on the condition that the crucial

[281] Russell, *PEP*, p. 148; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 118–119.
[282] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 27.
[283] PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 253r.
[284] McClure, *LJC*, p. 529.
[285] See Pursell, ESP, p. 722; *CGB*, I, pp. 372, 378. For Olivares's proposal of this scheme to the Spanish council of state in August 1623 (something which Charles accepted in principle, as Pursell says, on 10/20 August), see Pursell, ESP, p. 716.
[286] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 53; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 109; Pursell, ESP, p. 722; Adams, PC, p. 336; PRO, SP 94/28, fo. 188r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

period of his education was reassigned to the English court, though under the tutelage of the infanta.[287]

The Spanish diplomats were still regularly closeted with Buckingham, the king, and the prince, although, on 28 November, Valaresso was saying that Coloma had 'remarked that in the long run a war would be better for the Catholics than the marriage'.[288] In the third week of December, William Bishop reported that 'there be some that thinke' the Anglo-Spanish treaty 'wilbe peeced up againe one way or other, bicause it is holden in reason of estate so convenient both for the one king and thother'. The Spaniards were still making arrangements for the wedding to go ahead by proxy, and, indeed, the new dispensation, issued by Urban VIII, was brought to Madrid in late November. However, as we remarked above, on 26 November/6 December the earl of Bristol received instructions to link the marriage inseparably with a deal over the Palatinate. His immediate notification of this to the Spanish council of state was taken as a breach of the treaty.[289]

In mid-January 1624, quite extraordinarily, the Spaniards raised the stakes by offering that the infanta would land on English soil in March and that the Spanish-dominated part of the Palatinate would be handed back in August. At the same time, they promised 'to make urgent representations for the surrender of the rest to the palatine' under conditions laid down by the English diplomats in Spain. Furthermore, they consented to the marriage of the elector's son with the emperor's daughter, and to the supervision of Frederick's son at the English court. According to Valaresso, who reported this on 2 February, 'the king seems determined, the ambassadors revitalised and the Hispanophiles relieved'. Conway alone stood out against this. In the end it was Charles's utter refusal, as Buckingham suffered one of his many nervous collapses, to go along with this proposal that stymied the threat to the emergent war party.[290]

To the consternation of the war party, James seemed never to lose hope that he could reach a settlement based on negotiation rather than bloodshed. Only a slim majority on the privy council foreign affairs

[287] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 28; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 156, 158–159; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 270v. Charles soon declared himself opposed to this project: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 164; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 274v; cf. *Letter 36*.

[288] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 156–158, 165. Back in May 1623, Tillières had claimed that Coloma 'ne favorise pas le mariage', partly out of spite towards Gondomar and partly because he thought Spain's interests would not be served by it: PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 205v.

[289] *Letter 35*; Pursell, ESP, p. 723; BL, Additional MS 72286, fo. 119r.

[290] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 207–208; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 111r; *CCE*, pp. 147–148, 151; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 539–540; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 128–130, 133; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 39–40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

committee endorsed the decision that parliament should be called.[291] In late January, councillors were divided even over the question of how the treaties with Spain should be broken. While some simply wanted a 'public declaration' from Charles, others wanted 'detailed information about the whole affair'. They believed that Buckingham would thereby be ruined.[292]

From late December, however, Catholic newsletter writers avidly followed the progress of a new set of dynastic marriage negotiations, namely with the French court. William Bishop observed on 18 December that Buckingham and Carlisle had already conferred with the French ambassador 'about matching our prince in France as many do presume'.[293] Lord Kensington was sent to France in February to pursue the matter, though he had no formal commission to do so because the Anglo-Spanish treaties had not yet been broken. He appears to have made, initially, a number of negotiating errors: for example, he suggested that the marriage should be concluded separately from a military alliance between the two realms.[294]

It was hard, at least for the Catholics, to believe that Buckingham would manage to dazzle parliament in the way that he had obviously captivated the prince. Thomas More, the former secular clergy agent, now back in London, noticed on 9 February 1624 that 'great bandying ther is against the duke, and much opposition is like to be against him in the parlament' even though he had apparently 'won the puritan faction in great part' by his quarrel with the Spaniards. Moreover, on the privy council, only Carlisle and Conway seemed to be taking his side; the others, especially the earls of Pembroke and Arundel, were against him.[295] John Lockwood had heard that Buckingham was in disgrace because he had sent a message to the Spanish ambassador and had represented it as the word of the king. This had forced Buckingham to grovel before James. In Cambrai it was being rumoured that Buckingham was in the Tower.[296] On 5/15 February 1624, Anthony Champney affected to believe that James was listening to Spanish promises about the Palatinate, and that the earl of Bristol had been told to stay in Spain.[297]

[291] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 34.
[292] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 211.
[293] *Letter 35*.
[294] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 38–39; PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 20r; *Letter 43*; R.E. Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage for an Anglican prince', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 50 (1981), pp. 5, 6–7. For the difficulties encountered by Kensington, see also Adams, FP, pp. 157–158.
[295] AAW, B 26, no. 10; *Letter 37*.
[296] AAW, B 26, no. 11.
[297] *Letter 37*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When the Catholics did realize how far things had changed, it was undoubtedly, for many of them, a shattering blow. But the dislocations and incoherences within the court gave them a breathing space in which to revise their attitudes to the crown's dynastic policy, as well as to renegotiate their contacts with the foreign embassies in London. The French ambassador, Tillières, who had allowed the Jesuits the use of French embassy property, now offered entertainment to the leading secular clergy.[298] William Bishop opined that 'we must alwaies joyne with them whom our king most respecteth; which some now imagine to be rather the Frenc[h]e than the Spanish'. Bishop instructed the new clergy agent in Rome, Thomas Rant, to tell Urban VIII that Tillières was 'a very honest and zealous Catholike, and favoreth recusants and priest[s] so farr forth as he may, and is very ready to assist us all'.[299]

The secular clergy's opponents were, however, not going to be outdone easily, and started to realign themselves as well. To Bishop's disdain, Sir Tobias Mathew, 'who was knighted for his good service in Spain, declares himself openly to be for the duke of Buckingh[am] and saith he hath reason to do as he doth, that is, to be against the Spanish match, and that our prince was not well used there', and that Olivares was 'a darke and dull felow'.[300]

One of the conditions for this new match was obviously going to be some form of French military assistance for the recovery of the Palatinate. At the same time, the French court had to avoid concluding an alliance which could be construed as, in any sense, confessionally Protestant.[301] Thus it was with reasonable optimism that the leadership of the secular clergy could lobby at Rome and ask the papacy to persuade Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis, and her increasingly independent client Cardinal Richelieu to stand as firmly for the Catholics in England as ever the Spaniards had done. (In fact, very shortly before his own death, Bishop himself wrote to Louis, on 10 April 1624, begging him to secure the repeal of the penal laws as a condition of the marriage treaty.[302]) It was devoutly to be hoped that the pope would not show weakness over the dispensation which would now be demanded by the French. Tillières, who was a *dévot* Catholic (even the Spaniards admitted that he did not quite fit their picture of

[298] For some years, Tillières had employed the secular priest John Varder as a chaplain: Anstr., II, pp. 326–327; *Letters 35, 47*.

[299] *Letter 40*.

[300] *Letter 38*. Subsequently, the marquis of Effiat recorded that Mathew's knighthood had been procured by Buckingham, and confirmed that Mathew had thrown off his affection for Spain: PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 329v.

[301] Tillières, *ME*, pp. xvi–xvii.

[302] Allison, RS, p. 165; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the archetypal unprincipled Frenchman), had been informed of the conditions which the Spaniards had demanded.[303]

Tillières had of course been in contact with Francophile English courtiers, particularly with the staunchly Protestant earl of Carlisle.[304] His stock began to rocket once the Spanish match failed. Roy Schreiber claims that Tillières could not reconcile his *dévot* Catholicism with his country's national interest sufficiently to take advantage of the English break with Spain; and certainly he was extremely vocal about the difficulties of an alliance with a regime which was riding a wave of Protestant enthusiasm.[305] Thomas Cogswell argues, however, that his equivocal attitude to the proposed Anglo-French match was at least partly a response to his own political instructions; and his doubts were informed by political realism as well as by religious principle. He was in a good position to watch Londoners' displays of anti-popery. Of course, such displays were grist to the mill of a French diplomat who had no desire to see the Anglo-Spanish negotiations succeed, and who argued consistently that the proposed treaty would undermine the British state. But, equally, there was no reason to think that English Protestants would necessarily be any less anti-popish about a French princess.[306] Tillières had told François de Carondelet that, although he had been directed from Paris to negotiate an Anglo-French dynastic treaty in order to forestall the Spanish one, he was personally opposed to the idea, since he feared the consequences of an English alliance with the Huguenots 'if the king of France and his brother died without sons'.[307]

The French therefore avoided putting their cards on the table until they were sure that the Anglo-Spanish treaty was finally broken.[308] In January 1624, Sir Edward Herbert had summarized the position in France thus: 'the bigot partie tell the kinge that he ought to take this time to settle his affaires at home by reducinge' the Huguenots 'to an entier subjection', while the 'bons François [. . .] wish him not to loose this opportunitie to enter into league with' James 'for remittinge the affaires of Christendome into the state in which they were' in the reign of Henry IV. However, 'the graver sort of counsailors' believed that

[303]CRS, 68, p. 157; AAW, A XVII, no. 110, p. 355 (cited in *Letter 42*).

[304]Among Tillières's friends at court was also the Catholic Robert Maxwell, 1st earl of Nithsdale: PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fos 71v, 73r.

[305]Schreiber, *FC*, p. 56; PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fos 73r–74v.

[306]Cogswell, *BR*, p. 125. For Tillières's scepticism about the Spanish match, see, e.g., PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 26v: PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 223r–224r.

[307]CRS, 68, p. 161.

[308]Cogswell, *BR*, p. 125.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Louis should remain 'undeclared' until James's breach with Spain was overt.[309]

The 1624 Parliament

The new parliament assembled on 19 February. It had been postponed first by the hard frost and deep snow and then by the sudden death of the second duke of Lennox on 16 February. Thomas More remarked that he 'was a noble man of such worthie disposition that he carryed with him generallie the hartes of all and particulerly the Catholickes because of his good affection and furtherance of the match with Spayne', an odd judgment considering his presence among the 'Bohemian' faction and his reputation for opposing the Spanish match.[310] Those who did take their places in the session were definitely not so charitably inclined, particularly when stories flooded in from around the country that papists were preparing to challenge the rule of law and perhaps even to raise rebellion.[311]

As Cogswell notes, the opening of the parliament witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of former opponents (Sir Dudley Digges, Sir Edwin Sandys, Sir Robert Phelips, and Sir Edward Coke) rallying to Charles's and Buckingham's standard.[312] James's speech on 19 February denounced the false dealing of the Spaniards. He professed also that he had never intended anything more than a temporary reduction of the force of the laws against the practice of Catholicism, although, as Conrad Russell and Simon Adams point out, exactly how far he was prepared to go in following the Commons's anti-Spanish line was not clear.[313] Lord Keeper Williams, who was in some sense the architect of the limited toleration previously granted to Catholics, applauded James's speech but remained under attack throughout the session.[314]

[309] PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 9r.

[310] *Letter 39*. Lennox had, however, with Pembroke, Belfast, and Hamilton, abstained when Buckingham urged the junta for foreign affairs in January 1624 to endorse the breach of the treaties with Spain before parliament met: Adams, FP, p. 156; see also *CCE*, p. 165.

[311] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 139; *Letter 39*.

[312] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 149.

[313] PRO, SP 14/159/55; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 228–229; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 155–156; Adams, FP, pp. 164–165; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 155; ED, fos 1r–4r; *Letter 39*. For Conway's attempts to ensure that Inojosa and Coloma did not take 'ombrage ou offense par faux rapports' of James's speech, see PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 121r.

[314] See *Letter 39*; *LJ*, III, p. 269; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 193. For Sir George Calvert's admonitory message from James, delivered on 1 March, concerning petitions against Williams 'allreddy in the hows', see Thompson, *HA*, pp. 13–14; see also Russell, *PEP*, pp. 160, 166. Buckingham was now openly hostile to Williams: Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 175.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cogswell emphasizes, however, how extraordinary were the concessions which James made in this address, in the sense that he 'gave parliament *carte blanche* to discuss the domestic religious situation as well as the diplomatic one abroad'.[315] The speaker of the Commons, Sir Thomas Crew, made the not-unexpected request, in his response of 21 February, for legislation against monopolies and other evils, and for the execution of penal statutes against the Catholics.[316] James's toleration of all this was, says Cogswell, apparently an official sign of 'approval of a campaign against the recusants'.[317] There were calls that papists should have their military hardware taken from them;[318] and, at the opening of convocation on 21 February, Joseph Hall delivered a strongly anti-popish sermon.[319]

One Commons member, Sir Thomas Gerard, MP for Liverpool, was ejected because of suspicions about his religion.[320] Some members directed their barbs against the bishop of Chalcedon. Valaresso reported in mid-March that this was not surprising because William Bishop had 'passed all bounds and perhaps exceeded his commissions in consecrating priests, dispensing titles, dressing in the episcopal vestments and finally erecting a public tribunal', though it is not clear that he did any of these things except, perhaps, use episcopal apparel.[321] The parliament also heard complaints against Matthew Kellison, the president of the English College at Douai. Kellison was known to be in England on financial business.[322]

This, then, was the context for the ensuing denunciations of Spanish treachery and hostility, denunciations which came from the heart of the regime. Buckingham addressed the House of Lords on 24 February, and was extremely scathing about the earl of Bristol's dealings in Spain. The duke and Prince Charles placed themselves at the head of a prospective war party.[323] Following a series of committee reports

Williams complained on 2 February 1624 about the 'report of the Venecian embassador that [. . .] your Grace intended to sacrifice me this parliament to appease the dislike of immunityes exercised towards the Catholiques': BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 140r.

[315] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 167.

[316] PRO, SP 14/159/66; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 158–159; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 235–236. Crew had come back from Ireland, whither he had been sent for his opposition in the previous parliament: Russell, *PEP*, p. 156; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 168.

[317] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 168.

[318] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 169–170.

[319] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 169.

[320] *Letter 40*; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 89, 259–260.

[321] *Letter 39*; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 249.

[322] AAW, B 26, no. 27 (cited in *Letter 39*).

[323] T. Cogswell, 'The people's love: the duke of Buckingham and popularity', in Cogswell, Cust, and Lake, *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 216–219; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 169, 171, 172; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 162f.; *Letter 39*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and conferences, rehearsing the perfidy of the Spaniards, on 5 March, Archbishop Abbot, in the name of both Houses, urged the king to break the treaties.[324]

A succession of speakers then called for war against the Spaniards in retaliation for their trickery and their recent deliberate encouragement of the growth of popery in England. In particular, a joint report from Lords and Commons stated that 'whereas heretofore' the Catholics 'have bene devided amongst themselves in the partie of the Jesuitts, depending uppon Spayne, and the secular preists', who did not, now 'they are generally [. . .] strongly united together, depending no lesse on Spayne for temporall respects than uppon Rome for spirituall' ones.[325]

But it was far from clear that the regime was necessarily going to follow the Commons's lead on religion. Catholics said that Lord Keeper Williams had censured the speaker of the House, Crew, for his godly zeal against papistry on the grounds that it would make a nonsense of the crown's future foreign-policy plans.[326] James replied to the deputation from Lords and Commons on 5 March, with its address urging the rupture of the treaties with Spain, in part by justifying his courses towards Catholics.[327] He told his hearers that he knew best how to handle such matters, though he guaranteed that revenue voted for the recovery of the Palatinate should be administered by the Commons's commissioners.[328] James still wanted a negotiated settlement and he warned of the perils of war.[329] There ensued a suspicion-driven round of bargaining about how much war revenue should be generated through taxation, on whom the burden would principally fall, and how the money would be used.[330] For Russell, this showed that the Commons was not fully committed to war; for Cogswell, it meant that the members would not commit themselves to

[324]ED, fos 41r–51v; PRO, SP 14/160/29; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 248; Russell, *PEP*, p. 176; *LJ*, III, pp. 246–247. A copy of Abbot's speech was sent to Thomas Rant in Rome: AAW, A XVII, no. 107, pp. 347–350.

[325]Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 178–180, 181–182; PRO, SP 14/160/27, fo. 42r; ED, fos 41r–42r. Christopher Brooke claimed on 2 March that 'oure papists were not as the papists in France, Italy etc., for oure papists ar all Spanish papists': Thompson, *HA*, p. 14.

[326]*Letter 39*; PRO, SP 14/169/67.

[327]James's reply (reported in the Commons on 8 March) was 'the first occasion in the parliament when James had publicly to declare himself and to reveal how little he was prepared to concede': Adams, FP, p. 167. According to Holles's diary, James would 'have no warr, but upon necessity, as wemen ar called necessary evils': Thompson, *HA*, p. 25; ED, fos 57v–60v.

[328]Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 185; *Letter 40*.

[329]*Letter 40*.

[330]Adams, FP, pp. 167–170.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

voting a large revenue grant before they knew that there was definitely going to be a war.[331]

Most contemporaries, however, were certain that there would be a disjuncture between James's likely courses and some of his godlier subjects' expectations. James's meaning in his 5 March address had to be carefully re-explained by Charles.[332] Another deputation, led by Abbot, confronted the king on 14 March and demanded a breach of the treaties. Again James was noncommittal. He wanted five subsidies and ten fifteenths and then an annual grant of one subsidy and two fifteenths. Of James's speech of 14 March, Edward Nicholas remarked that it 'was thought to contradict all that had been said by the prince or Buckingham; the papists begin to brag'. Abbot was so disconcerted 'that he was sick, and absented himself for a day from the House'.[333] The Spanish ambassadors, who had not shown 'their heads out of doores for a fortnight together', went out and 'passed as it were in triumph through Cheapeside'.[334] James's demand had to be frantically renegotiated, largely through Buckingham's efforts, to an overall grant of six subsidies and twelve fifteenths.[335] Following the long subsidy/war debate on 19 and 20 March,[336] James tried to repair the damage further with a somewhat convoluted reply to a delegation from Lords and Commons on 23 March concerning the Houses' joint declaration of the same day.[337] The preamble attached to the eventual subsidy bill did contain a statement that the alliance and treaties with Spain were indeed broken, as Buckingham himself insisted to both Houses on 24 March.[338]

The parliament broke up briefly for Easter (between 26 March and 1 April). At this point, Charles ordered Lord Kensington to open formal negotiations for a dynastic match with France. Instructions were then drawn up for Kensington and Carlisle to deal with the French both for a treaty of arms (though the French ultimately balked at this) and for

[331] For Russell's account of the debates on the topic of supply and foreign policy, see Russell, *PEP*, pp. 177f.; cf. Cogswell, *BR*, p. 186. For Buckingham's controversial use of the subsidy revenue, granted in this session, to support Mansfelt, see Adams, FP, pp. 158–159, 170–171.

[332] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 193; ED, fos 76r–77r.

[333] PRO, SP 14/160/77, 81; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 195, 196; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 210–211, 218; Adams, PC, p. 342; Thompson, *HA*, p. 36; *Letter 41*.

[334] PRO, SP 14/160/89, fo. 147r. See also McClure, *LJC*, pp. 548–549.

[335] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 195, 197–198; Adams, PC, p. 342; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 186; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 254–255; PRO, SP 14/160/79, 80, 81, 89; ED, fos 78v–80r, 83r–86r; *LJ*, III, pp. 265–266; *Letter 41*.

[336] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 200f.; Adams, PC, p. 343; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 216f.; Adams, FP, pp. 168–169; ED, fos 92v–100r.

[337] PRO, SP 14/161/19, 24; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 229–233; ED, fo. 104v.

[338] Adams, PC, p. 345; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 233–234, 248, 253.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a marriage, while negotiations were also conducted with the Dutch.[339] Kensington tried to persuade the French court that the whole business was not simply a device to exert pressure on the Spaniards to make concessions. Bristol, however, came through Paris on his way back from Spain; he told the French that that was exactly what it was. In this, he was backed up, from London, by Tillières.[340] James had met the Spanish diplomats on 29 March and had refused to declare the treaties completely at an end.[341]

When parliament reassembled on 1 April, it heard warnings from Buckingham about the danger of a Spanish invasion. There were demands for redress of commonwealth grievances, one of which was the problem of Catholicism;[342] and there was extensive debate on 2 April about the danger from popery. A parliamentary petition followed on 3 April, drawn up in the Commons for immediate removal to the Lords. As well as citing (ironically rather briefly) the military danger from Spain, it warned at great length of the indigenous papist threat, and in particular that the Catholics were flocking together in London, especially to the ambassadors' houses. It demanded the expulsion of the Romish clergy from the realm, the disarming of 'all popish recusants, legally convicted or justly suspected', the removal of popish officials and office-holders, and the general enforcement of the laws against Catholics without delay.[343] Its language was too violent and, after prompting by Charles in the Lords, another version (with significant changes) was hammered out there by 6 April, just as the impeachment process against Lord Treasurer Cranfield was gathering pace. This version merely called for execution of the statutes against Catholic clergy and recusants. The Commons was not unanimous in endorsing it – they insisted, for example, on the need for a proclamation against Catholic clergy – but by 10 April a deal had been done. The absolute demand for a proclamation was withdrawn in return for a promise that a day would be fixed for the ejection of Catholic clerics. In part, this was because it had been

[339] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 234; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 323–324; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 207; *Letters 42*, *43*; PRO, SP 78/72, fos 214r–220r; BL, Harleian MS 1584, fos 10r–15r. Dutch ambassadors had arrived in England in February 1624 and had been 'antagonized by the lack of interest shown towards them': Adams, FP, p. 170.

[340] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 59.

[341] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 235.

[342] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 230, 231–232; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 189; ED, fos 109r–v, 121r.

[343] ED, fos 113r–114r; PRO, SP 14/162/9; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 238f.; *LJ*, III, pp. 287, 289–290; TD, V, pp. cccxli–cccxliii; *Letter 44*. On 1 March, Sir Francis Seymour had warned of the 'concourse of recusants to ambassadors houses': ED, fo. 36v. In the context of Catholic rallies at some of the London embassies, the anger of MPs such as Seymour is quite comprehensible. See also, e.g., BL, Harleian MS 1583, fo. 293v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decided to deal with papist office-holders separately.[344] On 6 April, James had personally sent an explanation to Sir Walter Aston in Madrid (and through him to Philip IV) that he had consented to the breaking of the treaties on the advice of parliament, 'having not found anie example that anie king hath refused the councell of the whole kingdome composed of faithfull and lovinge subjects'.[345]

The breach of the treaties with Spain accelerated the proposals to deal with Catholics. The parliament's petition against recusants was presented to James by a deputation from both Houses on 23 April.[346] James then acceded to the request for a proclamation and he promised to deal with the scandal of public displays of Catholicism.[347] Wild overestimates were in circulation about the number of priests within the realm, especially in London, a situation on which John Gee's *The Foot out of the Snare* capitalized. Gee had been one of those who survived the 'fatal vespers' at Blackfriars on 26 October 1623. His 'conversion' to godly Protestantism was managed by Archbishop Abbot and his chaplains Thomas Goad and Daniel Featley. It is clear that Gee's revelations about the extent of the Catholic clerical network in London were supposed to confirm and amplify the complaints in parliament about the de facto toleration of the Catholic clergy – for example, Thomas Wentworth (MP for Oxford)'s exclamation on 25 February, 'is it not wonderfull that traytors should walke up and downe with impunit[i]e?'[348]

The proclamation was finally issued on 6 May.[349] An attempt was now made to purge the kingdom of popish officials. Lists were compiled of those who were suspected of popery but nevertheless exercised authority in their localities: prominent among them were the earls of Rutland and Castlehaven, Viscount Colchester, and Lords Windsor, Eure, Petre, Morley, Teynham, Wotton, and Scrope.[350]

[344] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 245; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 275; ED, fos 116r, 118r, 129v; *LJ*, III, pp. 291–292, 297–298; TD, V, pp. cccxli–cccxliv; AAW, A XIII, no. 75, p. 191.

[345] PRO, SP 94/30, fos 167r, 171v.

[346] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 250; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 191; *LJ*, III, pp. 317–318; PRO, SP 14/163/32, 33; TD, V, pp. cccxliii–cccxliv; *Letter 44*.

[347] TD, V, pp. cccxlv–cccxlvi. On 30 April, Jean Beaulieu said that he had heard that 'the Spanish ambassadors, to breede a jealousie in the myndes both of the parlament and of the people of the kings intent therein, have taken upon them to assure their clients the papistes' that the king 'will never be brought to put anie such thing in execution against them, but that it behoveth him at this point to putt on such a shewe for the necessitie of his affaires': BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 142r.

[348] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 303; Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*; Thompson, *RD*, p. 13. Cf. McClure, *LJC*, p. 556, for Chamberlain's claim on 30 April that '1,400 friers, Jesuites and priests are certainly knowne and discovered in the land'.

[349] See *Letters 44, 45, 47, 48*.

[350] *Letter 44*; TD, V, pp. 152–153; *LJ*, III, pp. 394–396.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At this time, news was leaking out that there had been an attempt to overthrow Buckingham. At an audience with James over two months before, on 26 February, Inojosa and Coloma had bitterly reviled the duke.[351] They sent messages to James via Carondelet, Coloma's chaplain, that Buckingham was working behind James's back to organize the Anglo-French treaty. On 1 April, Carondelet handed over a general diatribe which claimed that Buckingham was usurping the king's power and function, and that there was a proposal to force James into retirement, even a form of house arrest.[352] A follow-up visit from Diego de Lafuente took place on Saturday 3 April to reinforce the prejudices against Buckingham that, the Spaniards trusted, had now taken root in James's mind.[353] The Spaniards hoped for assistance from those at court whom they thought might be sympathetic to them. This turned out rather unsuccessfully in the case of Lord Keeper Williams because, as soon as Carondelet approached him, Williams revealed everything to Buckingham.[354] Lafuente met James again on 20 April and launched another withering attack on Buckingham, alleging that the two-faced duke was supplanting James by posturing as a Protestant saviour. He claimed that the Protestant cause looked not to Charles for leadership but to the elector palatine, and in fact desired him as James's heir. He also said that Buckingham was scheming to divert the succession to his own family via a marriage between the elector's elder son and his own daughter. (This was a rumour which Tillières had reported in January.)[355]

The conspiracy culminated with an audience on 24 April. On that day, Inojosa and Coloma insisted that Buckingham and Charles would depose James if he declined to accept the breach of the treaties with Spain.[356] Charles's intervention in Buckingham's favour proved crucial, in that it prevented privy council members from joining in the

[351] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 265. According to Sir Balthazar Gerbier, the conspiracy was undertaken when the archduchess Isabella's agent, van Male, obtained from 'one of the men at the post office att London' an unciphered copy of a letter from Buckingham to James's daughter, explaining that the Spanish match was broken and that a military assault on the Spaniards was imminent: BL, Additional MS 4181, fos 20r–22r. For a copy of the representations made against Buckingham by Inojosa and Coloma, dated 9 March, see BL, Harleian MS 1583, fos 329r–330v.

[352] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 271–272; PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 230r.

[353] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 272–273; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 273; McClure, *LJC*, p. 553.

[354] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 273–276; see also Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 198–199; *Cabala*, pp. 90–93.

[355] Albion, *CI*, p. 52; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 194; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 279–281; PRO, SP 14/164/8; PRO, PRO, 31/3/58, fo. 14r.

[356] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 282f.; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 251; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 195; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 443r. It was suspected that the disgraced lord treasurer, Cranfield, was involved in the conspiracy: PRO, SP 14/163/50; PRO, SP 14/164/12; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 193. For Lafuente's reinforcement of the charges against Buckingham, see PRO, SP 14/164/8, 12; for Inojosa's backtracking in early May, see PRO, SP 14/164/44. Sir Francis Nethersole

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attack. The council collectively swore on 2 May that Buckingham was innocent of the ambassadors' accusations.[357] The Spaniards, despite a last-ditch attempt to get the recently returned Bristol to approach James in their cause, had failed.[358] The courtier Sir Lewis Lewkenor, who in mid-1618 had gone to the Spanish embassy and reconciled himself sacramentally to the Church of Rome, was sent to the Tower for, on his own initiative, writing to Sir Richard Bingley 'to furnish [. . .] a shippe for the Spanish ambassador to goe over', in what appeared to be an attempt to get Inojosa out of the country and off the hook for the plot against Buckingham.[359] Inojosa had already reported to Madrid that James intended to declare war, and had given his opinion as to where the English and Dutch would attack first.[360]

It was obvious that James was nothing like as hostile to the Spanish diplomats as Charles and Buckingham were. The Jesuit Thomas Fitzherbert remarked in Rome in June 1624 that the Spaniards' accusations might prove true and that this would 'happely worke other effects than yet have been designed by the parlament'. Fitzherbert speculated that 'perhaps the king may take occasion hereby to breake of[f] the parlament re infecta, and yet fynd meanes to recover the money graunted him, which may be [. . .] the cheefe marke he aymed at from the beginning'.[361] Inojosa, and subsequently Coloma, of necessity prepared for their departure, although Diego de Mendoza, Gondomar's nephew, was soon on his way to replace them.[362]

The Spanish faction at court was, however, being comprehensively ejected from office. Williams had already lost favour with Buckingham, who could not brook the lord keeper's continued espousal of the match or forgive his attempt during 1623 to resolve the spat between Bristol and Buckingham in Spain. Williams was temporarily retained because Charles intervened on his behalf, but he never fully regained favour, and fell, finally, in October 1625.[363] Bristol was already disgraced for his rivalry with Buckingham. His case was referred to the foreign-policy junta in early June 1624. A show trial was considered but

claimed that the Spanish ambassadors blamed Carondelet for the vigour of the allegations against Buckingham: PRO, SP 14/164/46, fo. 81r.

[357] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 286–294, 359; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 195–196.

[358] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 359.

[359] PRO, SP 14/164/92, fo. 151r; CRS, 68, pp. 104–106; see also PRO, SP 16/164/86, fo. 141v.

[360] *CCE*, pp. 152, 160.

[361] PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 209r.

[362] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 301; PRO, SP 14/167/28; *Letter 44*. Inojosa was ordered, before he left, to set up 'un service d'espionage, afin de rester au courant des projets du monarque anglais': *CCE*, pp. 168, 174. At Brussels, Inojosa received instructions to return to Spain 'to declare the necessity and commodity of a warr': BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 312r.

[363] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 140–144; Adams, PC, p. 384; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 150.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

postponed (until 1626) because of the risk of embarrassment to the prince and the duke, and evidently because Bristol made it known that he would not go down without a fight.[364] Lord Treasurer Cranfield was impeached after he launched a challenge to Buckingham's monopoly at court via his brother-in-law Arthur Brett, a groom of the bedchamber.[365] His had been a largely financial commitment to the Spanish match, but his support for it was one of the things which publicly damned him, although the allegations brought against him of financial mismanagement and peculation indicated how widely he had made enemies. Cranfield's trial in the Lords began on 7 May. Sentence was given a week later. He was dispatched to the Tower.[366] Subsequently, Calvert was levered out of his secretaryship; he had refused to take the oath of allegiance.[367] Sir Francis Cottington became an enemy of Buckingham by continuing to side with the king and to argue for the maintenance of good relations with the Spaniards.[368]

The freelance military commander Count Ernst von Mansfelt had come to London and was lodged at St James's, near to the prince's own chambers.[369] His special skills were to be employed to regain the elector palatine's territories. As Simon Adams argues, Buckingham had no clear ideological standpoint in the matter of European religious division; or, rather, he had no incentive to follow an ideological commitment to the European Protestant cause. He bound himself to the French alliance in order to underwrite and justify the reaction against Spain, even though it was far from obvious that this reorientation would secure the Stuart court's other foreign-policy objectives. Adams comments that, 'since neither success in parliament nor the break with Spain was assured', Buckingham could not afford a setback to the alliance with France. But his 'grand alliance' against Habsburg power, via the Anglo-French dynastic treaty, surrendered a great deal of the initiative to the French; the alliance 'would be dominated by French political considerations, one of the most important of which was the weakening of international Calvinism', something which threatened to alienate godly Protestant opinion in Britain. In order to retain political momentum and to engage the Stuart court in a war which would prevent any revival of the former Hispanophile policy, Buckingham sanctioned the employment

[364] Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 362f.

[365] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 233; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 58–64; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 343; *HMCMK*, p. 198; AAW, A XVII, no. 133, p. 421.

[366] For Cranfield's impeachment, see M. Prestwich, *Cranfield* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 448f.; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 60–62.

[367] *Letter 81*.

[368] Ruigh, *1624*, p. 288.

[369] *Letter 44*; Adams, PC, p. 348; Pursell, *WK*, p. 222.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Mansfelt, who in April 1624 set out his proposal for an Anglo-French military expedition, from French territory, to retake the Palatinate. James was prevailed upon to hope that Mansfelt's 'expedition might become the basis for the Anglo-French military alliance'. Mansfelt travelled to France in May 1624 with an advance of £20,000, out of the subsidy, in order to guarantee English commitment to the scheme.[370]

The British thinking behind the proposed dynastic alliance with France was relatively simple. The French could challenge the Habsburgs militarily but they were, of course, a Catholic nation. An alliance with them would not appear to commit the British state to a Protestant crusade. Meanwhile, Habsburg victories were threatening to leave the Bourbon realm encircled. The French would look for the resolution of the Valtelline question in their favour. In return, they were prepared to commit themselves to the restoration of the Rhineland Palatinate, though that was not, of course, one of their own military objectives.[371] Moreover, the Gallican temper of much of the French Church was sufficiently anti-papal to offer a platform for friendship and understanding with the English Church and state, even if at a respectable distance.[372] In April 1624, Charles had, as Chamberlain narrated, given 'great satisfaction' in parliament with his assurance that 'yf he did treat of mariage with any of contrary religion, yt shold be with that caution that there shold be no manner of connivance but for herself and her servants straungers'.[373]

In all probability, the internal contradictions of the Anglo-French alliance were not immediately evident to Catholics, even though negotiations with the Dutch States-General were opened at this point.

[370] Adams, FP, pp. 154, 156, 157–158; *idem*, PC, pp. 345, 346, 347, 349; *Letter 44*; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 11; BL, Egerton MS 2596, fo. 3r. As Adams explains, Mansfelt's scheme for a military expedition to the Palatinate was attractive because it was comparatively cheap and his proposals 'for joint action with France and vague promises of French interest would provide the functional basis for the alliance with France': Adams, PC, p. 348.

[371] Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', pp. 4–5. The problem for the English negotiators who joined the issue of the stand-off between the French and the Spaniards in the Valtelline to that of the Palatinate was succinctly summed up by the Venetian ambassador in Paris, Zuane Pesaro. He noted in March 1624 that the English thought 'the French want to lead others into war while keeping at peace themselves' and therefore the English wanted 'to unite the Palatinate and the Valtelline into one common cause, owing to the fear that, if the French receive satisfaction, they will be left to fight alone': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 245.

[372] Cogswell, *BR*, p. 122; D. Lunn, 'The Anglo-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston, 1567–1647', in D. Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Studies in Church History, 9 (Cambridge, 1972), p. 239. See also PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 242r–v ('The exemptions of the Church of France from the jurisdiccion of the pope [. . .]'); *Letter 81*.

[373] McClure, *LJC*, p. 553; Albion, *CI*, pp. 52, 54; Thompson, *RD*, p. 62.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

All that they could immediately hope for was that parliament would be dissolved.[374]

In fact, it gradually became clear that religion would be an issue in the treaty and that English Catholics' influence would be far from negligible. As all commentators on the French match – both Catholic and Protestant –were well aware, the still-unresolved predicament of the Huguenots in France was a crucial part of the equation. The position of the English Catholics was, in some ways, analogous to theirs. The French negotiators' contacts with and support for the English Catholic minority could hardly be kept separate from the assistance which might be rendered to the Huguenots by the Stuart regime. Sir Edward Herbert had predicted in April 1624 that the French court, in the forthcoming negotiations, would 'hope to drawe a dependance from the Englishe papists for whome (that they may not seeme lesse Catholique than the Spaniard) they intend to require the same priviledges' as had been recently promised to the Spanish negotiators. Indeed, the 'Jesuits and their adherents' in France argued that this was a 'profitable' project for Louis XIII since, 'by this means, hee will ever have a partie in England to counterballance' the Huguenots. The bait which the French court held out to James was that French patronage 'would divide and distracte' the English Catholics 'from their dependance on Spaine and consequently raise a faction by which they might more easily bee governed'.[375]

At the same time, the regime headed by Richelieu had to deal with the fury of the Habsburgs' friends in France, who believed that a war against the House of Austria was quite simply incompatible with the duty of the French king to suppress heresy within his own kingdom. Richelieu was, it appears, never ideologically committed to either side of the argument between the *dévots* and those who called themselves *bons Français*.[376] In the end, he decided to crush the Huguenot challenge to the French state before turning to confront the threat of Habsburg supremacy in Europe. In the process, it was essential for the French crown not to be seen to be committing itself to what could be viewed as

[374] *Letters 44, 47*; Adams, PC, pp. 349, 364; Pursell, *WK*, p. 236. The conclusion of the agreement with the Dutch, a defensive alliance only, was delayed for quite some time, in fact until September of the following year.

[375] PRO, SP 78/72, fos 127v–128r; Adams, PC, p. 362. See also PRO, SP 78/72, fos 279v–280r; *Letter 75*. Tillières was able to report in early June that the 'principalles et plus zellés Catholiques' who had been to visit him now offered their thanks to the French king and his ministers 'touchant la loy que les puritains voulaient, que l'on passait contre eulx ce dernier parlement'; and also that they recognized 'les artiffices des Espagnols': PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 125r.

[376] Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 7; R. Briggs, *Early Modern France 1560–1715* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 95–96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a Protestant alliance with a Calvinist king. Hence the long-drawn-out arguments over compliance with the terms of the papal dispensation and the visible implementation of concessions to James's Catholic subjects which had been written into the treaty.

As Adams points out, Richelieu was initially presented with a real difficulty when it appeared that the enthusiasts in the 1624 parliament had secured 'a full-scale war' against the Habsburgs 'on a religious basis'. However, 'Buckingham's commitment to a French alliance and marriage surrendered the initiative and allowed Richelieu to hamstring the English leadership'.[377] The cardinal would soon come to dominate the negotiations.[378] The English priest Richard Smith, who was about to succeed William Bishop as bishop of Chalcedon, served as one of Richelieu's chaplains; and he used his influence with the cardinal to intervene on the English Catholics' behalf.[379]

In the initial stages of the negotiations, however, there was little to encourage the English Catholic community. The strategy of the French court was, at first, to allow the diplomatic bargaining with the Stuarts not to be pegged to the issue of toleration for James's Catholic subjects.[380] (English Catholics were, of course, desperate that the two should not be separated.[381])

On 1/11 May, Kensington informed Conway that he had used a recent meeting with Louis XIII to feel 'once againe their pulse in

[377] Adams, PC, pp. 426–427. Herbert predicted that the French would try to take advantage of the forthcoming Anglo-Spanish war to 'settle their owne affairs at home to the assured detriment' of the Huguenots, and he advised that James should 'bringe them [. . .] to some reall and infallible proofes' that they would assist him 'in the recovery of the Palatinate', for otherwise they would take advantage of their existing double marriage alliance with Spain in order to 'keepe themselves in [. . .] peace and neutrality': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 128r.

[378] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 313–314; PRO, SP 14/167/28.

[379] Questier, *C&C*, pp. 378–379, 418, 420, 421, 423, 425, 444, 453, 465, 466, 471, 493; *Letter 48*.

[380] Albion, *CI*, pp. 52–53. The instructions issued to Carlisle and Kensington on 17 May 1624 insisted that 'the constitution of our estate cannot beare any generall change or alteration in our ecclesiasticall or temporall lawes touching religion', even though, temporarily, such an offer had been made (for special considerations – namely the restoration of the Palatinate) to the Spaniards. Instead, James's ambassadors were told to promise Louis XIII that, 'in contemplation of' the marriage, James would 'bee the rather inclined' to treat his Roman Catholic subjects 'with all favor, soe long as they shall behave themselves moderately' and keep 'their consciences to themselves'. The quid pro quo was, by implication, that James would not intervene on behalf of the Huguenots: PRO, SP 78/72, fos 215v–217r; cf. BL, Harleian MS 1584, fos 11v–13r.

[381] Back in early February, William Bishop had informed Thomas Rant that 'we do request the Frenc[h]e ambassador that he will procure his king to write unto our kings Majestie to protect us, because that of the Spanish is [. . .] more hatefull to the puritans'. Rant should, said Bishop, 'obtaine, if you can, his Holines['s] letters to the king of France that he may write to our king to favour his Catholike subjects as our king hath written to him in favour of his Calvinists': AAW, A XVII, no. 96, pp. 314, 315; TD, V, pp. cclxxvi–cclxxvii.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

matters of religion' and found the attitude of the French court to be broadly favourable. Kensington dealt 'plainely with the marquis de La Vieuville' concerning the course that James might 'be driven to hould against Jesuites and priests, of banishing them the kingdome, and of quickening the lawes against the other Catholiques', partly in order to reduce them to obedience, and partly in order to keep 'good intelligence with his parlement, without which he could not possibly goe through with such a weighty worke as he is now to undertake'. Charles Coskaer, marquis de La Vieuville, 'approoved of the course for the ends sake', though he hoped 'notwithstanding that his Majestie would not tye his owne hands from some moderate favour heerafter'. The Frenchman trusted that even a limited toleration might 'flowe from the mediation' of the French state following the treaty 'for the saving of their honour, who otherwise wilbe hardly reputed Catholiques' at all.[382]

Towards the end of June, some observers, such as Sir Francis Nethersole and Dudley Carleton, thought that the French would not even insist on a papal dispensation for the proposed marriage.[383] Tillières, who was a friend of Pierre Brûlart, vicomte de Puisieux (displaced, with Nicolas Brûlart de Sillery, in January 1624), was recalled. Gordon Albion comments that it was 'a wonder he had stayed so long'. Tillières was succeeded by the more flexible Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat. The change of ambassadors was taken by some, quite wrongly in fact, as an indication that the French court would inevitably make concessions on religion in order to secure the match.[384]

Parliament was now adjourned until 2 November.[385] James hardly concealed his irritation with the members before they dispersed, although superficially his speech to them on 29 May made a few conciliatory noises. Sir Francis Nethersole's account of the speech put the best possible gloss on it. He stressed that James had refused only four bills, though this included the legislation against recusants; he

[382]BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 28r.

[383]PRO, SP 14/168/40, 48; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 122–123; *HMCMK*, pp. 212, 218, 224. For the question of whether such a dispensation was in fact required for a valid marriage, see Redworth, *PI*, p. 53; Albion, *CI*, pp. 74–75; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 362. As Antony Allison points out, 'theological opinion in France was solidly against the view that the dispensation was strictly necessary. Many theologians maintained that there was no obligation *in foro interno* and that France had fulfilled her obligation *in foro externo* by the act of asking for the dispensation'. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld and Pierre de Bérulle were of this opinion: Allison, RS, pp. 192–193.

[384]Albion, *CI*, p. 53; Tillières, *ME*, p. 57. Schreiber notes that Tillières 'volunteered his own recall': Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 56, 65. For the instructions issued to Effiat, see PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 143r–147v.

[385]PRO, SP 14/165/61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also noted that the king had commended the controversial dealings of Bishop Samuel Harsnett in the diocese of Norwich.[386] Most of the Commons's charges against Harsnett dealt with central conformist issues (preaching, catechizing, images, and so on), but it was also said that 'his lordship connived at recusants'.[387] Catholic commentators, like others, were not slow to remark on these tensions.[388]

Valaresso observed that, three days after parliament adjourned, Cranfield was released from the Tower. The Venetian commented that 'this is the way in England: hardly has the ink dried of a sentence fulminated by parliament than the king annuls it'. The earl of Arundel, Bristol's friend, appeared to be rising 'hourly in the king's favour'; James was still seeing the shortly-to-depart Spanish diplomats and was expressing doubts about the proposed treaty with the Dutch; the 'council of war' was 'nothing but a name'; and Buckingham appeared physically very ill and was believed to be on the verge of falling from grace.[389] All would depend on the deal shortly to be struck with the French.

English Catholics, the Anglo-French Marriage, and War in Europe

While these events were in train, the English Catholic community was plunged into crisis yet again. William Bishop had expired at Bishopshall in Essex on 13 April 1624.[390] His death reopened the debate about the authority and function of a Catholic bishop in England, a debate which could not but be informed by the twists and turns of the negotiations for the Anglo-French dynastic treaty. Bishop's demise led to a furious struggle at Rome over who should succeed him. The leading secular clergy now enjoyed the backing of the French crown, although they anticipated considerable opposition, both in England and at Rome, to their own nominations for the

[386] *Ibid.*; PRO, SP 14/167/10; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 255–256; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 561–562; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 342. For Harsnett, see Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 245–246.

[387] *LJ*, III, p. 388.

[388] AAW, B 26, no. 77 (Thomas More to Thomas Rant, 18/28 June 1624).

[389] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 343–344; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 251; *HMCMK*, pp. 201, 203, 205. On 5 June, Chamberlain observed that 'the papists geve out malicious reports that' Buckingham 'shold be crased in his braine', although there was 'no such matter, but that the suspicion grew by reason of his often letting bloud': McClure, *LJC*, p. 563.

[390] Anstr., I, p. 38; AAW, B 26, no. 40A; AAW, A XXVIII, no. 58, p. 224.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appointment.[391] Richard Smith alleged that the Jesuits persuaded Inojosa to oppose the secular clergy's suit there.[392] At the end of July 1624, Edward Bennett wrote to Rome concerning the rumours that Thomas Fitzherbert was obstructing their suit for an episcopal appointment.[393] Smith alleged that the Jesuits in Rome, by which he principally meant Fitzherbert, were still repeating the old slanders that he (Smith) held heterodox opinions about the nature of the papal deposing power.[394] In early August, John Jackson claimed that there was a co-ordinated campaign in England both to secure gentry opposition to the appointment of another bishop and to prove that William Bishop himself had been a cause of division within his flock.[395] On 8/18 August, Smith complained that Sir Tobias Mathew had accused him of helping to secure Tillières's recall to France, thus making way for Tillières's supposedly more pliable successor, the marquis of Effiat, and thereby facilitating the French match without doing anything to help English Catholics.[396] The secular priest John Cecil added his voice to those who were critical of Smith.[397] Some enemies of the seculars also argued that the appointment of another bishop would impose a heavy financial burden on the Catholic gentry, who would be called on to support him, something which they could ill afford.[398]

As Antony Allison has shown, somebody put up an alternative slate of candidates to that proposed by the members of the deceased William Bishop's episcopal chapter. The alternative list named Cuthbert Johnson, William Smith, Oliver Almond, and John Roberts. Only Almond was a member of the episcopal chapter; Johnson was said by Richard Smith to be the Jesuits' nominee.[399]

Allison's definitive account of Richard Smith's election demonstrates how that election fitted into the strategy of the French undertakers of the Anglo-French treaty. Smith was not the preferred candidate of the English secular clergy. The French, however, intervened to force his election as part of their diplomacy to secure the marriage between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria. In fact,

[391] See, e.g., *Letter 59*; cf. Allison, RS, pp. 155–157. There is comparatively little archival material for the English Jesuits in the 1620s and so it is hard to gauge their response to the seculars' campaign for another episcopal appointment.

[392] *Letter 45*.

[393] AAW, B 26, no. 94 (cited in *Letter 59*).

[394] *Letter 59*; *NAGB*, p. 8.

[395] *Letter 50*. See also AAW, B 27, nos 30, 42 (cited in *Letter 58*).

[396] AAW, B 26, no. 105 (cited in *Letter 53*). In October 1624, Mathew complained to Cardinal Barberini about the watering down of protection for English Catholics in the wording of the treaty's articles: Albion, *CI*, p. 56; *Letter 53*.

[397] AAW, B 27, no. 28.

[398] Questier, *C&C*, p. 419; AAW, B 27, no. 9.

[399] Allison, RS, pp. 158–159; *Letter 53*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the French secretary of state, Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs, had written, when it became known that Bishop was dying, to ask Tillières to 'let me know whom you judge suitable to be appointed successor [...] so that we can dispose matters at Rome'. The right candidate would be able to influence the course of the treaty negotiations and to prevent Hispanophile Catholics from obstructing the marriage. Tillières, who had already urged on 14 April, the day after Bishop's death, that the new bishop must be a Francophile, replied on 4 May that the candidate who was most likely to be amenable to the French court's agenda was Smith himself.[400]

In a list of reasons drawn up by Thomas Rant for Smith's preferment over the heads of the others who had also been recommended, it was argued (in ascending order, as it were) that he was less aged, more vigorous, better known in England, better acquainted with the court of Rome, *and* that the king of France demanded him.[401] Rather than entrusting the case of Smith's alleged heterodoxy to the Inquisition's permanent commissary, Urban VIII appointed the French Cardinal de La Valette to oversee the Inquisition's investigation of the accusations which were being levelled against him.[402] This virtually guaranteed that Smith would be appointed. Some of the secular clergy were perturbed that Smith's preferment should have been so openly at the direction of the French court; it laid him and them open to charges of bias and faction. William Harewell lamented 'that his Hol[iness] should designe the persons of the bishops at the instance of princes (as it is presumed he hath)'. From this it would be deduced that

> the bishop and clergie shall be accounted as interessed in that princes faction by whose endeavours the saied bishop is made, and so the bodie inforced to loose all creditt and authoritie with the princes of the contrarie faction and disinhabled by their letters or advocats to effect any thing in the behalfe of their seminaries, or other their members, residing within their provinces or dominions.[403]

Far more serious, however, for the secular clergy party, which saw in this grant of episcopal authority another opportunity to invoke the cause of reform among English Catholics and to clear up what they called the 'chaos Anglicanum', was the fact that, when Rome finally made up its mind to appoint him, the authority granted to Richard Smith was limited in the same way that William Bishop's had been.

[400] Allison, RS, p. 165; PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fos 81v, 100v; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', pp. 8–9.
[401] AAW, A XVIII, no. 57, p. 345; Allison, RS, p. 181.
[402] Allison, RS, p. 185; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', pp. 14–15; *Letter 59*.
[403] AAW, B 47, no. 89 (cited in Allison, RS, p. 182).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smith was consecrated on 2/12 January 1625 by the Paris nuncio, Bernardino Spada, with Richelieu and Claude de Rueil, bishop of Bayonne, present to assist him. Smith's faculties had been granted to him ten days before. He was nominated as Bishop's successor to rule over the clergy and laity of England and Scotland. His powers were set out in a papal breve of 25 January/4 February 1625; it reached him in early March. But the breve stated that his authority was, like Bishop's, held during the pope's pleasure and that he was, in effect, subordinate to the papal nuncio in Paris.[404]

As we noted above, Tillières was recalled to France (temporarily, as it turned out) and the marquis of Effiat was sent in his place.[405] Effiat left Calais on 28 June/8 July 1624 and was in London by 3/13 July.[406] The secular clergy and their friends were concerned that Effiat was a cynic and that the French court would pursue the treaty without considering the interests of English Catholics. By contrast, Effiat and others, notably the Venetian diplomat Valaresso, believed that reports of persecution were being exaggerated by Hispanophile English Catholics, and by the Spaniards themselves, in order to thwart the negotiations for the marriage.[407] In fact, soon after his arrival, Effiat consulted Coloma about the English Catholics and then saw various Catholic representatives, mainly, it seems, from the religious orders. They gave him to understand that 'leur misères estoient telles qu'ils n'espéroient d'avoir jamais soulagement à leurs maux que par l'ayde de Dieu' and of Louis XIII. They had the temerity to insist that, while the Anglo-Spanish negotiations were in train, 'ils n'avoient respiré que douceur et liberté' but now that 'on avoit pourparlé du mariage' with the sister of the French king the cruelty with which they were treated was insupportable. Effiat decided that, since he had been officially instructed 'de les détacher d'avec Espagne', he should tell them that Louis XIII 'porte le tiltre de très Chrestien, et n'a plus grande gloire que de procurer à ceux qui ont ce saint nom, secours et soulagement en leurs afflictions'. How dare they suggest that he was the source of their misery, especially when they had thrown themselves

[404] Allison, RS, pp. 188–190; *Letter 64*; AAW, A XIX, no. 5, pp. 13–16.

[405] *Letter 47*; Schreiber, *FC*, p. 65. Tillières returned to serve (if rather briefly) as chamberlain of Henrietta Maria's household, and his wife also entered her service: Albion, *CI*, p. 50; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 223r.

[406] PRO, SP 14/169/2; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 382; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 157r–158r.

[407] AAW, B 26, no. 85; AAW, B 27, no. 15. See also Tillières, *ME*, pp. 79–87; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 394, 399, 411, 443–444, 451 (for Effiat's and Valaresso's views). An exchequer drive against recusants followed the collapse of the Spanish marriage negotiations, although, as Terence Smith demonstrates, 'hardly any money was ever received' from the 'new seizures' of Catholic separatists' property: T.S. Smith, 'The persecution of Staffordshire Roman Catholic recusants: 1625–1660', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), pp. 330–331.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'inconsidérérement entre les bras du roy d'Espagne'? The Spaniards had deceived King James with a mere illusion of an alliance purely for their own purposes. No one could doubt 'les malicieux artifices' which the Spanish king had used towards James, and it was not surprising that he had now retaliated against 'les principaulx instruments' which they had used to mislead him, namely the Catholics. Effiat told these Catholics that it was 'nécessaire pour vostre salut' that the prince should marry the French king's sister, and 'si Dieu bénit ce dessein [. . .] vous mettans en la protection du roy mon maistre', then their concerns would be taken into consideration.[408] These Catholics assured Effiat that 'en leurs assemblées secrettes, ils avoient résolu de s'attacher entièrement' to the French, despite 'les impressions mauvoises qu'on leur avoit données' that Effiat himself favoured the Huguenots. Effiat promised them that France would protect them 'd'une manière differente à celle d'Espaigne qui donne des promesses sans effect', and that Louis 'donniez des effects sans promesses'.[409] Effiat informed Buckingham of what had been said at this meeting, and then went for an audience with James at Windsor.[410]

In the round of negotiations which had begun in June 1624, the English had put forward a treaty based on the rather limited model of the proposals advanced in 1613 for Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria's sister Christine.[411] The French negotiators countered with proposals based on those which had been agreed in principle with the Spaniards. The English objected to some of the terms and especially to the suggested guarantee of toleration, by royal grant, for English Catholics. The French then made a concession: their compromise was that James's pledge would be kept secret, though it would be in writing. This initiative, offered via the agency of Lord Kensington, procured La Vieuville's downfall in early August 1624. Richelieu and Villeauxclercs moved to supplant him on the grounds that he had gone beyond his brief by assuring the English that French support for English Catholics was no more than gesture politics.[412] Carlisle, however, remarked that 'perhaps his greatest crime is to have aspired

[408] PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 159r–160r; Albion, *CI*, p. 58.

[409] PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 160v. On 18/28 July, Effiat repeated his opinion that the English Catholics were beginning to detach themselves from their former reliance on Spain: Bodleian Library, Carte MS 82, no. 410b.

[410] PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 160v–161r, 161r–163r; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 295–296. On 9 July, however, the Venetian ambassador narrated a visit he had received from Effiat, and said that Effiat still believed 'that the Catholics here are undoubtedly Spanish' and 'some of them had presumed to maintain Spanish interests in his presence': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 394–395.

[411] Albion, *CI*, p. 55.

[412] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 69–70; Albion, *CI*, p. 57. As Anthony Champney described it, La Vieuville fell from power because he had, 'contrarie to his kings will, assured the king of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to that glory which the queen mother and the cardinal desired to appropriate'.[413]

Some interpreted the religious issue in the negotiations as no more than a matter of French honour. Nethersole commented, soon after La Vieuville's disgrace was known, that,

> although they did in France insist upon the same conditions for matter of religion which were yielded unto in the treaty with Spayne, yet, to shew that this was onely for honors sake, they were contented to have all the articles concerning religion put apart in a treaty by themselves, unto which there should be no confirmation by oathe required, and not onely so but to have them couched in such generall wordes as that they might be observed without any great prejudice: for example, that the lawes against Catholiques should not be executed tandis qu'ils se comportent en bons sujets.[414]

But others, and notably the secular clergy and their friends, were happy to gloss La Vieuville's fall by reference to his alleged lack of enthusiasm for the Catholic cause. On 10/20 August 1624, Richard Smith observed that the negotiations were 'in my cardinals hands, who laboureth al he can to get good conditions for us and hopeth to obtaine [them]. The king hath put downe' La Vieuville 'cheefly for having so litle care of the Catholiks of England when he delt for the mach'.[415] Three days earlier, Carlisle himself had conceded that 'this change turned the streame of affaires heer into the cardinals hands, who now sweighs every thing as he pleases'. This had caused Carlisle and Kensington to wonder how to carry forward the negotiations, and even 'whether we should first addresse our selves to the king or to' Richelieu, in order to 'communicate with them the articles as they came reformed from England'. The cardinal assured the English negotiators that the change of personnel in the Bourbon regime would not lead to change of 'affections' towards the English.[416]

With Richelieu in charge, however, the English would have to take seriously the French strictures against the continuation of anti-Catholic measures and practices. La Vieuville's pledges to the English

Ingland that the king of France did not stand much' in the defence of the Catholic religion, 'which treacherie, being discovered', he was disgraced: AAW, B 26, no. 104; see also D.L.M. Avenel (ed.), *Lettres, Instructions Diplomatiques et Papiers d'état du Cardinal de Richelieu*, 8 vols (Paris, 1853–1877), II, pp. 20–26.

[413]Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 64–65; Albion, *CI*, pp. 56–57; C. Burckhardt, *Richelieu and his Age*, 3 vols (London, 1967), I, pp. 155–157; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 11; PRO, SP 78/73, fos 1r–2r, 6r, 7r, 11r–v, 94r–95v. (For other accusations against La Vieuville, see, e.g., PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 193r.) For Louis XIII's concessions on other issues, notably the education of the children of the marriage, see *ibid*., fo. 262v.

[414]PRO, SP 14/171/60, fo. 91r.

[415]AAW, B 26, no. 106.

[416]PRO, SP 78/73, fos 5r–7r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

over the issue of toleration were withdrawn. Louis himself told Carlisle and Kensington that the pope's dispensation would not be issued unless the pontiff were convinced that the Stuart court would guarantee some mode of toleration for James's Catholic subjects.[417]

The ambassador Effiat, who had been sent as a representative of an essentially politique French lobby, found that his position had become more complicated. He had made clear to Buckingham, almost immediately after his arrival, that there would have to be concessions over the question of religion before any treaty could be signed.[418] On 11 August, Effiat reported the long discussions which he had had with James about the required papal dispensation and the ways in which the penal laws against Catholics would have to be modified. He believed that he had extracted worthwhile guarantees that the laws against Catholics would be suspended.[419] La Vieuville's dismissal, however, threw all into doubt. Effiat told Buckingham about it on 8 August. The duke was astonished, though Effiat tried, initially with some success, to persuade him that nothing had changed.[420] But the French appeared to become so obdurate over the toleration issue that the negotiations threatened to stall altogether.[421] Kensington's and Carlisle's letter of 7/17 August 1624 (concerning the new French stipulations about toleration) provoked James into a decision to break the match, and Conway issued an order to this effect to the English ambassadors in Paris. James's angry letter was recalled and substantially rewritten only when Buckingham intercepted the messenger. Effiat then engaged James at Derby in a tense conversation over how the negotiations could be fruitfully restarted.[422]

There was a meeting on 20/30 August between Marie de Médicis and Kensington, who had proved more amenable than Carlisle to a compromise with the French. After a series of witty initial remarks and ripostes over Prince Charles's recent journey to Spain, and whether he was badly treated there, Kensington 'smilingly added [. . .] yow heer, madame, use him farre worse [. . .] in that yow presse [. . .] upon' him 'the same, nay more unreasonable, conditions'. For what the Spaniards

[417] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 70 (citing PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 8r), 71; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 361–362, 429; PRO, SP 78/73, fos 5r–6r, see also *ibid.*, fos 57v–58r. The English ambassadors made haste to seek an audience with the queen mother. They argued that pressing this issue would make Henrietta Maria less well received in England: PRO, SP 78/73, fos 8v–9v.

[418] Tillières, *ME*, pp. 79–87; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 163r–165r.

[419] PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 174r–177v, 180v.

[420] *Ibid.*, fos 182v–183r, 183v.

[421] Albion, *CI*, pp. 59–60; AAW, B 26, no. 97; see also *Letter 50*; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 431.

[422] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 72–75; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 203; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 5r; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 197v–199r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'traced out for the breaking of the match, yow follow pretending to conclude it'. This was, claimed Kensington, unacceptable

> in this conjuncture of tyme especially when the jealousies that such great changes in state are apt to begett are cunningly fomented by the Spanish embassador in England who vaunts it forth that there is not soe great a change in La Vieuvilles particular person as there is in the generall affections which did but follow before the streame of his greatnes and credit, thus casting in the kings mynde the seed of doubts.

Olivares was alleged to have boasted to the English ambassador in Madrid that, 'if the pope ever graunted a dispensation for the match with France, the king of Spaine wold march with an army to Rome and sack it'. The queen mother tartly replied 'nous l'en empecherons bien'. Kensington went on to insist that the seventh and last articles of the proposed treaty, as they then stood, were impossible for the Stuart court to accept, and that they must be altered, or at the very least that she must 'procure the allowance of this protestation by the king our master, when he should swear them, that he intended no further to oblige himself by that oath than might well stand with the surety, peace, tranquillity and conveniency of his state'. The queen mother thought this was reasonable and she promised to speak to the king and cardinal.[423]

Thus the English insistence that a concession of toleration, in the form which the French had demanded, was simply impossible was balanced by Buckingham's capacity to persuade James that the French proposal of an *écrit particulier* (outside the main treaty document) would suffice, and would be compatible with his guarantees made to the 1624 parliament. This served to keep the negotiations going. At the end of August, the French made a limited funding commitment to Mansfelt.[424] The new version of James's pledge (extremely vague and capable of a variety of interpretations), in the form of the *écrit particulier*, to show favour to his Roman Catholic subjects was phrased in such sort that James would merely promise rather than swear favour and liberty to Catholics.[425] The formula adopted was, ironically, virtually the same as the compromise originally advanced by La Vieuville.

[423]Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 76–77; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 31v–32v; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 174v.

[424]Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 12; Schreiber, *FC*, p. 77; Albion, *CI*, p. 60; Adams, PC, p. 352; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 434.

[425]Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 77–78; Albion, *CI*, pp. 60–64; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 11; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 205; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 227v; BL, Egerton MS 2596, fo. 67r. For Kensington's and Carlisle's account, of 18/28 August 1624, of this attempt to find a compromise over the guarantee that James would give for the liberties of his Catholic subjects, sufficient to persuade the pope to issue a dispensation for the marriage, see PRO, SP 78/73, fos 63r–69r. There was considerable debate also over the difficulties presented by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

James approved the new version of the marriage treaty (now in the form of twenty-six articles) by 1 September 1624. It was sent off to the French court, though the arguments about how far James was to be obliged to abrogate the penal law rumbled on.[426] Two days before, in Paris, Kensington had written to James that, in his opinion, Richelieu was playing a double game, posing as a protector of Catholics but in fact undermining *dévot* hardliners in France.[427] Nevertheless, on the same day, Conway wrote to Coventry with a list of recusants and priests for whom Effiat had petitioned the crown for favour.[428]

One practical effect of these delays was to give the English Catholics in London and in other European capitals a window of opportunity to snatch, if not victory, then at least some acceptable compromise from the jaws of defeat. The Catholics saw the possibility of inserting themselves back into the body politic from which the euphoric Protestant enthusiasts of 1624 had thought to eject them. But this would happen not only through a struggle with their Protestant critics but also by engaging with the French (who did not necessarily share English Catholics' views about how their Catholicism and French political interests should coincide) and with each other. Once it was clear that the French match was going to take place, the various Catholic interest groups moved swiftly into an end game where they tried to demonstrate that their religious concerns and ambitions were not just acceptable to the Stuart state but were a corollary of their support for the regime, even when, on the face of it, the purpose of the match was to confront the Habsburgs.

The irony here, of course, was that the Anglo-French treaty negotiations had initially made swift progress because those on the

the loyalty oath that the queen's servants and James's Catholic subjects would take: *ibid.*, fos 67r–v, 262v; see also *ibid.*, fos 105r–108r, 315r; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 236r.

[426] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 78; Albion, *CI*, pp. 60–61; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fos 216r–218v, 227r, 230r. For the problems caused by the English court's demand, accompanying the return to Paris of the *écrit* ('framed' by James 'into the fashion of a letter'), that the French should 'give an explanation in writing that the oath of alleageance is not contradictory to the Roman religion' or 'to the conscience of Romane Catholiques' (to which, Carlisle and Kensington advised on 18/28 September, the French would not agree), see PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 183r–v. For Conway's reply to this objection, see *ibid.*, fos 199r, 200r; see also *ibid.*, fos 229r–v, 262v–263r.

[427] *Ibid.*, fo. 103r; see also *ibid.*, fo. 105r; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 204–205. On 4/14 September, Kensington told Conway how Richelieu had given assurances that he was 'bon François'. The cardinal had even claimed that, in the context of the difficulties raised in the negotiations over what oath of loyalty (contained in the *écrit particulier*) would be stipulated for Catholics, and particularly for servants of Henrietta Maria, the 1606 oath of allegiance was 'in no way contrary to the Roman faith'. He 'affirmed' this 'to be the generall tenent of the Sorbonne', though it was still impossible to incorporate any such oath in the treaty articles themselves: PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 132r.

[428] PRO, SP 14/172/1.i.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

French council of state – principally Sillery and Puisieux – who were favourable to the Habsburgs had been levered out back in January 1624.[429] Their replacements were new men who wanted French differences with the Habsburgs settled with less diplomacy and more force: for example, over the question of the Valtelline.[430] Such people included La Vieuville and Villeauxclercs and, of course, Richelieu, though La Vieuville was, as we have seen, soon displaced and disgraced.[431]

There were, in fact, two agreements between the English and the French. One was the marriage treaty itself. The other was an accompanying military compact in which the French designs on the Valtelline would be combined with the military entrepreneur Mansfelt's assault on the Palatinate, even though, as Brennan Pursell points out, the actual Anglo-French marriage treaty 'did not include a provision for the restitution of the Palatinate'.[432] The problem was, as Simon Adams has shown in some detail, that the Stuart court's strategy, which revolved around an alliance between itself, the French, and the Dutch, was essentially a pipe dream in Buckingham's head. The French were still extremely reluctant at this point to engage in full-scale hostilities against Spain and the empire.[433] As Carlisle and Kensington (recently created earl of Holland) were compelled to report in early October 1624, the French negotiators of the treaty still argued that English concessions over the terms to be accorded to James's Catholic subjects and over the regulation of the entourage of Charles's bride were absolutely essential to prevent European condemnation of Louis XIII for an apparent betrayal of the Catholic cause. The French would not even concede a 'league offensive' 'till the marriage shall be consummate'. As Richelieu had recently said, 'donnez nous des prestres [. . .] et nous vous donnerons des colonels'. Now they claimed that 'to capitulate with us in writing would but cast rubs in

[429] See PRO, SP 78/72, fos 16r, 19r–v; Tillières, *ME*, pp. 57–58. For Puisieux's entertainment in early 1624 of Spanish proposals for a Franco-Spanish alliance directed against the forces of European Protestantism, designed to obviate the Anglo-Spanish dynastic treaty but dependent on restoring the Valtelline to French control, see PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 36r; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 214–215. The French ambassador in Rome, Noël Brûlart, had negotiated (contrary to the 1621 Treaty of Madrid) for the Spaniards' demolition of their forts in the Valtelline while retaining the right to 'have [. . .] passage free' through the region: PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 74r. For Brûlart's self-justification in this respect, see *ibid.*, fo. 96r–v. For the Valtelline issue, see *Letter 76*.

[430] The French and the Dutch signed the Treaty of Compiègne in the summer of 1624: Pursell, *WK*, p. 230.

[431] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 59–60.

[432] *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 78; Pursell, *WK*, p. 230; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 350–351, 613; Albion, *CI*, p. 63; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 9.

[433] Adams, PC, p. 351.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the way of the dispensation, and make it alltogether impossible, sith it must needs highly offend the pope to heare they should enter into an offensive league with heretiques against Catholiques'. It 'was like so farre to scandalize the Catholique princes of Germany', and Louis would 'loose all credit with them, whom yett he hoped to winne to the better party'.[434]

This was why Mansfelt was so important. He was the focal point for an Anglo-French military consensus, and he would shoulder most of the organizational difficulties and the risk of his proposed expedition to the Palatinate. He simply needed to be financed. The money would not be forthcoming until the partners to the alliance, notably the Dutch, put up funds as well. Using him did not necessarily mean – and this was crucial for James as much as for Louis – an outbreak of general hostilities with Spain.[435]

But the employment of Mansfelt was, as Adams says, Buckingham's 'most disastrous error in foreign affairs'.[436] Although the English and French negotiators discussed Mansfelt's proposals during the summer, the fall of La Vieuville temporarily threw the whole project into doubt. Carlisle had had serious qualms about continuing the discussions, but Buckingham had boxed himself in. If the negotiations with the French came to grief, then it was possible that James might decide to approach the Spaniards again.[437]

The raising of troops and the appointment of officers for a new English expeditionary force to the Netherlands had begun earlier in the year, in fact as the 1624 parliament was ending.[438] Clearly, English Catholics wanted the French match to proceed; but even the Francophiles among them did not want to see the treaty lead to a Protestant resurgence in mainland Europe. What Mansfelt did or did not accomplish was therefore extremely significant.[439] The Catholics in London had watched Mansfelt very carefully when he was in the

[434] PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 230r.

[435] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 243–245, 250f.; Adams, PC, p. 351.

[436] Adams, FP, p. 158; and see below, pp. 104–105, 114–115. While Buckingham wanted Mansfelt's expedition to constitute the 'basis for a revival of the Grand Alliance' which the duke had tried to create in 1623, in fact he had to make so many concessions to Richelieu to secure the treaty that the whole policy ended in a débâcle in 1625: Adams, FP, p. 158.

[437] *Ibid.*

[438] McClure, *LJC*, p. 562. For the recruitment and delivery of troops to the Dutch, allowing them to release their own veteran soldiers from garrison service, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 403, 422, and *passim*.

[439] Thomas Cogswell argues that Mansfelt has probably been underestimated as a commander: Cogswell, *BR*, p. 239. For his performance, for example, at Frankenthal in late 1621, at Wiesloch against Tilly in April 1622, and at the battle of Fleurus in late August 1622, see *Letter 1*; Adams, PC, p. 329; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 318, 414, 420; Pursell, *WK*, p. 172; PRO, SP 77/15, fo. 282v; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 160v; Lee, *Dudley Carleton to John*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

capital in April 1624; they continued to do so when he returned in September. They recorded the names of those whom he was seeing, where he was allowed to stay, whether he was receiving the trappings of honour, and how much cash was being allotted to him.[440]

As this sweeping reorientation of royal diplomacy was in train, a flood of anti-popish literature poured from the presses. Such works had no doubts about what should be done with the popish caterpillars of the commonwealth, even though James had shown himself so unenthusiastic about the recent parliament's calls for more effective measures against Catholics.[441]

What did the state do to fulfil popular expectations in this respect? Even if the regime did not, to a man, entirely share the sentiments of the tractate literature against the Catholic menace, Catholics claimed that they were again subject to the terror of house-to-house searches and of commissions dispatched here, there, and everywhere to assess what convicted recusants possessed, with follow-up commissions to enforce sequestration, and a whole series of middlemen taking their cut at each stage.[442]

Furthermore, a priest, one William Davies, had been arrested on 17 June and, in spite of his bad health and advanced years, had been sent to Newgate by the recorder of London.[443] In itself, the arrest of a Catholic clergyman was nothing new. However, in the circumstances of the Anglo-French treaty negotiations, it became something of a test case. Some Catholic commentators insisted that, despite the evidence of an imminent return to the bad old days, the king was still unlikely to concede the full onslaught against Catholics which the recent parliament had demanded.[444] As we have already seen, a proclamation against the Catholic clergy had been issued on 6 May. It commanded them into exile (by 14 June), and Davies was arrested for not complying with it.[445] But would it really be enforced? As John

Chamberlain, p. 293; *CCE*, pp. 98–99; BL, Additional MS 72254, fos 143r, 145r; cf. Adams, FP, p. 158.

[440] See, e.g., *Letters 44*, *55*, *60*; see also Cogswell, *BR*, p. 241.

[441] Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 281–307. A proclamation was issued in mid-August 1624 against seditious books and pamphlets. James had intervened to direct it equally against popish and puritan tracts. On 21 July 1624, Sir Edward Conway informed the attorney-general that the draft proclamation, on the king's order, had to be 'altered and, in all places where mencion is made of popish scandalous bookes, theis wordes are precisely to bee added: "as alsoe all sedicious bookes and scandalous to our person and state such as have ben lately vented by some puritanicall spiritts"': PRO, SP 14/170/35, fo. 53r; *SRP*, I, no. 256; S. Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and censorship', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), p. 53.

[442] AAW, B 26, no. 72 (cited in *Letter 49*).

[443] Anstr., I, p. 99; *Letter 47*.

[444] *Letter 45*.

[445] CRS, 68, p. 171.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colleton speculated, 'som hope that before the expiration of the dayes apointed there wilbe published a kind of mitigation or revocation' and 'others thinke that nothing wilbe don'.[446] It was not just Catholics who believed that the proclamation of 6 May had been issued purely to secure the parliamentary subsidies. The king had more or less admitted it himself.[447]

Despite John Gee's recent warnings about the swarms of Catholic clergy in the metropolis,[448] there was no mass round-up of clergy. When the aged cleric Davies was dragged off to Tyburn for execution, in front of a huge, expectant crowd, he was reprieved at the last moment. Sir Francis Nethersole lamented on 3 July that this had done more damage than if he had not been proceeded against in the first place.[449]

The only other priest who was arrested and detained at this time was Thomas Cole. Cole ran into the self-obsessed self-publicist John Gee in a London street, was arrested, and, like Davies, was sent to Newgate by the lord mayor after he refused the oath of supremacy. But, despite the protests of the recorder of London, Cole was allowed to go to live with one of the ambassadors.[450] At the beginning of August it was reported that two gentlewomen from the leading Yorkshire recusant family of Tankard had been condemned for helping a priest to escape. Execution of sentence was stayed by order of the judge.[451]

The issue of 'persecution' was, therefore, largely a matter of perception, just as it had always been. The earl of Carlisle had explained to Louis, at an audience early in the morning on 22 July/1 August, that the French had to be realistic about prevailing political conditions in England. Carlisle denied that there was a 'great persecution', such as Louis professed to believe that there was, of English Catholics. Carlisle himself had heard of no such thing. In any case, 'howsoever it were likely enough that there was some quickening and reviving of the lawes', Louis should not concern himself with it. James 'did but therby putt himself into a fitt posture of satisfying his desires, that so the thancks of any future ease' in the condition of James's Catholic subjects might not be attributed to Spain 'but rather

[446] *Letter 46*. On 12 June, Tillières described how he had presented to James two petitions, drawn up by English Catholics and by himself, against the enforcement of the proclamation: PRO, PRO, 31/3/59, fos 136v–137r.

[447] *Letters 45, 48*; *SRP*, I, p. 592, citing PRO, SP 14/163/30 and PRO, SP 14/164/72.

[448] Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*.

[449] *Letter 49*; PRO, SP 14/169/14.

[450] Anstr., II, p. 68; *Letters 50, 54*. In a Paul's Cross sermon of 31 October 1624 (the published version of which was dedicated to Sir Robert Naunton), Gee mentioned his encounter with Cole, and alleged that Cole had attacked him: John Gee, *Hold Fast* (London, 1624), p. 51 (cited in *Letter 50*).

[451] *Letter 50*; CRS, 68, p. 172.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to this match'. Carlisle asserted that 'to take away the lawes was not' within James's power, at least 'without his parlement'. If he were to 'exercise his grace against the penalty and execution therof [. . .] this must follow the match and not precede' it, and 'so follow that it might appeare to flow out of the clemency and sweetnes of his owne royall heart, and not anothers stipulation'. Louis should remember how much he had resented one of James's recent intercessions, via Carlisle, on behalf of the Huguenots.[452]

A letter arrived on 6 August for Lord Keeper Williams from Conway, who was staying at the earl of Rutland's house at Belvoir. Conway condemned the 'complaintes' which had been 'made to his Majesty of great persecutions lately upon the Roman Catholikes'.[453] (Indeed, as Conway noted, on that very day, in an audience with the king, Effiat denounced the 'furious persecucion of the Romaine Catholicks in England', and explained the 'traverse it would give to the negociacion at Rome'.[454]) Conway and the king could hardly believe it to be true, considering that James remembered 'well the directions he gave conserning the stay of all executions'. The judges also knew 'how far' it was 'from his Majestys [. . .] nature to suffer anny persecution' of 'his subjects espessially in case of religion'. But Conway instructed Williams to find out exactly what the judges had done on circuit.[455]

On the same day, Conway wrote in a similar vein to Sir Richard Weston, the chancellor of the exchequer, asking to know how the king's directions concerning Catholics had been fulfilled.[456] On 7 August, at James's direction, he instructed Carlisle and Holland in Paris to assure the French king that there was no persecution. For the sake of James's honour and the upholding of the law, and for the 'satisfaccion of his parlament', however, some measures were necessary to 'keepe in order the overswellinge humors of some Romaine Catholicks'. In fact, it was all for their own good. Conway insisted to the English ambassadors in Paris that they should remind Louis of the 'art which is imployed to breed misunderstandinge in this soe necessarie and soe usefull treatie for the good of all Christendome for the conservacion of theis crownes'. Those who made these claims that James was a persecutor did not intend 'the good and peace of the Romaine Catholick religion'. Instead, they sought, by 'practize and sedicions', to 'fish for the ends of a Catholick monarchie': in other words, the interests of Spain.[457]

[452] PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 366r; *Letter 49*.
[453] PRO, SP 14/171/22, fo. 28r.
[454] PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 15r; *Letter 53*.
[455] PRO, SP 14/171/22, fo. 28r.
[456] PRO, SP 14/171/21.
[457] PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 15r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The following day, Williams replied to Conway that, since the judges were out of London, he could not yet ascertain what was going on. But the recusants were 'a veryie cunninge and ever whyninge generacion, complayninge rather out of custome than anie true and reall cause'. For 'not one Romaine Catholick' had 'suffred this last circuite in anie countrey of England or Wales'. The judges had had precise instructions 'before their goinge this last circuite'. It was possible that some might have been 'more tart and pressing in their charges and speeches upon the bench than others according to the speciall natures and disposicions of men. But their speeches' had 'drawen noe blood nor anie one severe accion'. The 'messingers of the hiegh comission in both the provinces of Canterburie and Yorke' were 'soe restrayned and brydled up with instruccions for the ease of the Romaine Catholicks as they never have ben before this sommer sithence their first institucion'. The king 'hath ben in the opinion of most men but too too carefull for' the 'ease and immunitie' of the Catholics. At the very most, some of the judges might have 'commaunded the justices to informe themselves exactly of all the recusants in their severall divisions and to present unto them the names of such recusants at the beginning of the next tearme'. Williams opined that it was possible (in fact it was a racing certainty) that 'some justices' might have been

> forward enough in this service, and that the recusants are thereupon startled, and afrayd to bee all forthwith indicted and convicted. But the judges have noe intent at all to proceede in anye rigorous course against them more than to present their names unto his most excellent Majestie and to receave his royall pleasure and direccion what they are to doe therein.[458]

On 9 August the attorney-general, Sir Thomas Coventry, attested that he had not 'violated one syllable' of the king's 'gracious direction'. He thought that the judges on circuit had not done so either, 'and sure I am that att the first assises they can but indite and proclaime for recusancy and they which were indicted and proclaimed this assise are not convicted until the next assises'. The court of exchequer, for its part, had done no more than award

> those ordinary commissions which went of course every yeare until the late connivence for the goods and two parts of the lands of the recusants which commissions will not be returned until the next terme, and then his Majesty may receive an accounte of that which is or will bee donne therupon, and may declare his pleasure for the ease of any to whome hee shall thinke good to extende his grace and favor.

[458] PRO, SP 14/171/27, fo. 35r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'In all this', Coventry could not imagine 'what it is which is accounted a greate persecution'.[459] On that same day, Conway drafted a letter from James to Louis declaring that, 'in contemplation of the marriage', he would 'give all convenient favor' to Roman Catholics as long as they behaved like good subjects.[460] In fact, some priests were undoubtedly now receiving what amounted to royal favour: one week later, John Clare SJ obtained a warrant for his protection, releasing him from the need to obey the May proclamation (which had ordered the Catholic clergy to go into exile) and licensing him to go to Bath to take the waters.[461]

Weston certified on 12 August that he had received no special orders about recusancy revenue but simply took his cue from the king's direction to the judges. He had inquired of the exchequer officials as to 'the ordinary course with recusants for their arrieres due to his Majestie before the late connivence', and 'they brought me an usuall forme of a warrant which I signed'. Its purpose was to 'direct commissions into every county according to the ordinary manner, but how they are proceeded in I know not, but they cannot be said to take effect before they be retourned into the exchequer'. Then, as Coventry had insisted, 'his Majestie may use what clemency' he pleased, 'according to his owne goodnes, or the reason and condition of the times'. Weston, however, had no intention of simply making a 'stay of the generall' course of the law concerning Catholic separatism.[462] On 13 August, Prince Charles wrote to Carlisle that, if the French persisted 'in this new way [. . .] in making an article for our Roman Catholique subjects', then he should 'breake [. . .] the treatie of marriage, keeping the frendshipe in as faire tearmes' as he could.[463]

These attempts at compromise did not deflect French fears that, unless the terms agreed were, at least publicly, as favourable towards James's Catholic subjects as those recently granted, in principle, to the Spanish court, Louis would suffer from the 'calumnies of Spaine' and of 'Jesuitically-affected persons'.[464] Some English Catholics were

[459] PRO, SP 14/171/28, fo. 37r–v.

[460] PRO, SP 14/171/29, fo. 39r; see also PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 16r.

[461] *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 328. Smith believed, in mid-August 1624, that priests walked the streets in London 'as freely as before', and that Effiat had done very well for Catholics: AAW, B 26, no. 105.

[462] PRO, SP 14/171/42, fo. 60r–v. Ten days later, on 22 August, Williams was still asking Buckingham 'howe to demeane my selfe to the French embassador in matters concerning recusants' (especially since the judges remained on circuit). The day before, Effiat had 'sent unto me to knowe if I hadd received any order from his Majestye to staye this (as he tearmed it) persequtiion', though Williams had denied that there was any 'such matter in this estate': BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 159r.

[463] PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 40r.

[464] PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 373r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well aware how they might exploit this. In the third week of August, as the negotiations over the treaty articles were proceeding in Paris, John Jackson introduced himself to the new French ambassador. He assured him that, in some respects, the secular clergy had been ill-served by the Spaniards and that they could be trusted to work for the conclusion of the Anglo-French treaty.[465] All through September 1624, Effiat proceeded to intervene, on behalf of Catholics, with the duke of Buckingham and the king himself.[466]

This did not mean that the Catholic networks of news gatherers in the counties had desisted from their complaints that there was widespread popular hostility to them. Nor did such complaints come only from those Catholics who tended to look to Spain rather than to France. But the Francophile Catholics who believed that, in some sense, there was still a persecution of themselves and of their co-religionists needed to work hard in order to prevent the French from glossing over it and over them. They certainly tried to force the French negotiators to take more notice of English Catholics' alleged or actual plight than the French would have liked and than their instructions allowed for. The leading secular clergy in England vigorously protested, from time to time, that the French were not doing enough for them.[467] Valaresso suggested to Effiat in September, as they contemplated the Catholics' irritating insistence that there was a terrible persecution in progress, that 'the best plan to get at the real truth was to ask for particulars, making them name some one who had suffered persecution, the time and the place'. Effiat 'entirely agreed'.[468]

What this represented, however, was a sophisticated public debate about politics and religion, as various parties, including Catholics, tried to define what a 'persecution' was and to prove that it either did or did not exist. They did this not merely by comparison, for instance, with the Tudor past but in the context of what contemporaries of different ecclesiological stripes assumed or feared should or might be an entirely new status quo created by an Anglo-French dynastic union.

All the prevarication and arguments in the summer and autumn of 1624 over the exact terms of the treaty did not stop some English Catholics from anticipating the good effects which the treaty would

[465] *Letter 51*; PRO, SP 78/73, fos 63r–68r; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 210v; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 415–417.

[466] AAW, B 26, no. 139 (cited in *Letter 55*); CRS, 68, pp. 167, 168.

[467] See, e.g., *Letter 56*. On 23 August, two days after John Jackson's visit, Effiat, however, was complaining of the secular clergy's tendency to put their interests before those of the French state: PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 213r [*bis*].

[468] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 444.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

finally bring. As early as 13/23 July 1624, Richard Smith could rejoice that, in 'the mach with France', James had 'agreed to all the articles which the French proposed'; and 'the summe for Catholiks' was 'that they shal not be persecuted for practise of their religion in privat'. But 'more the duke wold not agree unto lest he shold offend the puritans of whome he hath made him self head'. Yet, 'if the Catholiks carie them selves moderatly, more in time wilbe graunted'.[469]

Indeed, it seemed, as the marriage negotiations began to move towards a conclusion, that Catholics had a good deal to be optimistic about. On 4/14 August, Matthew Kellison wrote that he had heard from Anthony Champney in Paris that the French match was concluded and that Louis XIII's envoy, Pierre de Bérulle, was being sent to Rome to seek the dispensation.[470] On 28 August/7 September 1624, Thomas More had reported from Rome that Bérulle, on his journey, had written from Turin that he 'will favour us all he maye and attendeth onlie to the procuring of the dispensation'. The secular clergy could confidently rely on the French ambassador in Rome, Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully. He had been their patron during the appellant controversy over twenty years before. More and Rant had been to call on him 'and ther he discoursed with us above an howre and an half'.[471] On the same day, John Colleton in London informed Rant and More that he had (on 1 September) formally written to the pope in favour of the proposed Anglo-French marriage. He had laid 'downe the generall desire of the whole bodie of Catholicks that his Holiness would be pleased to graunt the foresaid dispensation', and the sooner the better.[472] Champney, in Paris, wrote to assure Rant and

[469] AAW, B 26, no. 90.

[470] AAW, B 26, no. 100. Bérulle, the superior of the French Oratory, arrived in Rome in late September: Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 81–82. The use of Bérulle to persuade the pope that the dispensation should be granted was a shrewd French calculation that he would be seen as disinterested and principled, in a way that Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully (the French ambassador in Rome, and brother of the Huguenot duke of Sully) was not: *ibid.*, p. 81; PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 388r–v. Carlisle mentioned to Conway, in a letter of 29 July/8 August 1624, that he intended to persuade Bérulle that the Spaniards, 'pretending to procure a dispensation, suggested extravagant conditions to the pope [. . .] purposely to crosse the match'; and therefore Carlisle proposed to 'give him withall a brief discourse of the true state of things in England, actuall and possible, that it may serve as a healp to remove such obstacles as may be offred': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 388v. For Bérulle, see P.A. Klevgard, 'Society and politics in Counter-Reformation France: a study of Bérulle, Vincent de Paul, Olier and Bossuet' (unpublished PhD thesis, Northwestern University, 1971), ch. 2.

[471] *Letters 52*, *59*. For the negotiations for the dispensation, conducted in Rome by Bérulle and Béthune, see Albion, *CI*, pp. 68–72.

[472] AAW, B 26, no. 118; Albion, *CI*, pp. 58–59; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 208v. The offer by the secular clergy to write to Rome had been made by John Jackson to Effiat on 21 August: *Letter 51*. For Colleton's subsequent letter of 22 September 1624, directed to Urban VIII, which urged that, if the dispensation were not granted, this would unleash a new

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

More that they 'must both help [. . .] to procure the dispensation'. This should be done 'in the name of our whole clergie', even without specific directions from their clerical colleagues to do so.[473]

As long as Smith remained secure in Richelieu's favour and the secular clergy seemed able to deliver support for the match without provoking the Jacobean regime into direct and overt retaliation, the French would find it worthwhile to deliver the quid pro quo of assisting their suit for a successor to William Bishop, as well as urging the Stuart court to honour its tolerationist promises.[474] At one stage, Richelieu and the nuncio in Paris even considered sending Smith to Rome in order to lobby for the dispensation.[475] On 2/12 September 1624, Smith rejoiced that the match was concluded and signed by both parties, with good conditions for Catholics 'and in some points better than thos of Spayne'.[476]

A special papal curial committee was assembled in late October 1624 to discuss the two topics of whether Henrietta's religion was adequately ring-fenced and whether and how English Catholics would benefit from the marriage.[477] Initially, the papacy accepted the terms hammered out by English and French negotiators. But the real difficulties over the way in which the treaty would work in practice – something which, as we saw, had already threatened to halt the negotiations in August– now surfaced again. During October, heated arguments took place in Paris over the exact terms and mechanisms by which the English crown's guarantees to James's Catholic subjects would be made, and about how far French promises to assist the English military proposals to recover the Palatinate should be set out in a formal diplomatic document.[478] Subsequently, on 21 November/1 December 1624, Rome decided to impose further conditions which would have to be agreed by both regimes – principally that the English promise of toleration for Catholics should be public, not private. James objected strongly. In Paris, Carlisle and Villeauxclercs had a shouting match about it.[479]

wave of persecution by the 'puritans', see AAW, A XVIII, no. 62, pp. 357–358. For Matthew Kellison's letter of 16/26 August 1624 to the pope, requesting the dispensation, see AAW, A XVIII, no. 49, pp. 325–326 (cited in *Letter 51*).

[473] AAW, B 26, no. 103.

[474] *Letter 54*.

[475] *Ibid.*

[476] *Letter 53*; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 299r. For the other conditions of the treaty, e.g. the dowry, see PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 261r; Tillières, *ME*, p. xiv.

[477] Allison, RS, pp. 190–191; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 619, 620; Albion, *CI*, p. 65.

[478] PRO, SP 78/73, fos 229r–232v.

[479] Albion, *CI*, pp. 67–74; Allison, RS, pp. 190–191; AAW, B 47, no. 159 (cited in *Letter 75*); AAW, B 47, no. 78 (cited in *Letter 78*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Conclusion of the Anglo-French Treaty

The Stuarts' military exploits during the early stages of the Thirty Years War were a critical index for Catholics to work out what their own political position would be like once the French match was concluded. Catholics could point to the withering uncertainties inside the Jacobean regime as to what kind of war English forces were supposed to be fighting. As Russell comments, the end of the 1624 parliament allowed James to regain some of the initiative he had lost while it was in session. One of the effects of this reassertion of royal authority was that 'the supposed war on which Buckingham had expended so much effort slowly degenerated into one mercenary expedition to the Palatinate'. As we have already seen, the employment of Mansfelt was arguably Buckingham's crucial strategic error at this point. Moreover, Mansfelt's campaign, 'when it might have contributed effectively to war against Spain by relieving the key siege of Breda', as the French suggested, 'was forbidden to do so by James', who would not sanction the use of military force against troops deployed by the Spaniards.[480]

The prolonged and ghastly siege of Breda had started in August 1624. The archduchess Isabella could, by 17/27 October, boast that Breda was completely isolated, and that the prince of Orange was failing to dislodge the forces surrounding it.[481] Starvation and the plague had already set in. As Spinola increased his stranglehold on the town, the battle of wills between him and the defenders, and the question of whether Mansfelt could intervene, even if hardly related to the Palatinate issue, became a way of assessing how far the entire British war strategy was going to work.[482] For all James's professions that he would not allow the military forces at his disposal to be used

[480] Russell, *PEP*, p. 202; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 386; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 222–224. For James's guarantee, finally issued by Conway on 29 December 1624, that Mansfelt would not engage in hostilities in the dominions of Philip IV or of the archduchess Isabella, see PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 366r; *CGB*, II, pp. 590–591. The Spanish council of state initially disapproved of the apparently rash decision of the Habsburg administration in Flanders to besiege Breda: *CCE*, pp. 180, 187; see also Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares*, p. 236. The Brussels administration had itself been uncertain in July and August that the proposed siege was feasible, but Spinola insisted upon it: *CGB*, I, pp. 505, 507, 510.

[481] *CCE*, p. 185; see also *ibid.*, p. 188.

[482] For the arrangements at the French court, recorded by Carlisle on 21/31 August 1624, for regular payments to be made to Mansfelt, see PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 711r–v. On 23 September/3 October, the English ambassadors in Paris reported that the French 'desire an answerable proceeding in England' to the support which Mansfelt was receiving in France: *ibid.*, fo. 193v; for James's guarantees of financial aid to him, and for recruitment of men to be shipped to France, consequent on Louis's declaration of his 'conjunction in the accion', see *ibid.*, fo. 225r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

directly against Spanish troops, the archduchess was not so sure. She wrote to Philip on 16/26 November that James was raising a large number of soldiers under Mansfelt's command and, even though he had disclaimed any intention of levying war against Spanish military power, she thought that James 'veut secourir Bréda soit directement, soit en faisant une diversion'. The Dutch were recruiting around Breda. The siege was becoming a crucial trial of strength. The levying of additional troops, insisted the archduchess, was inevitable: 'il n'y a pas moyen de faire face autrement à tant d'ennemis'.[483] A month later, she feared that Mansfelt's force would establish 'sa jonction avec une troupe française', and she believed it would head straight for Breda, even though James had declared that his sole purpose was to set up the elector once more.[484]

The Catholics around London had, as we saw earlier, followed Mansfelt's movements almost obsessively as he came and went raising money and men. Every apparent hiccough in the recruitment process, every mishap with his shipping arrangements, and every incident of public disorder as his low-quality recruits for his expeditionary force (unpaid until they reached Dover) were assembled and taken to their rendezvous point allowed Catholic observers to pour scorn on the apparent schizophrenia in the crown's foreign policy, which was concluding a 'Catholic' dynastic marriage for the prince of Wales but could not even make its mind up about whether it wanted to be fully involved in a 'Protestant' military conflict.[485] James's understanding of the general thrust of the proposed campaign appears to have been quite different from that of many of his subjects, although it was clear that the French were also reluctant to commit themselves to war against the Habsburgs.[486]

It was in the middle of this somewhat half-hearted military exercise, as Mansfelt raised his army and hobnobbed with the great and the good in the capital, that arrangements were made for representatives of the French crown to cross the Channel and finalize the treaty. Several weeks before the French secretary of state, Villeauxclercs, arrived for this purpose, it appeared that Effiat had already secured something like a toleration. Zuane Pesaro, Valaresso's replacement as Venetian ambassador in London, reported on 1 October that the Catholics had been badgering Effiat to demand 'a *supersedeat* [*sic*] under the public seal for non-execution, as being entirely contrary to the laws and to the decisions and promises made to the parliament'.

[483] *CCE*, p. 191.
[484] *Ibid.*, p. 192.
[485] *Letters 67*, *68*, *70*; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 210.
[486] Albion, *CI*, p. 63; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 206–207, 222–223.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Effiat was proud, instead, to have 'obtained an order to withdraw all commands for executions against the Catholics for the chancellor of the exchequer who has charge thereof, thus obtaining actual relief for them without upsetting anything'. Effiat himself had described it on 26 September as 'un supersedeas qui est une cessation générale', one which even Catholics had not expected. It was 'une chose signée de la main du roy et scellé de son grand sceau, en somme un acte très publicque et qui fut résolu en plain conseil, le dit roy l'ayant assemblé exprès pour cela'. James had told him that he would 'non seulement cesser la persécution mais que l'on rendroit tout ce que l'on pouvait avoir exigé des Catholiques en vertu de commissions qui avoient esté expediés mesme avant qu'il m'eust donné sa parole'. Effiat lost no time in telling his Catholic contacts what he had done; and he wrote to Béthune 'cette bon nouvelle' in response to two letters from Béthune 'par lesquelles il me prie de l'advertir soigneusement de ce qui se faict en faveur des Catholiques touchant leur persécution'.[487]

On 9 October, a perplexed if not disgusted John Chamberlain mentioned that 'our papists begin to hold up their heads again, for wheras writts were gon out to inquire' of

> their lands and arrierages for not payeng according to the statut, letters are gon downe to suppresse that course and, yf any have payed, to restore yt: yt beeing (as is saide) the first article of this new alliance that no Romish Catholikes be troubled or molested for their conscience in body or goods.[488]

'There will be, as we gather, a calme', remarked Thomas Roper on 14 October. In fact, Roper had heard that 'the preistes and prisoners in Newgate are this daye to be released, and that there is order come to my lord keeper how to directe the judges for their carriadge about recusantes'. Furthermore, 'all the informers are of a sudden repressed'.[489] In mid-October, a priest, exiled but now returned from abroad, was (to the astonishment of Lord Zouch) ordered to be released on a writ from the king's bench prison. Zouch could not believe that James intended this to happen; Conway assured him that he did.[490]

[487] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 456; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 255r–v.

[488] McClure, *LJC*, pp. 581–582. On 24 September, the Venetian ambassadors could note that, of the Anglo-French treaty's twenty-six articles, eleven were 'in favour of the Catholic religion, either for the service of Madame or the advantage of the Catholics'; also, Effiat claimed to have done even more for them than his instructions allowed 'and much more than the Spaniards', especially in the arrangements for the education of the children of the marriage, in provision of chaplains for Charles's bride, and 'even in the sureties for the liberties of the Catholics': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 451. For the articles as they were eventually signed on 10/20 November, see Albion, *CI*, p. 63.

[489] AAW, B 27, no. 15.

[490] PRO, SP 14/173/59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conway told Lord Keeper Williams on 22 November 1624 that, now that the marriage articles were signed in France and that Villeauxclercs was expected at any time to arrive to ratify them, James intended, the moment the Frenchman disembarked, 'in contemplacion of that joyfull allyance [. . .] to give libertie to all the priests, saving those that by libertie' might 'bee exposed to dainger, which are those who have taken the oath of allegeance'. Williams was to see to the necessary paperwork, but it must 'appeare' that 'this libertie and favour' had been granted 'for things past, which they might forfeit if hereafter they' failed to 'governe themselves modestly and without scandall'.[491]

On 22 November also, Colleton wrote to More and Rant in Rome with the news that the order had gone out the previous day for bonfires and bells to celebrate the conclusion of the match. In a letter to More, his cousin Thomas Roper recorded that the ordnance at the Tower was discharged, 'and a ballette for joy mayde which here I send you'.[492] On 25 November, Colleton was also able to declare that Effiat had recently told the seculars that 'his Majestie had graunted the cessation of all penall statutes and other troubles for religion untill the 15 daye of Februarie next', in other words 'before the daie that the parliament' was expected to meet.[493]

When Villeauxclercs arrived on 6 December, he staged a public-relations coup by insisting on the release of several Catholics who had recently been put under restraint at Dover.[494] Prominent secular priests, including Colleton, Edward Bennett, Joseph Haynes, and William Shelley, visited the new ambassador, who carried directions to make contact with the leaders of the English Catholic community.[495] He

[491] PRO, SP 14/175/30, fo. 40r.

[492] AAW, B 27, nos 57, 58; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 503–504.

[493] AAW, B 27, no. 59.

[494] See *Letters 62*, *64*. As R.E. Shimp points out, Villeauxclercs was briefed also to 'cajole James into open war with Spain', though James still refused: Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 13; for the purposes of Villeauxclercs's embassy, set out in a document of 17/27 November 1624, see PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fos 284r–295r. John Hacket argued that Villeauxclercs was 'a fervent zealot in his own religion' and listened too readily to the grievances of 'our nimble-headed recusants': Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 212. For Hacket's account of the case made by Lord Keeper Williams to Villeauxclercs in justification of the legal status quo concerning recusancy and the technical proscription of the Catholic clergy, see *ibid.*, pp. 213–222. Hacket claimed that Villeauxclercs pushed the toleration issue so hard that James was 'observed to begin to be cooler in the treaty for the marriage than he had been': *ibid.*, p. 213.

[495] Albion, *CI*, p. 64. Hacket scornfully claimed that the English Catholics resorted 'daily to Mass in the embassadors house', and that they 'found access unto him and sighed out their grievances before him that their priests, who adventured to come to them for their souls health, were executed for traytors; and themselves were set such fines for their conscience that they were utterly impoverished', and begged him to alleviate their suffering: Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 212.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

made a commitment that he would do what he could for them and that they should not thereafter be troubled for religion.

On 12 December, Roper remarked, Villeauxclercs and Effiat 'after dinner were some three houres in private with the kinge in Trinity Colledge at Cambridge, none being presant but the duke and the prince'. Roper had heard that 'certayne articles were presented by them to the king, which his Majestie seigned, and that night they dispatched an expresse post into France with them, and thence they were to be sent to Rome'. The hope was that 'uppon the seight of them, his Holinesse' would 'graunte a dispensation'. Roper sent to More 'his Majesties graunte unto the ambassador in the behalfe of recusantes'. Catholics trusted that the ambassador would 'see these thinges performed by his Majesties officers before his departure'. If, commented Roper, 'these thinges be performed, his Majesties subjectes that are recusants will then say viva viva la France'.[496] Roper further noted that Villeauxclercs took a far harder line than Effiat over the performance of the royal guarantees of toleration to Catholics.[497] The earl of Kellie understood, on 15 December, that 'their is derektione gevin' to the lord treasurer and the chancellor of the exchequer 'that noe more processes' should 'goe out against recusants', and 'sutche be recalled that are out, and their bands takin bakke that wes gevin'; and 'this makes men believe that the same courss goes on now with the Frenche that was concludit with the Spainyard'.[498]

On 24 December 1624, following his meeting with the French ambassadors in Cambridge, James instructed Conway (who, Pesaro said subsequently, was blamed by the French for the impediments cast in the way of an effective toleration) that the law officers of the crown should be told to 'forbeare and cause to be forborne all manner of persecution' of Roman Catholics 'for the exercise of their religion', even though, on the same day, a commission went out to Abbot, Williams, and others to exile such clergy as had been 'convicted or attainted of or for any high treason or other offences whatsoever, and

[496] AAW, B 27, no. 79. See also AAW, B 47, no. 53; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 210; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 362r–v; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 209. In Paris, on 22 December 1624/1 January 1625, Anthony Champney was still complaining that 'the French conceive and utter their conceipt playnly that the Catholikes in England are Spaniards': AAW, B 47, no. 45.

[497] *Letter 65*; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 504. Both James and Charles signed the private agreement which granted relief to Catholics: Albion, *CI*, p. 63. For the French ambassadors' account of their meeting at Cambridge, see PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 305r *et seq*. They recorded that they had been assured that 'les Catholiques de ce pays ne seront jamais inquietés pour raison de serment de fidelité': *ibid.*, fo. 305v.

[498] *HMCMK*, p. 216; cf. McClure, *LJC*, p. 589.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also all other' Catholic clergymen whom it 'shalbe thought convenient or fitt to be soe dealt withall'.[499]

Villeauxclercs's insistence really does seem to have been the prime motivation for the toleration order which went through in late December. No more money was to be received for recusancy fines; discharges were to be issued for recusancy debts due at the exchequer; all money paid since the previous Trinity term was to be returned; no further proceedings against recusants were to be allowed; and all cash to be refunded was to be delivered to two Catholic middlemen.[500] The proceedings of the high commission were halted. Instructions went out that the fines levied on recusants under the act of uniformity should cease, and James ordered Williams to make out the necessary writs for releasing imprisoned Catholic clergy.[501]

Thus, as the new year came in, some Catholics thought that they could discern the outlines of a new and tolerant order. In fact, the debate continued throughout early 1625 among Catholic observers as to whether they had obtained toleration or not. It was not entirely clear whether they had, in any sense, won real rather than theoretical concessions from the crown. If they had, was this invalidated by sporadic instances of recusants being imprisoned or harassed again? Was the crown really trying to put a stop to such incidents? Was the supposed toleration merely a sham?[502]

Bérulle had left Rome in January 1625. On 4 February, Conway observed that Bérulle had 'arrived at last with the dispensation', but the document was being retained in the hands of the papal nuncio in Paris.[503] The nuncio, Bernardino Spada, had sent sceptical reports to Rome about the French intentions in the treaty. As a result, the official and final version of the dispensation (granted by Urban VIII on 21 November/1 December 1624), which had been sent to Spada

[499] PRO, SP 14/177/10, fo. 13r; PRO, SP 14/177/11, fo. 14r; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 539; PRO, C 231/4, fo. 173v. For the promises made to Villeauxclercs and Effiat that Conway had been ordered to dispatch warrants to free imprisoned Catholics and to restore property to them which had been sequestrated 'depuis ledit traicté', see PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 307v.

[500] PRO, SP 14/177/37, 39.i; *Letter 60*; Albion, *CI*, p. 64. Subsequently, on 1 February 1625, Conway directed James, Baron Ley, and Sir Richard Weston to implement the promised discharges of recusants' property; at the same time, Ley and Weston ordered the exchequer to 'give dischardge for all rentes and revenues for which any money hath bin receaved, bonds taken, lands or goods seized, or onely inquisicions taken'; and all money taken by virtue of commissions issued since the previous Trinity term should be redelivered, 'the bonds given up and the lands and goods dischardged as cleerely from the power [. . .] of these seizures, and from any burthen or incumbrance to rise by them, as possibly and legally may be done': *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 465; BL, Additional MS 35832, fo. 149r.

[501] PRO, SP 14/177/22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 36, 39, 45; Albion, *CI*, p. 64.

[502] See, e.g., *Letters 72*, *73*, *74*; AAW, B 47, no. 187.

[503] PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 51r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(whereas Bérulle had carried an unofficial one), was a great deal tougher. It effectively altered the treaty as it had been signed between the two crowns.[504] On 14/24 February, Carlisle and Holland relayed to Conway how Villeauxclercs had presented them 'with a copie of the articles [. . .] which he said he was ashamed to reade unto us, but [. . .] they were the conditions as the pope had limited the dispensation unto, and they were bound to present them unto us'. Louis himself apologized to them; but he said it was 'not in his power to alter it'. The English ambassadors were convinced that they were seeing a repeat of the final absurdity of the Anglo-Spanish negotiations. They believed that 'all these new condicions have beene forged here' in France, and advised James to 'reject these presumptuous and unreasonable demandes with a sharpe stoute negative, not admitting of any the least of them, for that would be to enter into a new treaty to the losse of tyme' and 'hazard to the whole busines, and to give them courage and appetite to presse for more'.[505]

There was a genuine possibility that the treaty might founder at this late stage. However, as Simon Adams says, Richelieu 'reasoned that Buckingham was so committed to the French alliance that he could not refuse'.[506] In the third week of February, Effiat lodged a protest about the slowness of the Jacobean regime to deliver on its promises of toleration, even though, on 1 March, he bitterly complained to his master that the English Catholics displayed 'une grande ingratitude' towards their royal benefactor and had forgotten that Louis had stopped 'le cours de la plus cruelle persécution'.[507] On 24 February/6 March, Carlisle and Holland had reported from Paris that Villeauxclercs, a 'false ingratefull fellowe', was semi-publicly averring that, although Louis XIII had given his royal word in the matter of the treaty, he would do better to break the compact 'for that therby he might make himself cheif of the Catholique league, and being so, he need not feare the kinge of Great Brittayne and the king of Spayne both'.[508] It was clear to the English that, while Richelieu gloried 'to have been a principal actor' in the conclusion of the match, a cabal was gathering which wanted both to remove the cardinal and the queen mother and radically to change French foreign policy.[509]

[504] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 576, 588, 597, 615; Albion, *CI*, pp. 72–73; Allison, RS, pp. 190–191; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 15; *HMCMK*, p. 222; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 63v; *Letter 75*.

[505] PRO, SP 78/74, fos 60r–61r; see also Philip Yorke, *Miscellaneous State Papers from 1501 to 1726*, 2 vols (London, 1778), I, pp. 551–555.

[506] Adams, PC, p. 362. Effiat had advised Louis on 1 March that 'la fortune dudit duc estoit perdu s'il venoit à se rompre': PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 64v.

[507] PRO, SP 78/74, fos 68r–v, 74r, 80r; *Letter 72*; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 72r.

[508] PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 78r.

[509] *Ibid.*; see also AAW, B 47, no. 78.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On 11 March, Conway tried to assure Effiat that the toleration order was on the verge of going through and that, if James 'escrivoit sa [*sic*] lettres aux juges, sheriffes et autres officiers, ce seroit la mesme chose qu'une proclamation'. The king would keep the promises made in favour of the Catholics. Effiat should not try to prescribe the means by which the king's beneficence should be distributed, as this would be counter-productive.[510] The next day, Conway wrote to the attorney-general with a list of Catholics whom the French ambassador had demanded should have freedom. The regime was happy in principle to grant favour but, added Conway, 'not in the public way they desire'.[511] On 14 March, Henry de Vic described the attorney-general's irate questioning of the Catholics' representatives about those who had been identified as prisoners exclusively because of their religion. The attorney-general launched an inquiry among the keepers of the London prisons in order to ascertain whether the Catholics' assertions were true.[512] A day later, a still angry attorney-general wrote back to Conway that he had looked into the cases which the French ambassador had specified and found that few of the people named were imprisoned for religion alone. He knew 'no cause why those that abuse his Majesties clemency by terming it persecution should, by such an importunity to my lord ambassador, procure greater favour than they have' already.[513] On 17 March, Williams complained to Buckingham that Effiat was 'fired with some complaints of our recusants, who (I verily beleeve) worke upon him purposelye, findinge him to be of a combustible disposition'. The lord keeper cited the letter he had received from Archbishop Mathew 'which shewes howe reallye his Majestyes promise hath beene in that kinde performed'. Williams advised Buckingham to reiterate to Effiat that the judges' proceedings against Catholic separatists were no more than 'orations [. . .] opening all the penal lawes; and the inditements, being presented by the countrey, cannot be refused by the judges. But the judges are ordered to execute nothing actuallye against the recusants nor will they doe it during the negociation'. Williams claimed that, with each of the ambassador's secretary's visits, he ordered those thus indicted to be transferred to the king's bench, 'out of the power and reach of the justices of the peace'; and, 'beinge there, the kinge maye and doth release them at his pleasure'.[514]

[510] PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 106r.
[511] *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 496; *Letter 73*.
[512] PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 124r–v.
[513] PRO, SP 14/185/54, fo. 83v; see also PRO, SP 14/185/95.
[514] BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 174r–v. On 5 April, however, Conway ordered Abbot to discharge specific prisoners, as named by the French ambassador, or to produce evidence that they were held for temporal causes: *CSPD, 1625–1626*, p. 6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The basically unsympathetic Pesaro noted, towards the end of March 1625, that 'some unhappy accidents are always happening in the persecution of the Catholics' and that 'those of the county of York have complained bitterly of the measures from which they have recently suffered'. Pesaro thought that the French diplomatic service was genuinely and generally doing its best and had even 'obtained royal letters under the seal with orders to the archbishop of York', Tobias Mathew, 'to stop the persecution'. Although there were rumours that 'free worship may not be authorised in any form', Effiat 'always works hard for the benefit of the Catholics, but they never cease making representations to the contrary at Rome to the despair of those who wish them well'.[515]

These delays and difficulties fomented more rumours, namely that the Spanish match would be revived. James himself had fuelled such rumours by dispatching envoys to Spain on 11 March to request a re-opening of the negotiations. They carried an invitation for Gondomar to return.[516] Predictably, Richard Smith suspected that the Jesuits had encouraged the incorporation of conditions in the dispensation which would prove politically unacceptable.[517]

There was an eleventh-hour diplomatic compromise whereby James, in fraught discussions with Effiat, refused to alter the treaty conditions as the papal dispensation required, in particular the demand that the *écrit particulier* should be 'confirmed by a public declaration'. But he agreed to write a private letter to the French king with a guarantee concerning how the existing articles would be interpreted. This was apparently enough. For various reasons – not least, the impending arrival of Cardinal Barberini to broker a Bourbon–Habsburg agreement in Italy – the French were now determined that the marriage should go ahead. In the end, it was the Roman curia and Spada who were forced, by English and French intransigence, to give in. The new papal conditions for granting the dispensation were withdrawn, and the document was handed over.[518]

Despite this last-minute compromise and the real uncertainty over how far the religious clauses of the treaty were likely to take effect, the anxiety caused to some of the regime's officials by this new course was clear for all to see. The attorney-general's correspondence shows how worried some ministers were by the prospect of implementing

[515] *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 620–621.

[516] Allison, RS, p. 191; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 468, 472, 474, 484, 486, 493, 495, 499, 522, 610, 616; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 15; Adams, PC, p. 345; see also *Letter 77*.

[517] Allison, RS, p. 191; *Letter 78*.

[518] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 83–86; cf. Albion, *CI*, pp. 72–76; Allison, RS, pp. 191–193; Bodleian Library, Tanner MS 73, fo. 516r; AAW, B 47, no. 154.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the regime's promises. Already, on 15 March, Coventry had written to Conway asking whether they genuinely meant to suspend the act of uniformity's one-shilling fine and also not to levy the forfeitures of £20 each month on convicted recusants' estates. Coventry thought it inadvisable to suspend the one-shilling fine since it would 'cause so generall a divulging of his Majesties purpose in these matters'.[519]

In the midst of the bargaining over the dispensation, King James died, relatively unexpectedly, on 27 March 1625. On 1 May, Charles sent orders to the increasingly beleaguered lord keeper that, on the pretext supplied by the impending marriage, all the crown's officers should be directed to suspend proceedings against Catholics.[520] Pardons began to be dispatched to specific recusants and priests, including, for example, John Percy SJ.[521] Of course, this did not prevent those officials who were less than convinced by the crown's proceedings from enforcing what they, correctly, believed the letter of the law still to be. During the summer months, recusancy prosecutions did in fact continue, temporarily ensnaring even some Catholic notables such as the earl of Clanricarde.[522] Charles's Protestant subjects did not want to believe that he was simply going to give effect to whatever had been promised to the French on the issue of toleration. On 13 April, Joseph Mead had been optimistic that Charles would be a new broom, for he understood that the king had 'ordered under his hand that no recusant papist shall have any mourning' for King James, 'of what rank soever he be'.[523] On 6 May, Mead believed that Charles had expelled from his household an Irish earl who would not attend divine service with him.[524]

Of course, this somewhat unstable state of partial de facto toleration does not look all that different from the position and condition of Catholics throughout much, though by no means all, of the early Stuart period. What was different was that the context for it was

[519] PRO, SP 14/185/54, fo. 84r–v. By 25 March, Pesaro understood that, although the lord treasurer had 'ordered repayment to the Catholics by degrees', the Catholics 'were not satisfied'. They wanted 'a general order for the restitution of their goods also, which would amount to a declaration against the laws, such as the king cannot make', nor was Effiat 'inclined to go to this extreme': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 625.

[520] PRO, SP 16/2/1.

[521] PRO, SP 16/2/22. Albion notes that, 'in fulfilment of his promises', Charles ordered Williams to 'stay the execution of the penal laws', whereupon '3,000 letters were sent out to the judges and bishops', although, informally, many Catholics who expected to benefit were told that they would have to wait until the end of the forthcoming parliamentary session: Albion, *CI*, p. 76.

[522] PRO, SP 16/4/63, 64, 68; J.S. Cockburn (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent indictments: James I* (London, 1980), no. 993; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 425–426.

[523] Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 10.

[524] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

entirely novel: a dynastic marriage to a princess whose government's representatives had made some very public statements about the necessity of actual tolerance of Catholics as a condition for the marriage.

On 12 May 1625, the recently arrived Richard Smith found it encouraging that 'I have bene here this forthnight and I heare not that the state taketh any notice of me'. Amazingly, Effiat 'offered me divers times to present me to his Majestie and the duke, if I wold', though Smith preferred to 'stay that til the coming of our queene'.[525]

The Arrival of Henrietta Maria

The new queen's imminent appearance had already provoked a good deal of speculation within the English Catholic community about the likely composition of her entourage.[526] It had seemed at one point that her confessor would be a Jesuit.[527] In the end, however, there was no Jesuit chaplain provided for her, even though the Jesuits had, Smith claimed, been in communication with the countess of Buckingham in order to get close to the new queen.[528] (In fact, Bérulle became her confessor.[529]) With a bad grace, the seculars suspected, the Jesuit provincial Richard Blount approved the choice – for the queen's liturgical and spiritual service – of the bishop of Mende (Richelieu's nephew Daniel Du Plessis), Bérulle, and the Oratorians.[530]

Just before the finalization of the marriage, the defence of Breda became unsustainable. The siege had been a test of how far the British commitment to the anti-Habsburg cause would hold up. Champney wished the town would fall, for then 'Mansfeilts armie would goe into smoake and [. . .] the day would growe clere that our kings intentions might be seene'.[531] James had, as we have seen, forbidden Mansfelt to take part in the attempt to lift the siege, and although this order was rescinded by Charles after James's death by then it was far too late.[532]

[525] *Letter 80*.

[526] See, e.g., *Letter 62*.

[527] AAW, A XIX, no. 2, p. 3. Richard Ireland had mentioned in his letter to Rant of 25 November/5 December 1624 that her confessor would be a bishop, 'which must be a Jesuit as it is commonly reported even by some of the Societye': AAW, B 27, no. 69; see also *Letter 64*.

[528] *Letter 69*.

[529] AAW, A XIX, no. 32, p. 105.

[530] AAW, B 47, no. 123 (cited in *Letter 85*); see also *Letter 53*; *CSPD, 1625–1626*, p. 67; C. Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria and the transition from princess to queen', *Court Historian*, 5 (2000), p. 23; Albion, *CI*, pp. 81, 108; Tillières, *ME*, pp. 63–64.

[531] AAW, B 47, no. 47.

[532] Adams, PC, p. 354; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 243.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On 2/12 April 1625, Champney observed that Mansfelt had arrived at Flushing with his troops in an appalling state. He was unlikely to 'doe anie thing either for the releiving of Breda or the recoverie of the Palatinate'. This would 'make our king and prince' (Champney was unaware that James had died) 'think they have committed an errour in going so farr that way after the puritaynes conduct'.[533] On 24 April/4 May, William Trumbull set down how, in Brussels, 'this day hath ben taken up with extraordinary devotion, espetially by our Englishe Romishe Spanishe Catholicks, for the good successe of the Marquis Spinola' in the siege of the hapless town.[534] An attempt in early May to relieve Breda, led by Sir Horace Vere, the earl of Oxford, and William of Nassau failed completely.[535]

Soon it was clear that the Anglo-French alliance was worth little more, militarily, than the paper on which it was written. The French and their allies had, even if only temporarily as it turned out, already achieved their immediate military objectives in the Valtelline during late 1624 and 1625: in other words, before the English could call on them to honour their promises over the Palatinate. In consequence, the French drew back from their commitment to assist James's son-in-law.[536] Breda capitulated, and the archduchess Isabella entered in triumph.[537]

[533] AAW, B 47, no. 49; *Letter 76*. Mansfelt had departed in late January 1625, taking his men to Holland. Those who had the misfortune to be sent to Geertruidenberg were unable to disembark and were struck down by infection on the ships: Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 228.

[534] PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 92r.

[535] *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 46–47, 61; *Letter 82*. For the account (dated 8/18 May) of the failed attempt, written by the Catholic Captain John Langworth, who was serving under Sir Edward Parham in the English regiment stationed in front of Breda, see PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 121r–v; see also *CSPD, 1625–1626*, p. 154.

[536] Allison, RS, p. 197; Schreiber, *FC*, p. 82; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 520, 536, 562, and *passim*; *HMCMK*, pp. 214, 219, 235; Ferrini and de Mas, *Lettere a William Cavendish*, pp. 294, 297; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', p. 13. Some English Catholics were horrified at the atrocities committed by French troops against Catholics in the Valtelline (in pursuit of the French court's alliance with the region's Protestants): *Letter 76*. In fact, the French military initiative in the region, after initial successes, subsequently ground to a halt for lack of naval support. Richelieu was forced to negotiate the Treaty of Monzón (March 1626) with the Spaniards, prior to turning to deal with the Huguenots: Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494–1660* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 207–208; Albion, *CI*, p. 5; T. Osborne, 'Abbot Scaglia, the duke of Buckingham and Anglo-Savoyard relations during the 1620s', *European History Quarterly*, 30 (2000), p. 19. Conrad Russell interprets the breakdown of the Anglo-French amity primarily from a domestic angle. He argues that the French had required tolerationist concessions from the regime in England which could not but irritate Hispanophobe sentiment. However, they had also demanded that Charles should sustain a war effort. This was something which he could not easily do once he had thus alienated those elements of the political nation which would be asked to provide the necessary revenue: Russell, *PEP*, pp. 209–210.

[537] *Letter 82*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Meanwhile, the marriage compact had been sealed in Paris on 1/11 May 1625. The ceremony took place at Notre Dame and was based on the ritual provided for Marguerite de Valois and Henri de Navarre in 1571. The duke of Chevreuse acted as proxy for Charles.[538] Buckingham set off for France in order to greet Charles's bride and, at the same time, to try – though in the event unsuccessfully – to give life and a measure of permanence to the military alliance between the two realms.[539]

On 8/18 June, Champney heard that Charles was 'between London and Dover, expecting the arrivall of his queene'. The countess of Buckingham 'with divers ladies' had gone to meet Henrietta Maria.[540] The ladies in question included some notable Catholics, for instance Jane Savage (the wife of John Paulet, Lord St John) and her mother Elizabeth Darcy, the wife of Sir Thomas Savage.[541] Henrietta Maria landed at Dover on 12 June (as George Fisher remarked, she and Charles 'bedded togeather the second night') and the royal couple reached London on 16 June.[542]

What was immediately obvious was that the political manoeuvring and bickering which had marked the Catholics' struggle for favour and influence before the marriage would continue with a vengeance after Henrietta Maria arrived. The clergy were no shrinking violets in their determination to gain access to this new source of favour. For, noted Fisher on 17 June, 'the very day of ther arrivall here, our new master', Bishop Richard Smith, 'attended with 5 of us, visited' Bérulle, the duke of Chevreuse, and Villeauxclercs. They all 'promised to doe ther utmost endeavour and all good offices for Catholikes so that now we are laboring how to setle matters, and to free our selves from the burden of persecution wich hath hitherto pressed us'.[543] It must have been encouraging for the secular priests that, as Pesaro remarked,

[538] Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', p. 17; Allison, RS, p. 193; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 261r; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 69v.

[539] *Letter 80*; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', pp. 16–17; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 236–238; Adams, PC, pp. 362–363; *Salvetti*, p. 17.

[540] *Letter 83*.

[541] *Letter 82*; L. Boothman and Sir Richard Hyde Parker (eds), *Savage Fortune* (Suffolk Records Society, Woodbridge, 2006), pp. xxxix–xl.

[542] Allison, RS, p. 193; AAW, B 48, no. 34, fo. 97r; *Letter 84*; PRO, SP 16/3/69. For the ceremonial and ritual accompanying Henrietta's arrival, notably in Canterbury, see Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', p. 18, citing M. Toynbee, 'The wedding journey of King Charles I', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 69 (1955), pp. 75–89; see also C. Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: perspectives on the role of consort queens in *ancien régime* courts', in I. Atherton and J. Sanders (eds), *The 1630s* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 94–95.

[543] AAW, B 48, no. 34, fo. 97r (cited in *Letter 85*). See also *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the queen's train consisted of 'a bishop and twenty-four Bérullists or fathers of the Oratory, Jesuits being absolutely excluded'.[544]

For Catholics such as Thomas Roper, all seemed bright. He exulted on 23 June that, 'on Sonday last [. . .] about 12 a clocke', the queen came 'by water from Whitehall to Somersette House to the duke of Cheverous where she heard service performed with great reverence by Monsieur Berule. There wanted some cairefull attendantes at the doore of the chapell, beinge present there halfe Protestantes, yet I heare not of any great misbehavior amonge them'. On Tuesday, the king and queen dined at the banqueting house, and 'the two dukes did contend who should exceede the other, yet Chevrous was judged to surpasse our duke, since Chevrous hathe feasted the kinge and queene at Sommersette House and Buckingh[am] hathe don the like at Yorke House'. Chevreuse had been angered by the evidence of continued legal proceedings against Catholics, in particular the case of one of Roper's neighbours. This man had been 'committed to the Counter for a debte to the kinge contracted for [. . .] recusancy'. Chevreuse 'complayned to the kinge, and his Majestie was informed that there was none troubled for recusancy, but that it was for debte, and so Cheverous was told, who hathe furder enquired of the truthe, and founde it to be for recusancy and no other cause'. Both Chevreuse and Villeauxclercs were 'zealous' even though, it had to be conceded, they were ultimately pessimistic about royal guarantees of toleration to Catholics.[545]

Some Catholics affected to believe that only meagre provision had been made for the formal and ceremonial expressions of the queen's Catholicism, certainly nothing compared with what had been envisaged for the infanta in 1623.[546] Contemporaries were noting as early as June 1625 that Charles was distinctly unsympathetic towards

[544] *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 82.

[545] AAW, A XIX, no. 56, p. 166; see also AAW, B 47, no. 132; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 94–95 (Chevreuse's statement on behalf of English Catholics at his first audience with Charles I, asking him to honour the concessions which had been made to them). For proceedings against Catholics reported by the duke of Tuscany's agent, Amerigo Salvetti, on 24 June, see *Salvetti*, p. 24. Salvetti commented that 'those who had charge of the negotiations in France' had failed to provide adequately for this situation, and they 'apparently believed, or induced others to believe, that the English [Catholics] are a sort of Spanish Catholics, different from the French'. A week later, however, he recorded that, although some English Catholics were deeply critical of the French diplomats, the diplomats themselves had lodged protests with the court about the proceedings against Catholics: *ibid.*, pp. 24, 25.

[546] AAW, B 47, no. 190. See also Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 33; *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 34. For the arrangements for Henrietta Maria's chapel, see Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', p. 17; PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fos 309r, 320r. She was entitled to a chapel in each royal abode, with as many as twenty-eight chaplains in all, and a bishop to serve as her almoner.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his wife's liturgical requests and requirements.[547] On the other hand, for many Protestants, any expression of Catholicism at court was too much. In the same month, complaints about the queen's chapel were voiced in parliament.[548] On 4 July, the earl of Pembroke, the lord steward, informed the upper House that 'the kinge hath certified him and others that such servaunts as she had when she was princes[s]' would be the only ones allowed 'to waite on her'. She would have no subjects of his to serve her 'without they goe to church'. He also said that Charles had 'given strict comaund to his porter at St James his house, where the q[ueen's] chapell is to bee erected, that no one subject whatsoever should bee suffered to come to the Masse'.[549]

While different Catholic factions had calculated how they might best insinuate themselves into the queen's entourage and favour, precautions had been taken to make sure that Henrietta Maria met only the right sort of English Catholics. For example, the regime sent for a cantankerous Benedictine called John Barnes, promising him both 'securitie' and 'preferment'. Barnes was renowned for his anti-Jesuit views; he also favoured Thomas Preston's opinions about the 1606 oath of allegiance; and he had been presented to Buckingham in Paris. It seemed that the regime would offer patronage to those who countenanced the Jacobean loyalty oath, and it was rumoured that such clerics would replace Henrietta Maria's Oratorian chaplains.[550] Initially, though, the queen's Oratorians seemed to be a great success.[551]

The 1625 Parliament and the Aftermath of the Anglo-French Treaty

The 1625 parliament was deferred several times before it finally assembled on 18 June. The principal reason was the royal marriage, although the plague, raging in London, contributed to its delay.[552]

[547] Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 33; Albion, *CI*, p. 80; cf. *Salvetti*, p. 25.

[548] TD, V, p. 160.

[549] F.H. Relf (ed.), *Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords* (London, 1929), p. 58. In a newsletter of 1 July, Joseph Mead was informed that this was in response to Henrietta Maria's officials dismissing all the English Protestants who attended upon her: Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 39. For the ambiguities about what exactly the situation was with regard to the queen's chapel, see *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 118.

[550] *Letter 81*; D. Lunn, *The English Benedictines, 1540–1688* (London, 1980), pp. 108–110.

[551] *Letter 85*.

[552] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 204–205. Buckingham wrote to Lord Nithsdale that the postponing of the parliament was 'for manie waightie considerations' but mainly to allow for the arrival of Henrietta Maria, so that her 'graces and virtues [. . .] will not onlie stay the exorbitant or ungentle motions that might otherwise bee made in the house of parlement but will facilitate, in his Majesties proceeding, those passages of favors, grace and goodness which

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

According to Conrad Russell, the combination of the postponements and the completion of the French treaty created a fertile ground for suspicion that true (Protestant) religion was in danger. This was, as he points out, the period when 'theologically alert' members of the Commons, such as John Pym, began to be aware that there was a dangerous species of doctrinal novelty creeping in among English Protestants and creating serious dissent within the Church of England.[553] For Russell, however, the sudden and violent anti-popery scare of 1625, if it did not quite come out of nowhere, emerged from normal and traditional anti-popish feeling but at a time when there was no visible 'external' enemy to fight, and when the regime, though outwardly led by a godly Protestant sovereign who had broken with Spain, was forced to prevent the full implementation of that anti-popish impulse.[554]

Of course, we might wonder whether this was not the first time that this had happened in the 1620s. Within rather recent memory, in fact, the regime had committed itself to honouring tolerationist promises made to a foreign power, namely Spain. But when an opportunity for rapprochement with the parliament was provided by the plague and the resulting adjournment to Oxford in August, Charles failed to take advantage of the breathing space offered to him.[555] Simon Adams's account of Buckingham's packing of the council and royal household, from mid- to late summer 1624 onwards, helps to explain why the Protestant enthusiasm for the breach of the treaties with Spain turned so quickly to disillusion.[556]

Charles's speech at the opening of the session was, as John Chamberlain noted, short. The king told the members that the war was, financially, parliament's responsibility. The fleet was in readiness and it was for them to fund its expedition properly. He also said that they should 'not doubt nor suspect his religion seeing he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel'.[557] Parliament's response was a stream of anti-popish invective. The speaker of the House of Commons,

his Majestie hath promised for the ese of the Romaine Catholickes'. This would make diplomacy with the French court easier. It would also allow 'the beginning of a straighter correspondence' with 'him you went to', i.e. Urban VIII, 'than could be hoped for these manie yeres past': BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 179r. The marquis of Effiat had urged (for example, in a dispatch to Villeauxclercs of 29 February) that parliament should not meet before Henrietta Maria's arrival, in part because 'les puritains', who were 'offencés des graces que nous faisons recevoir aux Catholiques', could afford to speak their minds now that the Spanish match was irretrievably broken: PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 58r.

[553] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 204–207.

[554] *Ibid.*, pp. 208–209.

[555] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 89.

[556] Adams, PC, pp. 359–360.

[557] McClure, *LJC*, pp. 625–626; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 242.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sir Thomas Crew, was presented on 20 June. Despite the context of a loyal address and of the slew of petitions which were customary at the beginning of a session, he inveighed 'bitterly against recusantes'; and the 'lower House did propose unto his Majestie that the penall lawes might be putt in execution against them'. But Charles, via Lord Keeper Williams, told them that this was not 'the businesse for which they were cauled', though he would do 'what was fittinge'.[558]

The mismanagement of the war effort provoked intense and hostile criticism. Furthermore, the French crown had requested English naval assistance in late 1624: Louis wanted ships for service against the Genoese. Then the proposed target changed from Genoa to the Huguenots. Initially, faced with Soubise's pre-emptive rebellion against the military action planned against La Rochelle, Buckingham did not object, particularly since it did not appear, at first, that the majority of Huguenots desired conflict with the French crown, especially when it seemed that Louis might go to war with Spain, and could not do so if threatened by a Huguenot revolt. In the end, the French received the ships, though without their crews. But Buckingham had been manipulated and outwitted by Richelieu, who had talked up the prospect of peace with the Huguenots as a prelude to the transfer of control of the ships. The episode raised, during the summer of 1625, the possibility that English forces would wage war against the cause of European Protestantism.[559]

On 23 June, 'an act for explanation of a branch of 3 Jac. concerning the discovering and repressing of popish recusants was twice read together'. MPs demanded that loopholes in the law must be closed.[560] This was essentially the same as the bill which had been introduced and lost in both 1621 and 1624.[561] Chamberlain noted that, on 24 June, the members were 'with the king about yt'. They 'began to mutter about matters of religion that the king promised them when he was prince that he wold never contract any mariage with conditions derogatorie to that we professe'. Some were actually saying that 'all goes backward since this connivence in religion came in, both in our wealth, valor, honor and reputation, and that yt is visiblie seen that God blesses nothing we take in hand wheras, in Quene Elizabeths

[558] AAW, A XIX, no. 56, p. 166 (cited in *Letter 85*); Russell, *PEP*, pp. 219–220; Hacket, *SR*, part II, pp. 11–13; *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 34–35.

[559] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 211–212; Adams, PC, pp. 361, 363; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 229–231, 252–255; Shimp, 'A Catholic marriage', pp. 13–14; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 63–64. In September 1625, the Huguenots under Soubise were defeated at the Ile de Rhé: Adams, PC, p. 376; *Salvetti*, p. 33.

[560] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 232–233, 504–505; C. Thompson, 'Court politics and parliamentary conflict in 1625', in Cust and Hughes, *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, p. 186; *LJ*, III, p. 446.

[561] *Proceedings 1625*, p. 226, n. 4; *LJ*, III, p. 248.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

time, who stoode firme in Gods cause, all thinges did flourish'.[562] As early as 25 June, Thomas Roper recorded parliament's reluctance to make the full customary grant to Charles of the one shilling in the pound in tonnage and poundage duty which they 'formerly gave his father unlesse he will graunte them their desiers'. More generally, Roper thought that the 'common wealthe is sicke and muche distempered'.[563]

Between 25 and 28 June, a subcommittee drew up various articles to be presented to Charles. These mainly concerned the 'great increase' of papists in the realm. It was claimed that these papists aimed at 'the possessing themselves of the whole power of the state'. For the umpteenth time, the standard and not necessarily inaccurate anti-popish mantra of the period was trotted out – 'such is the restlessness of their spirit that, if they gain but a connivancy, they will press for a toleration, then strive for an equality and lastly aspire to such a superiority as may work the extermination both of us and our religion'. Commenting on the extent to which the various Catholic factions had intruded into recent diplomatic processes, the articles stated that the danger from papists was much increased by their 'dependency upon foreign princes'. Their aspirations would open 'a way of popularity to the ambition of any who shall adventure to make himselfe head of so great a party'. The fundamental cause to which these articles pointed was the weakness displayed by the crown as it negotiated for treaties with those same foreign powers. The crown's spinelessness was principally displayed in 'the late suspension of the execution of the laws against the Jesuits, seminary priests and popish recusants'. It was compounded, even when those laws were enforced, by the frauds practised by popish officers of the crown. This encouraged the recusants in their boldness. Foreign ambassadors had 'interposed' in the English Catholics' favour. Catholics had been audacious in their resort to London and in 'their frequent conventicles and conferences heare'. The Commons also cited the distribution of popish books, the harm caused by popish schoolteachers, the freedom of the popish clergy to come and go as they pleased, and the bad state of the Church of England ministry. Significantly, the agitation over religion now included proposals that the Church of England should be made more amenable to godly Protestants. Sir Nathaniel Rich, for example, suggested that ministerial subscription should be compelled only to those of the Thirty-Nine Articles which parliament had confirmed by statute. As Russell says, this subject had not been touched in 1621

[562]McClure, *LJC*, p. 626.

[563]AAW, B 47, no. 190 (cited in *Letter 85*); Thompson, 'Court politics', p. 176; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 82–83.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and 1624. The 1625 parliament also saw the storm over the Arminian polemicist Richard Montagu.[564]

It was urged that public expressions of Catholicism should be strictly curbed. In particular, Charles was to be petitioned 'that no popish recusant be permitted to come within the court', except upon specific royal warrant. Significantly, in the light of the Catholic episcopacy campaign and the arrival of Bishop Smith, the Commons also demanded that Charles should be requested 'to take such order [. . .] that no bishop, stranger, nor any other by authority derived from the see of Rome, confer ecclesiastical orders or exercise any ecclesiastical function whatsoever towards or upon any of his Majesty's natural subjects within any of his Majesty's dominions'.[565]

Although statutes had already codified all the possible penalties that had ever been imagined for dealing with Catholic offenders against the law which governed religious conformity, the petition rehearsed most of them. All that was necessary, it was declared, was to enforce them. The question, as ever, was what implementation of the law would mean in practice. Enforcement to the absolute limits of the statutes against Catholics implied what was impossible even in the late 1580s under Elizabeth, namely a 'terror' of Jacobin proportions. In other words, despite the qualifying and respectful phrases used by the Commons, all such advice, coupled with claims about the increase in the number of recusants, was a critique of royal government. A select committee for drawing up a petition concerning religion was appointed on 28 June; it reported, with the text of the petition to the king, two days later.[566] The Commons's petition against recusants, which had been sent to the Lords on 1 July after a request for a joint conference, was read on 4 July. It was discussed and amended after yet another conference between the two Houses' representatives. Measures were considered for restricting the Catholic impact that Henrietta Maria would have.[567]

Also on 28 June, the Lords heard the reading of a petition brought in by Lionel Farrington. It concerned a recusant against whom Farrington was proceeding 'pro domino rege quam pro seipso'. But the

[564] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 260–264; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 230, 231–233. On 28 June, a draft bill was introduced by Sir John Strode 'for the educating of the children of popish recusants': *Proceedings 1625*, p. 257.

[565] *Ibid.*, p. 263. On 4 July, at a conference between the Commons and the Lords, it was decided that the provision concerning foreigners executing episcopal jurisdiction should be 'extended to natural subjects': *ibid.*, p. 305. On the same day, Bishop George Carleton complained about Richard Smith: Questier, *C&C*, p. 424.

[566] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 265–266, 274.

[567] *Ibid.*, pp. 155, n. 12, 78–79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 305, 314, 316; *LJ*, III, pp. 451, 453, 456, 457, 458, 460, 465.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recusant, one William Andrewes, had, when arrested at Farrington's request, produced a 'protection [. . .] subscribed by [. . .] Lord Eure'. Eure was one of the popish office-holders who had been named and shamed in May 1624. The Lords took the opportunity to pronounce that 'none are to be privileged against any statute of recusancy'.[568]

Following the extremely ill-received royal request on 8 July for an additional grant of supply, and a simultaneous announcement of the adjournment of the parliament from plague-ridden London to Oxford, the members reconvened there after intermission (11 July to 1 August).[569] There, the regime experienced a barrage of criticism over how it had conducted its recent business.[570] One of the topics which kept recurring was the issue of Catholicism. On 4 August, Charles addressed both Houses in Christ Church. They were promised that the petition against recusants would be dealt with, though there were protests the following day about pardons obtained for recusants by the French ambassador.[571] In the extensive debates in the Commons on 5 August, about a range of controversial issues (including the war and financial supply), Sir Robert Phelips openly demanded an explanation of the purpose of the Anglo-French alliance, and of why Charles had married a Catholic.[572] Sir Simon Weston demanded that 'papists' estates' be subjected to a greater tax burden.[573] On 6 August, Sir Nathaniel Rich, seconded by Phelips, put forward five demands. They dealt with the apparent de facto toleration for Catholics, the absence of a coherent war strategy, evil counsellors, and royal finances. Others, such as Sir Henry Mildmay, referring to the plague, lamented that 'our coldness in religion [is] one of the principal causes of the grievous visitation now upon us'. He suggested that the king should, 'upon no instance, give any connivance to the papists'.[574] On 8 August, in the context of a long speech from Buckingham in defence of the regime's proceedings, both Houses were (as part of a strategy to instigate a grant of supply) advised by the lord keeper that the king and privy council

[568] *Ibid.*, pp. 446–447. Farrington had come to grief at the hands of the allegedly crypto-papist Sir Henry Spiller early in the 1621 parliament, when Farrington joined in the petitioning against alleged maladministration of the exchequer procedures for fining recusants and sequestrating their property: Questier, 'Sir Henry Spiller', p. 256.

[569] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 235–237; Adams, PC, pp. 366–367; Thompson, 'Court politics', pp. 176–179.

[570] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 238–252; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 260–267.

[571] Thompson, 'Court politics', pp. 180–181; Russell, *PEP*, p. 241; Alexander, *CLT*, p. 84; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 255, 260; *LJ*, III, pp. 470–471.

[572] Adams, PC, p. 368; Thompson, 'Court politics', p. 181; *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 395–396. For the debates about financial supply, see Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 84–88.

[573] *Proceedings 1625*, p. 391; Adams, PC, p. 368.

[574] Adams, PC, p. 369; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 261; *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 412, 549.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were considering remedies to satisfy the petition against recusants.[575] The petition was read in full on 9 August 1625 and Charles's reply was delivered.[576] 10 August found John Delbridge still complaining in the Commons about 'pardons to Jesuits' and the afflictions of the Huguenots at La Rochelle.[577] Archbishop Abbot reported from the recent conference between delegates from both Houses (requested on 8 August) that the lower House was extremely concerned about these issues and could point to recent prerogative pardons extended to Catholics.[578]

In fact, following Charles's answer to the petition concerning religion, it was decided by the Lords that this matter should, in effect, be allowed to drop.[579] On 11 August, Sir Edward Coke, back from conference with the Lords, was still protesting about the terms obtained by the French for English Catholics, although the Lords had 'resolved to move the king never to pardon any Jesuit or other papist til they be attainted'.[580] As Schreiber and Russell stress, the regime was quite ready to breach the toleration clauses of the Anglo-French treaty if that was the price of both supply and popularity. This did not serve, however, to protect Buckingham from attack; and it was the attacks on Buckingham which played a major part in forcing Charles to dissolve the parliament. The session ended on 12 August.[581]

In the face of Protestant parliamentary hostility, the new king had tried very hard to head off charges of dalliance with popery. But would the crown now allow the resumption of proceedings against Catholics? Apparently, the answer was that it would. The law would be enforced as usual against Catholic nonconformists, in spite of (or perhaps in part because of) the occasional French protest and, of course, the overt *dévot* Catholicism of the queen.[582]

It was far from clear, however, that the royal administration of the law against nonconformity was now exactly as it had been. On 14 August 1625, Charles issued a proclamation which ordered those at

[575] Relf, *Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords*, pp. 61–62; Russell, *PEP*, p. 248; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 262–265; PRO, SP 16/5/28; *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 147, 148; Thompson, 'Court politics', p. 183; *Salvetti*, p. 27.

[576] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 155f., 170, 177, 433; *LJ*, III, pp. 477–481.

[577] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 448, 556, n. 181; *Salvetti*, p. 29.

[578] *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 146, 152, 169, 171–172, 375, 412, n. 10.

[579] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[580] *Ibid.*, pp. 458, 461; *LJ*, III, p. 487.

[581] Schreiber, *FC*, p. 90; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 248–252; Adams, PC, p. 370.

[582] Allison, RS, p. 197; Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', pp. 19, 20, 23, 24; Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 52; *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 129; Albion, *CI*, pp. 79–85; TD, V, pp. 161–162. A good deal of the opposition to Buckingham at court came from within the queen's entourage (before it was diminished through dismissals): Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', p. 23; Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 96–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the seminaries to return to England and commanded that the penal laws be enforced against the Catholic clergy.[583] On 8 September, Sir George Goring advised Carleton that the Catholics believed that the game was up and that 'they have offered underhand 3 hundreth thousand pounds sterling presently to be leavyed for regaining the peace they did injoy but were not contented then withall'.[584] In Michaelmas term, an order was delivered to the judges that, in their circuits, they should execute the penal laws against Catholic separatists. This was Charles's response to the parliament's petitioning. Charles could interpret those statutes according to a particular set of commonplaces in contemporary commonwealth theory. Here, it was argued, the Catholic nonconformists' fines and sequestrations would make amends (for the rent in the social and political fabric that Catholic nonconformity had caused) by being employed for national defence.[585] In some ways, this anticipates the composition schemes of the later 1620s which, to many Protestants, did appear to be a form of de facto toleration.

Even as these orders were being issued, stories flooded in from around the country that papists were plotting all manner of treasons. Their power and their lawlessness undermined, it seemed to some, the nation's capacity to defend itself as it anticipated a full-scale war against the Spaniards.[586] In October, instructions were issued that leading Catholics should be disarmed.[587]

In Northamptonshire, on 31 October, this attempt to seize papists' weapons had resulted in a brawl at the house of Lord Vaux, with 'blowes exchanged betwene the said lord and Mr Knightly, a justice of the peace who assisted the deputy lieutenants in that action'.[588] The

[583] *SRP*, II, no. 23; Albion, *CI*, p. 79; *Salvetti*, p. 31; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 66r–v.

[584] PRO, SP 16/6/35, fo. 50v.

[585] AAW, A XIX, no. 89, pp. 273–274; *CSPD, 1625–1626*, p. 142 (Charles's commission of 3 November 1625 to the lord keeper and others 'to see the laws against popish recusants put in execution according to the petition of the parliament; with a declaration of the king's pleasure that all fines and forfeitures of recusants' goods be set apart for certain specified public services'); PRO, SP 16/9/51 (a similar commission of 11 November 1625, which specifically directed that 'all sums received for pecuniary forfeitures' of recusants should be 'applied towards the provision of gunpowder and repair of fortifications'); see also Hacket, *SR*, part II, p. 7.

[586] PRO, SP 16/6/41, 41.i, 46, 57, 68, 68.i, ii, iii, 104; PRO, SP 16/7/37, 69; PRO, SP 16/10/42, 42.i–iv; PRO, SP 16/11/42; PRO, SP 16/12/71; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 201v; Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 58.

[587] Questier, *C&C*, p. 429; *APC, 1625–1626*, pp. 188–189; Durham University Library, Mickleton and Spearman MS II/2, fos 355r, 363r–365r, 371r–372r. For the two separate orders to disarm papists at this time, on 2 October and 30 October, see Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, pp. 441, 449. See also B. Quintrell, 'The practice and problems of recusant disarming', *RH*, 17 (1985), pp. 208–222; Boothman and Parker, *Savage Fortune*, p. xxxix.

[588] BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 201r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

search was clearly motivated and informed, in part, by Vaux's recent military exploits on the Continent. As Godfrey Anstruther comments, there was a fear that 'soldiers equipped in Flanders might be bringing [. . .] weapons' back home and 'putting them by for future reference'.[589] On 3 November, the searchers wrote up their own account of what had happened, and sent it to the privy council. Conway sent a version of it to Buckingham:[590] in it, he described how the quarrel developed following the search for 'martiall munition'. Initially, the Vauxes 'respectfully consented to the search' and 'noe armes [were] found'. But Lord Vaux's brother, William, opined loudly that the searchers 'gave to the recusants the worst usage they could, except they should cutt theire throates, and with divers other oathes wished it were come to that day'. Richard Knightly, who was also a deputy lieutenant, replied that there 'were divers statutes against recusants which they were not troubled withall'. When Vaux's brother denied this 'with greate oathes', Knightly cited the 1581 recusancy statute as one of which they were free but 'further told him there was a late statute against swearing which putt a penalty of 12^{d} upon every oath and told him he must exact that from him'. More expletives followed, and Knightly demanded satisfaction from Lord Vaux and his mother. They refused, and so Knightly commanded a 'counstable to distreyne soe much of Mr Vaux his goods as would satisfy three shillings and give that to the poore according to the statute'. Lord Vaux 'tooke Mr Knightley aside and told him that if hee found him in another place hee would call him to a reckoning for this. To which Mr Knightley replyed, you knowe where I dwell.' In the hall, however, Lord Vaux gave Knightly a push, and told him to 'bee gone', to which Knightly retorted that he would search some more if he felt like it, 'and when hee had done his office hee would more willingly bee gone than hee would have him'. At this point Lord Vaux 'gave him a good blowe on the face'. They grappled with each other and were dragged apart. But that only provided the opportunity for the noble lord to obtain a 'cudgell out of anothers hand' and strike 'Mr Knightleyes man' and, according to Conway's account, Vaux 'broke his head and knockt him downe'. This persuaded the search party to leave the house in haste.[591]

In the context of the recent uncertainty over the status and enforcement of the law against Catholic separatism, this was a high-profile incident. The king directed that the matter should be dealt with in the star chamber. As the parties left the 'councell chamber', Vaux

[589] Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, p. 441.

[590] PRO, SP 16/9/18; BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 342r–v; Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, pp. 441–445.

[591] BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 342r–v; Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, pp. 441–445.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implied that Sir William Spencer, who had testified against him there, had perjured himself, and Vaux was sent to the Fleet prison. Yet this was hardly evidence of a determined drive against Catholic dissent. 'In the disarming of the lords recusants, there was as much respect had', Carlisle assured Buckingham, 'of some who have relacion to your lordship as yow yourself would desire'.[592] Significantly, Conway informed Buckingham that Knightly, being soon after appointed sheriff, was 'perplext' and argued 'that all the world would thinke it was a punishment laid upon him for my Lord Vaux'.[593]

There was, nevertheless, evidently supposed to be some kind of equivalence in the public mind between the sequestration of arms and armour from recusants' households and the provision of military equipment for the war with Spain, even though recusants in general had very little in the way of military hardware and the war effort needed a great deal more, and was not receiving it. It was this kind of thinking which lay behind the suggestions of MPs such as Sir John Eliot in the 1624 parliament and Christopher Sherland at the very end of the 1625 parliament that forfeited recusant property might serve to pay for a fleet to fight against Spain.[594]

In January 1626, there was a proclamation against recusants in anticipation of the meeting of the 1626 parliament.[595] Mass indictments of Catholic nonconformists took place at this time. Late February saw public brawling between the French diplomats' servants and royal officials over the resort of Catholics to the French embassy at Durham House for Mass. In March, there were prison searches once again.[596]

In the meantime, Buckingham had tried to rescue himself from the disaster of the Anglo-French alliance. He did this by attempting, in the latter part of 1625, to construct a new alliance, one which replaced the French with the United Provinces and with Denmark; in the course of its construction, Mansfelt's troops were reassigned to Danish service, though this led to yet another defeat for him (at Dessau Bridge in April 1626). This new strategy was also what had spawned the failed expedition to Cadiz in late 1625.[597]

[592] BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 201r–v.

[593] *Ibid.*, fo. 343r; Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, p. 448. For the subsequent conduct of the case, removed from the star chamber to the House of Lords after Vaux took the oath of allegiance in the 1626 parliament, see Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, pp. 448–453.

[594] Russell, *PEP*, pp. 174, 251–252; ED, fo. 37r. Cf. the implementation, in the subsidy bill passed on 8 July, of the proposal that recusants should pay double subsidy: *Proceedings 1625*, pp. 276, 279, 391, n. 5.

[595] *SRP*, II, no. 36.

[596] PRO, SP 16/21/23, 63; PRO, SP 16/22/112 (see also BL, Harleian MS 161, no. 30, fo. 93r); PRO, SP 16/23/125.

[597] Adams, PC, pp. 371–376; Pursell, *WK*, p. 240; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 278–279.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The eventual war between England and France severely tested the English Catholics' political coherence. Charles managed, of course, to drift into war with France (in the form of the Ile de Rhé expedition, undertaken in the belief that assisting the Huguenots would bring down Richelieu) while he was still at war with Spain. And he did this at one of the few times in the period when the Bourbons and the Habsburgs were not at war with each other – in other words, before the Mantuan succession conflict meant that normal service was, as it were, resumed.[598]

The 'approbation' controversy, when Bishop Richard Smith challenged his Catholic critics and spectacularly lost, destroyed a good deal of the vision of the leading secular clergy and their patrons for the renascence of a unified hierarchical version of the Catholic Church in England.[599] On the other hand, the Caroline regime did not now readily identify, if it ever had, its ideological enemies as being primarily among the king's Catholic subjects.

Conclusion

The period after 1625 lies beyond the scope of the texts reproduced in this volume. However, the newsletters written by the secular clergy in the late Jacobean and early Caroline period demonstrate how far Catholicism in England was politically wired into national and popular politics. The programme of these clerics was itself, on one reading, a resurrection of Catholic aspirations at the accession of James in 1603. At that time, it had briefly appeared that the condition of Catholics might change irreversibly. What had seemed possible in the years 1603–1604 (in the sense of a toleration for the Catholic community) actually happened, albeit briefly, during the early 1620s.

Here, also, we have a contribution to the 'post-revisionist' critique of certain recent accounts of parliamentary politics in the 1620s. As Thomas Cogswell has pointed out in a series of ground-breaking studies of the period, looking beyond the narrow confines of Westminster gives us not just a wider perspective but a view which is different in kind from one which is constructed by concentrating on parliament and the court. He argues that 'the pronounced polarization of the realm during the Spanish match [...] was not a passing aberration in early Stuart politics'. Certainly, the conduct of royal policy in the early 1620s would come to be regarded by contemporaries as a direct prequel to the 1630s – 'the stress on the blessings of peace, the

[598] Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 102–103; Bonney, *European Dynastic States*, pp. 208–210.
[599] Questier, *C&C*, ch. 13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tight episcopal control over preachers, the campaign against puritans amid a de facto toleration of Catholics, and [. . .] the reliance on Spain'.[600]

As the above exposition of Catholic attitudes to central political themes in British politics at this time has attempted to show, behind the rhetoric of heretical depravity and depictions of ruthless puritans intent on maliciously vexing and mulcting innocent and helpless Romanists, there was a clear political awareness among Catholics of a radical discrepancy between the crown's approach to the conduct of foreign policy and the supposed religious and ideological underpinning of that policy. The Stuarts' Catholic subjects realized at least as well as, if not better than, others that the crown's response to the parliamentary demand for a war against the Habsburgs was not in tune with the agenda of the Commons as it emerged in, and was expressed all through, the 1620s.[601]

The late Jacobean and early Caroline period had seen the further opening up of an already deep and public political fracture over the relationship of Britain to Europe and also over the function of religion in interpreting this relationship. Through this gaping breach, a number of Catholics – even if often deeply at odds with each other – could easily drive a coach and four, finding now that many of the previous blocks and obstacles in their way were no longer there.

Here we have the basis of an explanation of the relationship between the crown and the Catholics which is compatible with the period's anti-Catholicism, and with anti-popery's opposites as well. As Anthony Milton has shown, the post-Reformation anti-Catholic canon was never particularly secure. Many of the images which anti-papists used to establish their demand for zero tolerance had very visible contemporary antitheses. These antitheses had existed for a long time; but it was only in the 1620s and 1630s that it seemed that they were being established somewhere near the centre of the political and ecclesiastical establishment – even at the heart of the royal court.[602]

Furthermore, as is clear from, for example, Simon Adams's account of the policy manoeuvres sponsored by Buckingham in this period, what the crown did served to create a series of ideological fractures which were in the end irremediable and were heavily informed by contemporary religious debate. It was this, rather than the simple fact that the Stuart war policy was strategically disastrous and

[600] Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', pp. 110–111.

[601] Adams, PC, p. 431.

[602] A. Milton, 'A qualified intolerance: the limits and ambiguities of early Stuart anti-Catholicism', in A. Marotti (ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (London, 1999), pp. 85–115.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

financially unsustainable, which caused the crown so many problems. Buckingham's contribution to the contracting of an alliance with Spain (manipulating though not ideologically sympathizing with members of the Spanish faction) and then to the breaking of the Anglo-Spanish treaties and the contracting of a French alliance (without, however, being prepared to hold the French to a credible Protestant-cause raft of policies) inevitably made the crown liable to attack, and not just from former supporters of the Spanish match such as Arundel and Bristol. This was made infinitely worse when Buckingham and Charles tried, unsuccessfully, to rely on parliament to underwrite their increasingly confused programme and then were forced to fall back on a much smaller nexus of political supporters. Among these supporters were known Catholics who clearly appreciated the political and ideological significance of the crown's strategies here, as, of course, did the so-called 'Arminians' who looked to the new regime, and specifically to Buckingham, for favour.

It is not exactly a revelation that the Caroline regime infuriated Protestants of a certain kind (increasingly referred to by some contemporaries and some modern historians as puritans); nor that the Caroline court admitted entry both to those who were overtly Catholic and to those who might be suspected of harbouring popish tendencies; nor that the Laudian experiment (however appropriate a term that is) seemed, to some people, popish by association, if nothing else. However, a review of the political priorities of certain strands of English Catholicism during the early 1620s can tell us a great deal about how these connections and equivalences began to be made.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003340 Published online by Cambridge University Press