

JACOBAN SECRETARY:
THE POLITICAL CAREER OF SIR RALPH WINWOOD (1563-1617),

by
Charles Maffitt McAllister,

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in
History

APPROVED:

M. A. Alexander, Chairman

W. E. Mackie

T. C. Howard

May 1978
Blacksburg, Virginia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Abbreviations	iv
Note on Dating	vi
Chapter	
I. Early Life and 'Lying Abroad'	1
II. 'This Fair Helen': The Secretaryship after Salisbury, 1612-1614	22
III. The Addled Parliament of 1614	40
IV. 'Present Necessitie': 1614-1616	58
V. 'The Boistrous Secretarie'.	86
VI. Epilogue: 'Three Hundred Winwoods'	102
Bibliography	112
Vita	140

ABBREVIATIONS

- APC J. R. Dasent, et. al., eds., Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1542-1628, 43 vols. (Washington, 1963).
- CJ Journals of the House of Commons, from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2nd 1628, in the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First (nd.).
- CSPD Calendar of State Papers, Domestic 1598-1618, 4 vols., ed. M. A. E. Green (Nendeln, 1967).
- CSPV Calendar of State Papers, Venice, 1607-1619, 5 vols., ed. H. F. Brown and A. B. Hinds (Nendeln, 1970).
- DNB Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, eds. The Dictionary of National Biography, 22 vols. (London, 1921-1922).
- DC to JC Maurice Lee, Jr., ed., Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters (New Brunswick, 1972).
- Gardiner S. R. Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642, 10 vols. (New York, 1965).
- HMC Historical Manuscripts Commission.
- LJC N. E. McClure, ed., The Letters of John Chamberlain, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1939).

Memorials

E. Sawyer, ed., Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (Chiefly) from the Original Papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood, Knt., Sometime One of the Principal Secretaries of State, 3 vols. (New York, 1972).

Moir

T. L. Moir, The Addled Parliament of 1614 (Oxford, 1958).

Spedding

J. Spedding, The Life and Letters of Francis Bacon, 7 vols. (Stuttgart, 1963).

State Trials

T. B. Howell, ed., Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials, 33 vols. (Washington, 1971).

NOTE ON DATING

Seventeenth-century Englishmen followed the Julian calendar, which was ten days behind the Gregorian calendar, widely used on the continent. Where possible the dates given in this paper correspond to the Julian calendar, with the exception that the year is considered to begin on 1 January rather than 25 March.

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE AND 'LYING ABROAD'

Ralph Winwood was born at Aynhoe in Northamptonshire to Richard and Anne Winwood about 1563. His grandfather, Lewis Winwood, had once served as secretary to Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. His father, who is described in the Oxford registers as a commoner, was probably a tenant on an estate owned by the university. Richard Winwood died sometime before 1581, when his widow married John Weekes of Buckingham, a yeoman of Queen Elizabeth I's guard. Ralph had one brother, whose name was perhaps Henry or Arthur, as well as one sister, who later married a Mr. Sergeant. Beyond this little is known of Ralph Winwood's early family life.¹

¹Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 4:1662. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 1:133, 139, 148. DNB, 21:704. William Dunn Macray (ed.), A Register of the Members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, from the Foundation of the College (London, 1894-1915), 3:87. John Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First (London, 1828), 134. Queen Elizabeth to Magdalen College, Oxford, 27 June 1581, Greenwich; Henry Savile to Winwood, 26 October 1599, Westminster; HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleugh and Queensberry, K. G., K. T., Preserved at Montagu House, Whitehall (London, 1899-1926), 1:24, 28. John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 25 November 1613, London; LJC, 1:489. In 1571 Edward and Thomas Wynewoode were named in land transactions. See Calendar of Patent Rolls, Elizabeth I, 1558-1572 (London, 1939-1966), 5:184. Ralph's brother may have been the merchant Arthur Winwood named as a defendant in a case

In 1577 the fourteen-year-old Winwood began his long academic affiliation with Oxford University by matriculating at St. John's College. The next year he transferred to Magdalen College, from which he received the degrees of bachelor and master of arts and bachelor of civil law. Although he later supplicated for admission as a doctoral candidate at Magdalen in civil law, he does not appear to have been accepted. In 1581 his step-father petitioned the Queen to support Winwood's advancement as a fellow of that college. In approving Weekes's suit Elizabeth noted that the young student was well-known to her "in behaviour & conversation honest, in learning well aduanced, & of good disposition otherwise." Winwood served as a fellow of the college until 1601.²

In March 1589 Winwood entered a recognizance of £40 for his appearance at the Middlesex general sessions to testify against one John Tannett, who was accused of robbing

of officer's malfeasance in Thomas G. Barnes (comp. and ed.), List and Index to the Proceedings in Star Chamber for the Reign of James I (1603-1625) in the Public Record Office, London, STAC 8 (Chicago, 1975), 2:749. For Henry Winwood see HMC Buccleuch, 1:212. Thomas Birch, The Court and Times of James I (New York, 1973), 1:294 mistranscribes "Ned Winmarke" as "Ned Winwood." LJC, 1:576, corrects this mistake.

²Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 4:1662. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 1:139. DNB, 21:704. Macray, Register, 3:25, 88. Elizabeth to Magdalen College, 27 June 1581, Greenwich; [Magdalen College], 30 July 1587; HMC Buccleuch, 1:24-5.

a goldsmith's servant. And, in September 1592, when Elizabeth made her second progress to Oxford, Winwood helped to direct a philosophy play at St. Mary's Church. On her departure, he accompanied her beyond the city and delivered "a long, tedious oration" as the Queen sat in her carriage.³

To gain further experience and ability in foreign languages, Winwood traveled to the continent in 1594. For some months he studied at Padua, where the astronomer Galileo taught, becoming well-acquainted with the land and peoples of Northern Italy. David Lloyd, a seventeenth-century biographer, maintains that Winwood was a soldier in service to the United Provinces against the Spanish Netherlands. After a five year absence he returned to England "an accomplish'd Gentleman." His talents were soon recognized by Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex and the Queen's current favorite. In January 1599 Essex commended Winwood to attend Sir Henry Neville, the English ambassador in Paris, as a diplomatic secretary. Two years later Neville's implication in the tragic Essex revolt led to his dismissal. Winwood stayed on in France to man the

³C. F. Tucker Brooke, The Life of Marlowe and the Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage (New York, 1966), 42, n3. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 2:134. Charles Plummer (ed.), Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford, 1887), 250-2, 261.

post. It was no great change, for Neville had often been absent in England, leaving most of the work to his secretary.⁴

Winwood's principal duties as English agent at Paris were to secure the repayment of the heavy debt owed the English crown by the French government and to ameliorate the treatment of English merchants in France. Neither duty made him popular with his hosts. His audiences with Henri IV were congenial until Winwood raised the sticky matter of the debt, and then no amount of solicitation could secure a definite commitment from the king. Trade

⁴Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 4:1662. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 1:139, 148. DNB 21:704. Macray, Register, 3:66, 87-8, 108. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 2:134. Passport by the Earl of Essex and Lord Howard, June 1594, Theobalds; Sir Henry Neville to Winwood, 3 April 1601, Chelsey; HMC Buccleugh, 1:26, 32. Giovanni Battista Lionello to the Doge and Senate, 5 January 1617, London; CSPV, 1615-1617, 400. David Lloyd, State Worthies (London, 1670), 826. Algernon Cecil, A Life of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury (Westport, 1971), 274. Chamberlain to Carleton, 17 January 1599 and 27 May 1601, London; LJC, 1:65, 122. Neville to Robert Cecil, 28 July 1599, Blois; Cecil to Winwood, 7 March 1601; Winwood to Neville, 16 March 1601, Paris; Memorials, 1:81, 299-302, 305-6. Zachary Lok to Cecil, 6 March 1601, Chelsea; HMC Calendar of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, K. G., &c., &c., Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire (London, 1883-1973), 11:110. Neville to Cecil, 20 March 1601; CSPD, 1601-1603, 19. G. B. Harrison, The Elizabethan Journals . . . A Last Elizabethan Journal, 1599-1603 (London, 1939), 175. Elizabeth to Henri IV, 20 March 1601; G. B. Harrison (ed.), The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I (New York, 1968), 283-4. A. Francis Steuart, "The Scottish 'Nation' at the University of Padua," Scottish Historical Review, 3 (1905), 54-6.

negotiations proved equally frustrating. English cloth declared to be of inferior quality was usually seized; and, by the highly disputed driot d'aubaine, the French authorities laid claim to the goods of any foreign merchant who died within their borders. Henri IV's troublesome relations with the Protestant Duke of Bouillon were further points of contention with which Winwood occasionally had to deal.⁵

Much of Winwood's character becomes evident during his years in France, including his pronounced intolerance of all things Catholic or Spanish, an exaggerated sense of dignity and place, and an uncompromising attitude. A staunch Protestant, Winwood railed against the Jesuits (whom he considered personal enemies) and kept a constant watch over the activities of English Catholics abroad. He promoted an aggressive anti-Spanish policy and privately criticized Elizabeth's passivity. Nevertheless Winwood held his aging sovereign in high regard. When a company of Italian comedians in Paris advertised a production of L'Histoire Angloise contre la Roine d'Angleterre, Winwood

⁵Winwood to Neville, 30 August 1600, Chamberg; Cecil to Winwood, 7 March 1601; Winwood to Neville, 16 March 1601, Paris; Memorials, 1:250-3, 299, 305. Elizabeth to Henri IV, 20 March 1601; Harrison, Letters of Queen Elizabeth I, 283-4. Harrison, A Last Elizabethan Journal, 175. Maurice Lee, Jr., James I and Henri IV (Urbana, 1970), 55.

protested strongly against its representation of the Queen. He presented the French Council of State with one of the play bills and complained of the indignity done to her Majesty's honor. Thereupon the play was cancelled and its principals imprisoned. When a group of Frenchmen retaliated by objecting that a recent play in London had depicted the murder of the Duke of Guise in 1588, Winwood replied, not without humor, that that play had not been performed during the Duke's lifetime.⁶

Winwood was never popular in Paris. Narrowness, intolerance, and conceit made him numerous enemies. While his location gave him access to valuable materials for a new edition of St. Chrysostom's works planned by Sir Henry Savile, the learned provost of Eton, Winwood's position remained largely unrewarding. Early in 1602 Sir Thomas Parry arrived as the new resident ambassador from England, but his slight knowledge of French affairs necessitated

⁶Winwood to Neville, 23 September 1600, Grenoble; Winwood to Cecil, 15 July 1601 and 7 July 1602, Paris; Memorials, 1:260, 341, 425. _____ to _____, 15 May 1602, Rome; Anthony Rivers to Ridolfo Nercico, 9 March 1603, London; CSPD, 1601-1603, 197, 301. The unnamed offensive play was almost certainly Christopher Marlowe's The Massacre at Paris. Cecil's anxiety not to antagonize the French may account for the play's apparent disappearance from the stage. John Bakeless, The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe (Hamden, 1964), 2:95. Frederick S. Boas, Christopher Marlowe (Oxford, 1966), 168.

that Winwood remain throughout the rest of the year to instruct him.⁷

By the autumn of 1602 a restless Winwood had petitioned the principal Secretary of State, Sir Robert Cecil, for recall to a more profitable office. His position in Paris was untenable in the face of mounting hostility, even from Parry's men. Winwood recorded one such episode in which he was insulted by the son of a stable groom. During a Sunday worship service some of Parry's servants gave an extraordinarily poor musical rendition of the psalm for the day. When one Sigismund Alexander joked loudly about the quality of the singing and Winwood sought to quiet him, a sharp argument ensued. Winwood's antagonist taunted him by declaring: "What an Ass you are to bid me leave my laughing, you are an Asse and a very Asse, you are now no more an Agent but an Inferior, and too saucy to me." Though Winwood refused to be provoked by this outburst, he later complained to

⁷Cecil to Winwood, 27 February 1602, Savoy; Sir Henry Savile to Winwood, 2 February and 7 March 1602, Westminster, 1 August 1602, Eton, 1 October 1602, Oatlands, 25 November 1602, London, and 2 February 1603, Richmond; HMC Buccleugh, 1:33-7, 39. Thomas Edmondes to Carleton, 12 July 1602, Greenwich; CSPD, 1601-1603, 222. Chamberlain to Carleton, 17 June 1602, London; LJC, 1:149.

Parry and Cecil about this affront to his and England's honor, and demanded satisfaction for it.⁸

In February 1603 Winwood at last returned to England, fully expecting to succeed the late George Gilpin as English agent to the United Provinces; but March brought the demise of Queen Elizabeth and a delay in his plans as the new monarch came south from Scotland. Winwood was among those to whom the accession of James I proved an important windfall. In June the former agent in Paris was sworn as one of the four clerks of the Privy Council and received his commission for Holland. Winwood celebrated his improved fortunes by marrying Elizabeth Ball, step-daughter of Sir Thomas Bodley, founder of the Bodleian library at Oxford. Their wedding was a modest affair, with only Winwood's close friends John Chamberlain and Alexander Serle braving a violent summer storm to attend. By 10 July the couple left England for the Low Countries, where Winwood's father-in-law had been the English resident

⁸Winwood to Cecil, 29 September, 29 October and 17 December 1602, Paris; Memorials, 1:438-9, 442, 453.

from 1589 to 1597, and where, in 1602, his bride had lost her elder brother.⁹

Upon his arrival at The Hague in mid-July Winwood took an official oath before the assembly of the States General as a councillor of state. In addition to the usual problems of debt recovery and commercial affairs, Winwood was expected to maintain good relations between the Dutch and their two companies of English troops, and to reconcile the States to James's desire for peace with Spain. The resignation of the English commander, Sir Francis Vere, created a minor diplomatic incident in which the Dutch, fearful of James's pro-Spanish position, rejected Winwood's compromise proposal. But in spite of this and other problems during his first year, Winwood adapted easily to his new station. One friend reported "that he holds up his horn and lives worshipfully." He was also able to strengthen the literary connections

⁹Chamberlain to Carleton, 15 October, 4 and 19 November, 4 and 23 December 1602, 27 January, 11 and 28 February, 30 March and 10 July 1603, London; LJC, 1:165, 169-71, 175, 177, 182-4, 186, 191, 195. Savile to Winwood, 1 October 1602, Otelands, and 2 February 1603, Richmond; [King James I] to Prince Maurice, 24 June 1603, Greenwich; HMC Buccleuch, 1:36, 39, 42. Sir Edward Norris to Carleton, 4 November 1602, London; Dudley Carleton to George Carleton, 23 November 1602, Paris; Anthony Rivers to Giacomo Grelteo, 9 March 1603, London; CSPD, 1601-1603, 49, 265, 298. Jan den Tex, Oldenbarnevelt (Cambridge, 1973), 1:325, 333. A. G. H. Bachrach, "Some Dutch Contacts with the Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth Century," Bodleian Library Record, 4 (1952), 149.

established during the 1590s by Bodley and to make important contributions to his father-in-law's extensive collection of books.¹⁰

Formal negotiations for an Anglo-Spanish peace treaty opened in May 1604. Despite repeated assurances of English friendship, the Calvinistic "war" party of Count Maurice of Nassau opposed the talks. Winwood's efforts were limited by his own hostility to Spain and the Archduke at Brussels; and he was drawn easily to side with Maurice against the "peace" party of Advocate John van Oldenbarnevelt. Within the bounds of his instructions Winwood encouraged the Calvinists; and on 5 May Cecil found it necessary to order him to quit the Count's military camp, "where your

¹⁰James to the States of the United Provinces, 10 August 1603, Hampton Court; Lords of the Privy Council to Winwood, 10 August 1603, Hampton Court; Lawrence Warner to Winwood, 1 September 1603; Privy Council to Winwood, 23 September and 11 December 1603, Hampton Court; Neville to Winwood, 19 August 1604, London, and 1 November 1604, Star Chamber; Memorials, 2:1-4, 10, 12, 26, 35. Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 November 1605, London; LJC, 1:214. Carleton to Chamberlain, 15 January 1604, Hampton Court; DC to JC, 58. "Proposition faite a Messrs. les Estats Generaux pour le fait des Marchens le 6^e de Janvier, 160[4];" HMC Salisbury, 16:1-3. Tex, Oldenbarnevelt, 1:333, 336. Bachrach, "Some Dutch Contacts," 149-51. DNB, 21:704-5.

Residence giveth some Ground of Suspicion on the Spaniard's side, now that we are upon the point of Treaty."¹¹

The Anglo-Spanish Treaty of 1604 was concluded in August; and though it was a major victory for English diplomacy Winwood and the Dutch withheld their approval. Winwood could not openly oppose his king, but he did not hesitate to warn the Secretary of the "detriment this State received by the late peace made by Spain. The eye of sense doth see it doth sap and mine the groundwork whereon this union [with the United Provinces] was first founded."¹²

In regard to the Dutch debt to England--estimated by Cecil as £812,000 in 1604--Winwood promoted improved commercial relations as a means of repayment; but the two countries continued to quarrel over trade. Indeed they were too similar not to clash. As sailing and trading nations, both England and the United Provinces stood to gain at the other's expense. Winwood must have realized

¹¹"The States General," 19 August 1603; HMC Salisbury, 15:239. Cecil to Winwood, 5 May 1604; Memorials, 2:20. Entires dated 2 December 1603, 5 May, 5 June, 25 August, and 4 September 1604; Howard Vallance Jones, "The Journal of Levinus Munck," English Historical Review, 68 (1953), 248, 252-4. Lee, James I and Henri IV, 37-9. G. N. Clark and W. J. M. Eysinga, The Colonial Conferences between England and the Netherlands in 1613 and 1615 (Leiden, 1940-1951), 2:18.

¹²Winwood to Viscount Cranborne, 12 September 1604, Middleburg; Memorials, 2:31. Winwood to Viscount Cranborne, 20 November [1604]; HMC Salisbury, 16:360-1.

this, for he often complained of the fruitlessness of his efforts to reach a workable compromise.¹³

The early years of the seventeenth century were characterized by intense diplomatic movements in the various European capitals as James followed a "policy of unadventurous and inoffensive goodfellowship." Guided by an elusive concept of peace, the English Solomon sought to gain friends in every quarter and to dissuade domestic interference by foreign powers. It was a vague scheme that had succeeded in Scotland under altogether different circumstances. James was hindered by a suspicious Secretary and an ambassadorial corps which was at best competent and at worst no match for the agents of Spain. Winwood "did journeyman service" at The Hague but was no prime mover in foreign affairs. While one historian has characterized the decade after 1610 as "the period of Gondomar," another, to emphasize the difference between the English and the Spanish, asks pointedly: "can anyone imagine . . . an 'age of Winwood?'"¹⁴

¹³Lee, James I and Henri IV, 38, 46-9. G. M. D. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974), 64.

¹⁴Charles H. Carter, "The Ambassadors of Early Modern Europe: Patterns of Diplomatic Representation in the Early Seventeenth Century," in Carter (ed.), From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation (London, 1966), 284-5. Maurice Lee, Jr., "The Jacobean Diplomatic Service," American Historical Review, 72 (1967), 1264-82. Lee, James I and Henri IV, 6-7, 11-14, 18. Also see Garrett Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy (London, 1955), and Charles H. Carter, The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625 (New York, 1964).

Much to his credit Winwood was one of Cecil's favorites in the diplomatic circle. Judging by the importance of his assignments while in Holland, the Secretary relied heavily upon him. Winwood was shrewd and strong-willed, though rather narrow in his perceptions of his country's policy. Like many other courtiers of the time, Winwood could cloak his haughty and critical attitude in the formal language of correspondence. In 1602, while asking to be recalled from Paris, he professed himself to be wholly Cecil's servant. Only four years later, in another private letter, he confided to Sir Fulke Greville: "We are both but standers-by in the state, no actors at all in the great scene of business, while my lord of Salisbury lives." Somewhere there should have been a middle ground between servility and hostility--even for one of Winwood's temperament.¹⁵

In the spring of 1607 Winwood returned to England to advise James on impending peace talks between the Dutch and Spanish governments. After several lengthy audiences with the king, Winwood was knighted at Richmond on 28 June. In August Sir Ralph sailed back to The Hague with

¹⁵De la Fontaine to Winwood, [1602]; HMC Buccleuch, 1:38. Algernon Cecil, A Life of Robert Cecil, 274. P. M. Handover, The Second Cecil (London, 1959), 265-6. Winwood to Cecil, 18 October 1602, Paris; Memorials, 1:442. Winwood to Fulke Greville, 1606; Ronald A. Rebholz, The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke (Oxford, 1971), 185.

Sir Richard Spencer and new instructions to treat with the States for a mutual assistance pact, which was included in the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 1608. In a separate agreement signed at the same time, the States acknowledged a debt of £818,408 to the English crown and established a schedule of payments. In return for his services in this regard, Sir Ralph was granted the office of clerk of the privy council for life on 25 May. Yet, for some reason, Salisbury commanded him to surrender the patent before attending a conference at Dusseldorpf in 1609. Winwood complied on 15 August, after having held the post for little more than a year.¹⁶

In January 1608 the States began negotiations for a truce with the Spanish Netherlands. These were assisted by Winwood, Spencer, and two commissioners representing Henri IV. According to Oldenbarnevelt's modern biographer, Winwood was the driving force of this special diplomatic

¹⁶Carleton to Chamberlain, 18 December 1606, Cripple-gate; DC to JC, 95. Salisbury to Winwood, 2 April 1607 and 14 August 1609, Whitehall and Basing; James to the States General and to Maurice, 5 August 1607, Basing; "Instructions to Spencer and Winwood;" Winwood to Salisbury, 15 August 1609; Memorials, 2:298-9, 328-35; 3:58, 60. Earl of Dunbar to Salisbury, [(June) 1607]; HMC Salisbury, 19:426. Zorzi Giustinian to the Doge and Senate, 16 July and 1 August 1607, Crayford and London; CSPV, 1607-1610, 11-2, 19. Chamberlain to Carleton, 20 July 1607, London; LJC, 1:246. Samuel Calvert to William Trumbull, July 1607; HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire, Preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berks. (London, 1924-1940), 2:28. Lee, James I and Henri IV, 114. CSPD, 1603-1610, 438.

party. Spencer, though nominally the principal English envoy, was intended mainly to curb Sir Ralph's ardent hatred of Spain. The final settlement, signed on 29 March 1609, called for a twelve-year cessation of hostilities on the part of both the States and the Archduke. The four commissioners were honored and entertained in Brussels and Antwerp, and offered E4000 sterling worth of plate by the grateful governments. Winwood accepted the plate, but characteristically he rejected a present from the Archduke.¹⁷

The Truce of Antwerp was an important milestone in the reign of James I of England. Two noted historians of the period, S. R. Gardiner and Maurice Lee, Jr., both consider it the most fateful step taken in English foreign affairs during the early seventeenth century, for, in

¹⁷Tex, Oldenbarnevelt, 2:378. Gardiner, 2:29. Thomas Birch, An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the Year 1592 to 1617 (London, 1749), 263-300. Herbert H. Rowen (ed.), The Low Countries in Early Modern Europe (New York, 1972), 112-13. Spencer to Winwood, 29 March and 6 April 1609, Antwerp; Sir Thomas Edmondes to Winwood, 16 April 1609, Brussels; Memorials, 3:1, 3-5, 16. Enno, Count of East Friesland, to Spencer and Winwood, 10 April 1619, Liehrort; HMC Buccleugh, 1:80. Carleton to Chamberlain, 27 April 1609, London; CSPD, 1603-1610, 506. Edmondes to Trumbull, 17 May 1609, Brussels; John Chandler to Trumbull, 5 July 1609, Antwerp; HMC Downshire, 2:101, 111. Antonio Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 16 June 1609, Paris; Marc' Antonio Correr to the Doge and Senate, 8 July 1609, London; CSPV, 1607-1610, 285, 296.

their view, it was in England's best interests for the war to continue. They contend that a bolder stand by the English--which would have included giving Winwood more latitude--might have prevented several of the developments which led within a decade to the Thirty Years War. As it was, Winwood and Spencer were compelled to allow the French to take the initiative. The result of James's hesitancy was an uneasy truce and a tense era of cold war.¹⁸

Following the truce Winwood expected to be recalled and promoted. Early in May 1609 his London agent, John More, made ready a home that Sir Ralph had recently purchased in Westminster, near that of his friend Neville. But Winwood had to remain on the continent when a quarrel erupted over the Cleves-Julich succession. James I, Henri IV, and the States favored the stronger claims of the Protestant Elector of Brandenburg against the Catholic contenders. The failure of the Treaty of Dortmund (May 1609) led to a conference at Dusseldorpf, during which Winwood and the French ambassador, Boissise, sought vainly to mediate between the Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolph II, and the Protestant Union. Further talks between Winwood and

¹⁸Gardiner, 2:29-30. Lee, James I and Henri IV, 96, 142, 182-3. Guistinian to the Doge and Senate, 14 February 1608, London; CSPV, 1607-1610, 96.

the Union resulted in England's alliance with the Protestant German princes, embodied in the Treaty of Wesel on 28 March 1612.¹⁹

Such increased diplomatic activity may have saved Winwood's financial position. During the Antwerp negotiations he had enriched himself with more than £6000 by means of the many gifts heaped upon him and a £10 daily allowance for his diet. Had he returned to England he would have had only his clerkship for support, and its salary of 10s. per day--the same as he paid one of his servants--and slight hope of immediate employment were not promising. The renewed European conflict allowed Sir Ralph to remain abroad as an ambassador. The exchequer was notoriously slow in reimbursing agents for their past expenses, but the dignity of office and the promise of

¹⁹Gardiner, 2:93-101. Carter, Secret Diplomacy, 16-22. Lee, James I and Henri IV, 147-8. DC to JC, 109-10. Edmund H. Dickerman, "Henry IV and the Juliers-Cleves Crisis: The Psychohistorical Aspects," French Historical Studies, 8, (1974), 626-53. For a genealogical table of the succession see William L. Langer (ed.), An Encyclopedia of World History (Boston, 1968), 432. For Winwood's movements during these negotiations see: Memorials, 3:2, 17, 43-4, 53-4, 57-9, 76-8, 81-4, 87-8, 107, 112-15, 132-4, 138-43, 185, 210-11, 222-3, 342, 357; HMC Buccleugh, 1:85, 87, 91, 100-1, 105, 108, 129; HMC Downshire, 2:111, 145, 152, 154-7, 168, 175-7, 182, 192, 210-12, 219, 221, 229-30, 233, 236-7, 242, 261, 264, 266, 273, 281, 283, 292, 402-3, 406, 485; 3:168, 198, 208, 235, 250, 259, 265, 279, 308-10; HMC Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Eglinton (London, 1885), 566, 571, 574; CSPV, 1607-1610, 334, 357, 384, 391; and CSPD, 1611-1618, 22.

future advancement more than made up for current deficiencies. His fellow ambassadors, who resented his pretentious display of self-importance after the Treaty of Antwerp, carefully noted his changing fortunes and his obsession with advancement.²⁰

Meanwhile Winwood involved himself in the theological disputes of the Dutch. As a councillor to the States, Sir Ralph spoke out in behalf of the ultra-Protestants; but his Majesty's most fervent defender of the faith made his most notable contribution in the Vorstius controversy. In 1611 Conrad Vorstius, an Arminian, was nominated as professor of divinity in the University of Leyden. James strongly opposed the appointment and directed Winwood to protest it before the States. Winwood threw himself into the task, attacking Vorstius in three major speeches and in numerous letters. However, the Dutch were slow to

²⁰Calvert to Trumbull, July 1607 and 27 September 1609, [London]; Chandler to Trumbull, 5 July 1609, Antwerp; Edmondes to Trumbull, 17 and 24 May 1609, Brussels, 14 September 1609, London; John Beaulieu to Trumbull, 4 October and 23 November 1609, London; HMC Downshire, 2:28, 101, 111, 128, 146, 154-5, 190. Carleton to Chamberlain, 21 April 1609, London, and 4 October 1609, The Priory; DC to JC, 109-10, 113. Carleton to Edmones, 30 March, 6 April, and 6 August 1609, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:89-90, 94-5, 100-1. John More to Winwood, 27 February and 28 March 1610, London; HMC Buccleuch, 1:85, 87-8. Winwood may have been paid as little as £4. See Edward Sherburn to [Carleton], 23 February 1617, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 437. For problems involving ambassadorial pay see Lee, "Jacobean Diplomatic Service," 1276-80.

prohibit this "most remarkable Atheist," as Winwood described him. In January 1612 Sir Ralph declared to William Trumbull, the English agent in Brussels, that "never wise men were so much bewitched, by the Sleight and Hypocrisy of so wretched a Sycophant."²¹

The controversy demonstrated the less noble side of Winwood's character. In addition to his public assaults, Sir Ralph sought to undermine Vorstius in more subtle ways--even to the extent of soliciting the aid of the Society of Jesus. Again to Trumbull he wrote:

If you have any good acquaintance with any smart Jesuite who hath a quick and nimble Spirit, who would at your Instance (though you be not seen in it) bestow a few Lines against the Atheisms of thys Wretch, and yf by the way he did give a gentle Remembrance upon our

²¹Frederick Shriver, "Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair," English Historical Review, 85 (1970), 449-74. Lee, "Jacobean Diplomatic Service," 1269-72. HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Right Honourable Viscount De L'Isle (London, 1925-1966), 5:35-6. James to Salisbury, 31 August 1611, Farnham; CSPD, 1611-1618, 71. Salisbury to Winwood, 5 September and 5 November 1611, Salisbury House and Whitehall; James to Winwood, 6 October 1611, Theobalds; Winwood to Trumbull, 9 October, 14 November, 12, 15 and 31 December 1611, 11 January 1612, The Hague; Memorials, 3:290, 295-6, 300, 302, 310, 313, 318, 323. For Winwood's remonstrances concerning Vorstius, 11 September, 14 November and 9 December 1611, see Memorials, 3:293-5, 304-6, 309-10. Abraham Williams to Trumbull, 18 September 1611, The Hague; Sir John Throckmorton to Trumbull, 26 September 1611, Flushing; More to Brumbull, 24 October 1611, London; HMC Downshire, 3:142, 149, 169. Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 6 May, 16 June and 11 September 1609, Paris, 31 December 1611, London; CSPV, 1607-1610, 268, 284-5, 337-40, and 1610-1613, 264.

Grudges in Holland, who forget
both God and their best Friends,
assure your self you should do a
Service well pleasing to His Majesty.

It appears that Trumbull did find a Jesuit for Winwood, for Sir Ralph later wrote asking the agent to hurry his 'friend' along.²²

Winwood pursued Vorstius with too much passion and too little moderation. He lost favor with the king, who often had to modify his ambassador's bold protestations. His overzealousness made even James reconsider this course of action. And though he fumed over his sovereign's caution and the State's delays, Winwood could not secure the desired banishment of Vorstius. The issue was not resolved during Winwood's tenure at The Hague and, years later when advising his successor, he wrote bitterly of the failure and characteristically blamed others for it.²³

²²Winwood to Trumbull, 12 December 1611 and 25 January 1612, The Hague; Memorials, 3:311, 330. "Though your Jesuit be slow, yet I hope he is sure." Winwood to Trumbull, 16 May 1612, The Hague; HMC Downshire, 3:294.

²³Salisbury to Winwood, 29 December 1611, Whitehall; More to Winwood, 1 and 25 January, 17 February and 17 March 1612, London; Winwood to Trumbull, 18 February, 16 March and 13 April 1612, The Hague; Canterbury to Winwood, 5 May 1613, Lambeth; Memorials, 3:316-20, 331-2, 337, 339-40, 348-9, 357, 451-2. Throckmorton to Viscount Lisle, 22 January 1612, Flushing; Throckmorton to [Maurice], 26 April 1612, Flushing; HMC De L'Isle, 5:4, 26. Throckmorton to Trumbull, 9 January and 17 April, Flushing; Winwood to Trumbull, 26 February 1612, The Hague; HMC

By 1612 Sir Ralph stood a seasoned ambassador who was generally respected for his learning and diplomatic abilities--if not for the skill with which he always made use of his assets. The fifty-year-old diplomatic agent was still on the lookout for a high office with which to satisfy his ambitions, but Salisbury continued to have a tight grip on both the secretaryship and the treasury. For several years Winwood had believed that Salisbury was an obstacle to his advancement, and now the relations between the two men had apparently deteriorated to such a point that he could expect no improvement in his station. But on 24 May all this changed dramatically, for the great Secretary died and Sir Ralph again turned his eyes eagerly homeward.

HMC Downshire, 3:218, 248-9, 277. Winwood to Sir John Digby, 13 April [1612?], The Hague; HMC Eglinton, 575. Chamberlain to Carleton, 15 January and 12 February 1612, London; LJC, 1:329, 333. Carleton to Chamberlain, 20 March 1612, Venice; DC to JC, 121. Winwood to Rochester, 9 April [1612]; HMC Salisbury, 21:353-4. Winwood to Carleton, 16 February and 4 June 1617, Whitehall; Dudley Carleton, Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, Knt., during His Embassy in Holland, from January 1615/6 to December 1620 (London, 1757), 101, 134. James Orchard Halliwell (ed.), The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D' Ewes, Bart., during the Reigns of James I and Charles I (London, 1845), 1:98.

CHAPTER II

'THIS FAIR HELEN': THE SECRETARYSHIP AFTER SALISBURY, 1612-1614¹

The Jacobean political scene was nothing if not competitive. Salisbury had dominated royal government for many years as Secretary of State and then as Lord Treasurer. His death signaled an intensive, widespread struggle to divide the spoils of his offices. This was particularly true of the secretaryship, which attracted the most feverish competition. Indeed, maneuvering for the post began as early as February, when Salisbury lay seriously ill. And soon after his death in May the King complained of the multitude of candidates recommended to him. Among the leading contenders were several diplomatic agents--Sir Charles Cornwallis, Sir Thomas Edmondes, Sir Henry Wotton, Neville and Winwood--as well as the noted philosopher-statesman, Sir Francis Bacon. Sir Thomas Lake, who had assisted Salisbury with the foreign correspondence, also had hopes of succeeding his late master. James, however, was in no hurry to nominate a new Secretary. Professing himself to be "prettelie skilled in the craft,"

¹Sir John Holles to Sir John Digby, 1613; HMC Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland (London, 1891-1931), 9:32.

he decided to try his own hand at the office. Characteristically the King soon tired of being his own Secretary and the duties devolved on the current royal favorite, Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, who, in turn, passed them on to his personal secretary, Sir Thomas Overbury.²

Winwood himself was quite confident of receiving the appointment. Having recently concluded the important pact with the German Protestant Union, he hoped to climax his long service abroad with the secretaryship at home. Winwood's relations with Salisbury had deteriorated over the last few years, and close friends assured the ambassador that, except for the late Secretary's hatred of him, the office would have been his already. Salisbury himself, never a popular figure at court, fell from James's favour following the failure of his parliamentary Great Contract in 1610. Winwood was so sure of his appointment that he adopted a low profile and tried to appear disinterested.³

At first the ploy worked. In late June the King secretly summoned Winwood home. His arrival surprised

²More to Winwood, 17 February 1612, London; Memorials, 3:338-9. Chamberlain to Carleton, 29 April and 11 June 1612, London; LJC, 1:347, 354-5. Robert Kirkman to Trumbull, 4 June 1612; HMC Downshire, 3:311. Gardiner, 2:141-8. P. R. Seddon, "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset," Renaissance and Modern Studies, 14 (1970), 48-68.

³Winwood to James, 7 April 1612, The Hague; HMC Salisbury, 21:354-6. Chamberlain to Carleton, 2 July 1612, London; LJC, 1:365. Gardiner, 2:143-4.

and encouraged his backers; but their expectations were soon dashed. During his three weeks in England Winwood attended the King, who employed him in writing letters. He was graciously used by Queen Anne and Prince Henry, James's eldest son. Nothing, however, was said about the secretaryship, though the common view around St. Paul's was that it would soon be conferred upon him. Worried by this unforeseen turn of events, Sir Ralph fought to maintain his composure. Hanging in suspense made him vulnerable to the slights and criticisms of other office-seekers. He grew daily more impatient and despondent. In mid-July he returned in virtual disgrace to The Hague. His only consolations were the King's good words and vague promises of recall by the end of September. Crossing the channel in rough weather, he arrived in Holland to find his pregnant wife close to death with a burning fever. Fortunately she recovered and was safely delivered in August, but her trial greatly compounded his anguish.⁴

⁴Chamberlain to Carleton, 25 June, 2, 9, and 15 July 1612, London; Chamberlain to Winwood, 10 August 1612, London; LJC, 1:363, 365, 368-9, 373, 375. More to Trumbull, 2 and 18 July 1612, London; Throckmorton to Trumbull, 7, 15, and 18 July 1612, Flushing; Winwood to Trumbull, 7 July and 1 August 1612, London and The Hague; John Chandler to Trumbull, 10 July 1612, Antwerp; Thomas Albery to Trumbull, 16 July 1612, London; Beaulieu to Trumbull, 17 and 29 July 1612, Paris; Nieuland to Trumbull, 23 July 1612, The Hague; Williams to Trumbull, 1 August and 17 September 1612, The Hague; Calvert to Trumbull, 3 August 1612, [London]; HMC Downshire, 3:323, 325-7,

The call to take up the seals of office did not come at Michaelmas as Sir Ralph expected. Not until March 1614--nearly two years after the death of Salisbury--was Winwood's desire realized. Much of the blame can be laid on the King, who felt little need to fill the place. Factional and personal divisions also contributed to the delay as court groupings sought to advance their particular creatures. None of these arrangements was permanent. Queen Anne at first supported the ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton, who fell from grace because of a pun composed a decade earlier. Neville suffered from gout and was believed by James to have encouraged the opposition in the last parliament; but he was a serious contender to the last. The pro-Spanish and pro-Catholic faction, led by Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, backed Lake. His advantage was lost, however, when he mistranslated some words at the signing of a royal marriage pact. For all of Bacon's confidence, he was never in the running.

329-30, 332-3, 335, 341-4, 371. Trumbull to Sir Thomas Digby, 4 and 14 July, and 13 August 1612, Brussels; HMC Eglinton, 594-5, 598. Foscarini to the Doge and Seante, 14 July 1612; CSPV, 1610-1613, 394. Carleton to Winwood, 14 August and 2 September 1612, Venice; Edmondès to Winwood, 28 August 1612, Paris; Memorials, 3:387-8, 393. Carleton to Chamberlain, 14 August 1612, Venice, DC to JC, 132. Calvert to Edmondès, 1 August 1612, Charing Cross; Birch, Court and Times, 1:191.

Edmondès, an able diplomat, was often spoken of; but Winwood's name was more commonly mentioned.⁵

Once again Winwood's experience in foreign affairs gave him numerous opportunities to demonstrate his worth. In 1612 and early 1613 the English king sought to strengthen his ties with the leading Protestant rulers of Europe. James's scheme involved two phases: honoring Count Maurice with the Order of the Garter, and marrying his daughter Elizabeth to Frederick V, the Elector Palatine of the Rhine. As the King's agent at The Hague, Winwood played an important role in both projects.⁶

⁵Chamberlain to Carleton, 2 July and 31 December 1612, and 7 January 1613, London; Chamberlain to Winwood, 3 November 1612 and 9 January 1613, London; JBC, 1:135, 385, 399, 401. Wake to Carleton, 17 December 1612, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 161-2. Gardiner, 2:146-8. Moir, 74. Wotton composed the fateful play on words in Augsburg in 1604: Legatus est vir bonus, peregre missus ad mentiendum reipublica causa ("An ambassador is an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country."). Carter, Secret Diplomacy, 99, rightly contends that his fault was not inaccuracy but indiscretion in stating a well-known fact. For Wotton's apology see Logan Pearsall Smith, The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton (Oxford, 1966), 2:9-11. For the principals of each faction see D. H. Willson, King James VI and I (New York, 1956), 335. Charles H. Carter, in "Gondomar: Ambassador to James I," Historical Journal, 7 (1964), 193-4, contends that the "Howard party" was pro-Spanish only in the sense that they favored an Anglo-Spanish alliance against a French one (supported by the King's Scottish favorites) and the Puritans' desire for a war with Spain.

⁶Winwood to Rochester, [1611?] and [1613?]; Rochester to Winwood, 7 December [1612], Royston, and [1613?]; Neville to Winwood, 6 September 1612, Windsor; HMC Buccleugh, 1:103-4, 111-2, 119, 148-9. Winwood to Rochester, 7 April

During the Vorstius controversy James had conceived the idea of conferring the Garter upon Maurice, so as to bring him closer to English policy. Prince Henry and Winwood both encouraged the King in this, for they respected the count and believed his support to be vital against the Spanish. Early in 1612 Winwood began the official proceedings which led ultimately to the creation of Maurice as a Knight of the Garter on 26 January 1613. During the ceremony Winwood made a speech before the States, after which a great banquet was held. Maurice displayed his gratitude to the ambassador by presenting him with a gold cup worth £500.⁷

Concurrent with the count's honor was the union of the royal houses of England and the Palatinate. The

[1612], The Hague; HMC Salisbury, 21:353-4. Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 January and 23 September 1613, London; LJC, 1:401, 492-3. State Trials, 2:973. D. H. Willson, The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629 (New York, 1971), 137-8.

⁷ Winwood to Trumbull, 16 May and 1 December 1612, and 29 January 1613, The Hague; Throckmorton to Trumbull 26 January 1613; HMC Downshire, 3:294, 424; 4:25, 29. Sir Thomas Overbury to Winwood, 9 October [1612], Royston; Rochester to Winwood, 7 December [1612], Royston; HMC Buccleugh, 1:114, 119. Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 1 June 1612, London; CSPV, 1610-1613, 366. Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 January 1613, London; Chamberlain to Alice Carleton, 4 February 1613, London; LJC, 1:407-8, 416. Tex, Oldenbarnevelt, 2:490. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 2:518-21. Thomas Birch, The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I (London, 1760), 245, 272-3.

marriage grew out of Winwood's negotiations with the German Protestant Union, and was meant to underline the importance of the Treaty of Wesel. In early October 1612 Frederick V and his "wisely moderated" household of some two hundred persons were entertained by Sir Ralph as they passed through The Hague on their way to England. While there the Palsgrave, as he was often termed by the English, stood godfather for Lady Winwood's newly born twins. Frederick, at his own request, bestowed the name of his future bride on the girl, and his own upon the male infant. The marriage was delayed inadvertently when Prince Henry died of typhoid fever in November. Winwood, who had been enormously fond of the young prince, joined the nation in mourning his passing. He did, however, seek reimbursement from the treasury for his "blacks."⁸

On 14 February 1613 Elizabeth and Frederick were at last married. Though still stationed in Holland and unable to attend the wedding, Winwood did receive a detailed account of the glorious occasion from his friend, John Chamberlain. In late April the couple sailed for the Low

⁸Sir Edward Conway to Adam Newton, 3 October 1612; Birch, Life of Henry, 519. Williams to Trumbull, 14 October 1612, The Hague; Nieuland to Trumbull, 31 October 1612, The Hague; HMC Downshire, 3:381, 386. [More to Winwood, January 1613]; Holles to Winwood, 22 February 1613, Lincoln's Inn; HMC Buccleugh, 1:123-4, 127.

Countries, where they were attended closely by the ambassador. Winwood's many efforts were amply repaid by the excellent reports that reached the King in London. Sir Ralph gained considerable political ground by the marriage, though Queen Anne, who detested her daughter for marrying a Protestant, never forgave him his role in promoting the match.⁹

The coveted office of Secretary of State remained vacant during the fall and winter. Despite Winwood's notable accomplishments and the optimism of his friends, he was no nearer the appointment. In late January 1613 the death of his father-in-law, Sir Thomas Bodley, presented him with yet another issue with which to grapple. In Bodley's will he was named one of the executors, along with Archbishop Abbot, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, and the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Edward Coke. Bodley's sole passion had been his library at Oxford, to which he bequeathed most of his fortune. He slighted nearly all his old

⁹Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 January, 23 February, and 10 June 1613, London; LJC, 1:408, 427-8, 458. Princess Elizabeth to Winwood, 18 April [1613?], Heidelberg; HMC Buccleugh, 1:246. Winwood to wife, 3 May [1613], Middleburgh; HMC Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu of Beaulieu (London, 1900), 88. Winwood to Trumbull, 26 May 1613, The Hague; HMC Downshire, 4:115. Abbot to Winwood, 1 June 1613, Lambeth; Memorials, 3:459. Ethel Carleton Williams, Anne of Denmark (London, 1970), 190. Albert J. Loomie, "King James I's Catholic Consort," Huntington Library Quarterly, 34 (1971), 311.

acquaintances and relations, leaving only a small legacy to Lady Winwood and next to nothing to Sir Ralph, in whose house he had died. The normally even-tempered John Chamberlain, who had known Sir Thomas for forty years, was enraged by the terms of his will. The affair meant another burden for Winwood. Though outwardly hopeful of Sir Ralph's chances, Chamberlain wished privately that he had never spoken for the office, "for yf he do misse, yt will make him greve over the world, and leave those courses that might easily have brought his both profit and advancement."¹⁰

¹⁰Lady Winwood's mother, Anne Bodley, had died in June 1611. In 1612 Sir Ralph purchased from Bodley the "Great House" in St. Bartholomew's the Less, Smithfield. It remained in the family until 1655. Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 September and 4 November 1612, 9 January, 4 and 25 February, 29 April, and 10 June 1613, London; Chamberlain to Winwood, 3 November 1612, 9 and 29 January, 10 February, 10 March, and 6 May 1613, London; LJC, 1:378, 386-7, 402-3, 406, 413-4, 416-7, 419-20, 432, 435, 445-6, 451, 455. More to Winwood, 23 May 1612, [January], 6 and 8 February, 1 (2) March, and 7 August 1613, London; Sir Robert Naunton to Winwood, 15 September and 17 November [1612], Honeburne; Lisle to Winwood, 13 September 1612, Flushing; Savile to Winwood, 29 January 1613, London; HMC Buccleugh, 1:107, 112-4, 118-9, 123-6, 128-9, 141. Carleton to Chamberlain, 28 May 1613, Venice; DC to JC, 140. Neville to Winwood, 22 October 1612, London; Memorials, 3:403. More to Trumbull, 25 September 1612, London; Nieuland to Trumbull, 6 October 1612, The Hague; [Throckmorton] to [Trumbull], 12 December 1612, London; Williams to Trumbull, 23 January 1613; HMC Downshire, 3:374-5, 436; 4:24. Wake to Carleton, 17 December 1612, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 161-2. Holles to Digby, 17 February 1613; HMC Portland, 9:31. Edmondes to _____, 24 April 1613; Birch, An Historical View, 374. Bodley to Thomas James, 22 March and 28 May [1611], London; G. W. Wheeler (ed.), Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, First Keeper of the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1926), 210, 213 and nl.

As the spring of 1613 progressed, Winwood feared that Edmondes might gain the edge on the secretaryship, despite the support Sir Ralph enjoyed from Rochester and the Earl of Southampton. He appeared stoically resigned to his fate and professed to desire only "without trouble, toil or vexation of spirit to procure honestly and quietly without noise or bruit a competent state of livelihood for my wife and children."¹¹ Here Winwood was obviously masking his intense ambition with a facade of modesty. His desires and expectations were much higher than he was willing to admit. When the more open Edmondes later fell behind Winwood in the competition, he practiced no such hypocrisy.¹²

The ambassador's position improved greatly in April. Rochester became enamored with Lady Frances Howard, the beautiful and cunning daughter of the Earl of Suffolk and

Reliquiae Bodleiane (London, 1703), 1-15. Norman Moore, The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital (London, 1918), 2:226, 264-5, 839. D'Arcy Powers, "Sir Thomas Bodley's London House," Bodleian Quarterly Review, 8 (1935-1937), 203-5. S. Gibbon, "An Interior," Bodleian Library Record, 1 (1940), 132-9. For a more favorable view of Bodley see Wallace Notestein, Four Worthies (London, 1956), 82-3.

¹¹Quoted in Lee, "Jacobean Diplomatic Service," 1281.

¹²Edmondes to _____, 24 April 1613; Birch, An Historical View, 374. Rev. Thomas Lorkin to Sir Thomas Puckering, 24 June 1613, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:248. Lee, "Jacobean Diplomatic Service," 1281.

estranged wife of Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex. Rochester's secretary Overbury encouraged the courtship as a means of weakening the Howard faction, but opposed Rochester's marriage plans, although the King himself favoured the match. To remove Overbury, James offered him an ambassadorship overseas. Overbury's outright refusal offended James, who threw the tactless secretary into the Tower of London. On 15 September 1613 Overbury was found dead in his cell. Just ten days later a royal commission annulled Lady Frances's marriage to Essex on the grounds of impotency. For Winwood these developments meant that a great stumbling block to his appointment had been removed; but at the same time it meant that his primary supporter would come under the sway of the Howards. Like Abbot, Winwood disapproved of the divorce in particular and of the Howards in general. However, in 1613, when forced to choose between place and principle, Sir Ralph compromised the ideal in order to profit from the practical.¹³

¹³Chamberlain to Winwood, 6 May 1613, London; LJC, 1:448. Packer to Winwood, 22 April 1613, London; Neville to Winwood, 18 June 1613; Overbury to Rochester, [September 1613]; Memorials, 3:447-8, 462-3, 478-9. Thomas Bull to Winwood, 20 July 1613; HMC Buccleugh, 1:139-40. Winwood to [Carleton], 28 September 1613, London; "Account [by Sir William Waad] of his dismissal from the lieutenancy of the Tower," [September?] 1615; CSPD, 1611-1618, 200, 307. State Trials, 2:916. "The Narrative History of King James, for the First Fourteen Years" (London, 1651); printed in

In July 1613 Winwood received royal permission to return to London to supervise Bodley's estate, but he and his family did not arrive in England until late August. Upon leaving The Hague for the last time, the States presented him with a gold chain and dispatched a letter to James commending his services. Neville, who was supported by Suffolk, was now commonly held to have the advantage over Winwood in the competition for secretary. Sir Ralph might at most expect a secondary position. September and October passed without a decision. At wit's end, Winwood declared that, if by November he did not receive the appointment, he would return to Holland for another three or four years and then retire. When pressed at the end of October, the King put him off, but urged him to postpone his return. Again Winwood tarried, though not inactively. While threatening to return again to The Hague--even to the point of ordering repairs to his house there--he courted the great lords.¹⁴

Walter Scott (ed.), A Collection Scarce and Valuable Tracts . . . of the Late Lord Somers (New York, 1965), 2:318. Seddon, "Robert Carr," 60. Gardiner, 2:166-87. Beatrice White, Cast of Ravens (New York, 1965), chapters 3-4. William McElwee, The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury (London, 1952), chapters 2-8.

¹⁴Chamberlain to Carleton, 1 August, 9 September, 14 and 27 October, 11 November, 9 and 23 December 1613, London; LJC, 1:472-4, 479-81, 484-5, 490, 492-3. James to Winwood and to the States, 18 July [1613], Windsor; The States to James, 30 August 1613, The Hague; Enno to Winwood, 30 August 1613, Emden; B. B. de Wallmerod to

Early in November Rochester was created Earl of Somerset, and on St. Stephen's Day (26 December) he was married to Lady Frances Howard at Whitehall. Their marriage was the grand social and political affair of the season, and Winwood joined eagerly in the rush to shower lavish gifts on the ill-fated pair. Among the hordes of courtiers in attendance, Sir Ralph cut perhaps the most distinguished figure. He came dressed in a solid black suit made especially for the occasion, at a cost of £80. His present was the exquisite gold plate given him by the States after the conclusion of the Treaty of Antwerp. In return the Somersets gave Winwood a fine pair of gloves worth £3. Earlier the bride could not find suitable horses to draw her new coach through the streets of London, and Sir Ralph graciously offered four of his own handsome steeds. The Earl at first refused to take them as a gift, but Winwood convinced him "that yt was not for such a Lady to use any thing borrowed." As his Dutch horses drew her carriage through the City on that brisk December night, many

Winwood, 1 September 1613, Hesse; "Winwood's House," [1613?]; HMC Buccleugh, 1:138, 143-4, 150. Sir Henry Peyton to Trumbull, [29 July] 1613, Sluice; Winwood to Trumbull, 1 August and 14 October 1613, The Hague and London; Williams to Trumbull, 21 August 1613, The Hague; Throckmorton to Trumbull, 25 September and 18 October 1613, Flushing; More to Trumbull, 13 November 1613, London; J[ohn] S[tanford] to Trumbull, [23 December] 1613, London; HMC Downshire, 4:172, 174, 184, 205, 224, 228, 252, 274. Seddon, "Robert Carr," 62-3. Clark and Eysinga, Colonial Conferences, 2:83.

exclaimed that they were the crowning touch to the procession, "'so bespangeled with jewels that the torches and flambeaux were but little bright beside them.'"

Sir Ralph's ostentatious display at the time of Somerset's wedding solidified for him the Earl's valuable support.¹⁵

Winwood's appointment to the secretaryship did not immediately follow his coup in December. However, his confidence remained undaunted, despite the caprice of the court gossips. He was caught up in the struggle for power between Somerset and Suffolk, and John Chamberlain lamented that his friend could not see the machinations of these gamesters. Winwood had no perspective beyond the daily encouragements and disappointments. His great expectations seemed elusive, especially when Edmondes made another strong bid for the office.¹⁶

For nearly two years the secretaryship had remained unfilled; but, early in 1614, the necessities of government

¹⁵Chamberlain to Alice Carleton, 30 December 1613, London; Chamberlain to Carleton, 5 January 1614, London; LJC; 1:496, 499. Gardiner, 2:210-11. McElwee, Murder of Overbury, 148-9. G. P. V. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant (Cambridge, 1963), 186-7. Margaret Irwin, That Great Lucifer (New York, 1960), 239. Irwin's contention, that Somerset refused the horses because the black-clad Winwood "looked like a harbinger of death," is unfounded.

¹⁶Chamberlain to Carleton, 5 January, 10 and 17 February 1614, London; LJC, 1:500, 506-7, 509-10. Winwood to [Carleton], 24 February 1614, St. Bartholomew's; CSPD, 1611-1618, 225. Seddon, "Robert Carr," 61-3.

at last compelled James to make an appointment. A year earlier the Privy Council had petitioned the King to name a new Secretary of State. On 13 February 1614 they urged him to summon a parliament to meet in April, in the hope of restoring the pitifully depleted royal finances. At first Winwood was selected to take the suggestion to the King at Newmarket, but that resolution was reversed by his enemies in the council. Yet he was again favoured by the general talk and besieged by courtiers clamoring for his ambassadorship. Among these were Sir Robert Naunton, Sir John Ogle, and Sir Dudley Carleton. Ogle offered a £400 gratuity to Lady Winwood if he should advance by means of Sir Ralph's help. Of the three, Winwood was most disposed towards Chamberlain's friend Carleton. As the English ambassador in Venice, Carleton was desperate to escape the least important of the permanent Jacobean diplomatic posts. Winwood's resolve that Carleton should replace him was strengthened by the valuable gifts of Italian oil, wine and mirrors sent to him from Venice.¹⁷

¹⁷Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 September 1612, 7 and 28 January 1613, 5 and 20 January, and 3 February 1614, Ware Park and London; Chamberlain to Winwood, 3 November 1612, London; LJC, 1:380, 386, 395-6 and n1, 402-3, 410, 489, 500-1, 505. Carleton to Chamberlain, 20 March and 14 August 1612, 30 September, 4 November, and 24 December 1613, and 25 February 1614, Padua and Venice; DC to JC, 12, 121, 132, 148, 151, 156-7, 159. Naunton to Winwood, 17 November [1612], Holeburne; Sir John Ogle to Winwood, 26 January 1613 and 19 January 1614, Utrecht; HMC Buccleugh,

Sir Ralph's dependence upon Somerset did not slacken, but, in order to be safe, he made plans to return to The Hague should his bid for office fail. Finally a compromise was worked out between Somerset and Suffolk, whereby Winwood would receive the appointment to the secretaryship and Lake would become a councillor. On Tuesday morning, 29 March 1614, Sir Ralph's long-sought dream at last became a reality: he was sworn of the King's council as principal Secretary of State. He was the first holder of the office not inherited from Elizabeth by James. On 8 April the post was granted to him for life.¹⁸

The reasons for Winwood's appointment are not altogether clear. According to F. M. G. Evans, the King, in his first parliament, had weakened his own cause by

1:119, 122, 150. Carleton to Chamberlain, 22 December 1608, Eton; Carleton to Cope, 12 April 1609, London; Winwood to [Carleton], 24 February 1614, St. Bartholomew's; CSPD, 1603-1610, 476, 503; 1611-1618, 225. Edmondes to Trumbull, 25 February 1614, London; HMC Downshire, 4:138. Seddon, "Robert Carr," 63.

¹⁸Chamberlain to Carleton, 3 and 31 March 1614, London; LJC, 1:515, 521-2. William Colwall to Winwood, 17 and 24 March 1614, The Hague; The President and Scholars of Magdalen College to Winwood, 4 April 1614; HMC Buccleugh, 1:152, 156, 158. Edmondes to Trumbull, 18 March 1614, London; Packer to Trumbull, 30 March 1614, Whitehall; Edward Waldegrave to Trumbull, 30 March 1614, London; More to Trumbull, 31 March 1614, London; HMC Downshire, 4:342, 354-5, 357. APC, 1613-1614, 403. CSPD, 1611-1618, 230. Both McElwee, Murder to Overbury, 152, and Alexander Brown, The First Republic in America (Boston and New York), 201, err in giving the date as 9 March and 8 April respectively. If McElwee did not so often misuse information relating to Winwood, this mistake might be taken as typographical.

elevating Salisbury to the Lords. In 1614 James saw the need to have an able representative in the House of Commons. But this conclusion ignores two painfully obvious facts: Winwood had been abroad for nearly two decades and had never sat in parliament. His legislative naivete may have appealed to the King, for Winwood had not been involved with the vocal opposition which plagued him between 1604 and 1610. Both Thomas L. Moir, the most thorough student of the Parliament of 1614, and D. H. Willson, James I's best biographer, depict Winwood as a concession to popular sentiment. But it is apparent that the haughty, and often tactless, ambassador had made many enemies among the political nation. Factional jealousies--of which Winwood was not an integral part--would severely limit any Secretary, but particularly one of Winwood's uncompromising nature. Consequently, it appears that his selection resulted from his political inexperience and relative freedom from factionalism, more than from any proven ability on his part. Above all, James was pressured by his council and by time to decide on a Secretary. The choice hinged ultimately on Somerset, who urged that the office be granted to Winwood. It was subsequently rumoured that Sir Ralph or the States--if not both--rewarded the Earl

with a gift of £7000. Such was the nature of early seventeenth-century politics that this may well have been the case.¹⁹

The beginning of Winwood's tenure as principal Secretary of State was rather inglorious. After being sworn as a councillor he sat at the board for the first item of royal business: the illegal exportation of sheep. However, he was destined for tasks of more pressing consequence. Within a week of his elevation the second parliament of the reign opened.²⁰

¹⁹Chamberlain to Carleton, 27 October 1613, London; LJC, 1:481. Sir Thomas Roe to Trumbull, 17 March 1614; Throckmorton to Trumbull, 1 April 1614, Flushing; HMC Downshire, 4:340, 363. Sir John Holles to Sir George Holles, 18 July 1615, London; John Holles, Letters of John Holles, 1587-1637 (Nottingham, 1971), 1:74, 76. F. M. G. Evans, The Principal Secretary of State (Manchester, 1923), 241. Moir, 75-6. Willson, Privy Councillors, 137, and James VI and I, 345. James O. Halliwell (ed.), The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the Reigns of James I and Charles I (London, 1845), 1:69-70. White, Cast of Ravens, 86. Irwin, That Great Lucifer, 239-40, assumes incorrectly that Somerset "furiously disagreed with the King's choice" of Winwood, and that the appointment was "the cause of his first real quarrel with the King."

²⁰APC, 1613-1614, 403-4.

CHAPTER III

THE ADDLED PARLIAMENT OF 1614

Winwood was a poor choice for Secretary of State. Though possessed of a good academic mind and extensive diplomatic experience, he had, as previously noted, long been away from England and had never sat in the House of Commons. It is tragically ironic, rather than comical, that the first speech he ever heard in the House was his own. Moreover, this is a sad comment on the state of the Jacobean political scene. Worse, Winwood's recent appointment only gave him a week to familiarize himself with the routine of office and adjust the government's program to fit his own abilities. As Winwood lacked any previous parliamentary experience, he could not be left on his own to work out details as Salisbury had earlier done. This of necessity threw much more responsibility on the King, who was ill-prepared himself and unwilling to accept it.¹

Winwood's effectiveness was further limited by his personality. Brash, belligerent, and overconfident almost to arrogance, he could not be expected to accommodate the opposition he was certain to encounter. His sympathy with

¹Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:523. Moir, 76-7. Willson, Privy Councillors, 84, 145.

many of the current parliamentary grievances along with his intense concern for his career made him overly sensitive about personal criticism. Other considerations argued against his success. Many aspirants had sought the secretaryship only to be rebuffed. Now they worked against Winwood. Unfortunately, several, including Bacon and Lake, were his colleagues in both the Council and the Commons, and he sorely needed their cooperation. With more training, time, and competent guidance, Winwood could perhaps have done well in a secondary role. He had none of these advantages, however.²

The Parliament of 1614 opened on Tuesday, 5 April. Winwood represented Buckingham, a small corporation borough which the Council had controlled in 1604. His election was subsequent to his appointment as principal Secretary. Winwood was but one of nearly three hundred new members of the lower House, and one of the contingent of only four Councillors. None of the leading governmental officials was particularly well-suited for his tasks.³

²Moir, 76-7. Willson, Privy Councillors, 139. McElwee, Murder of Overbury, 153, is once again in error. Winwood was not "mainly responsible" for the calling of parliament.

³The exact number of new members in the House of Commons and the meaning of the election of 1614 are still subjects of debate. Contemporaries such as Sir Edwin Sandys and William Hakewill spoke of 300 first-time representatives. CJ, 1:467, 473. Bacon claimed there were 356. Spedding,

The first day began badly. Despite foul weather James delayed the procession from Whitehall to Westminster until Sarmiento, the Spanish ambassador in London, arrived, which offended English sensibilities. Later, when the Commons met with the Lords to hear the King's speech, they found their places filled with strangers. Most of the members returned in ill humor to St. Stephen's to await those who remained in the upper chamber.⁴

Parliament had been summoned primarily to reduce the burden of the royal debt, estimated at £680,000 and climbing at the rate of £200,000 a year. Post-Salisbury finances

5:176-91. Gardiner, 2:236, and Williams M. Mitchell, The Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the English House of Commons (Westport, 1975), 60, accept the lower estimate. Moir, 60-1 counts 281 new members, while Rabb, Enterprise and Empire (Cambridge, 1967), 94, finds only 258. Gardiner, 2:236, and Willson, Privy Councillors, 60, 69-70, see the election as a decisive defeat for the crown. Moir, 187-94, rejects their concept of the election as a contest between the court and country and concludes that 160 of the 464 members of the lower House were connected with the court. Mitchell, Revolutionary Party, 60-1, 175-93, places this figure at 142. Christopher Hill, "The Commons," Past and Present, 18 (1960), 112, criticizes the strictly statistical analysis of Mitchell as being incomplete and inconclusive; and Robert W. Kenny, "Parliamentary Influences of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1536-1624," Journal of Modern History, 39 (1967), 231, shows that at least one councillor, Lord Admiral Nottingham, was losing his effective parliamentary influence. It is relatively safe to say that there was in the Commons a large group of new members and that the government did not use this fact and its influence to better advantage.

⁴CJ, 1:455. Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:522.

had proved unmanageable. But James--borrowing heavily from proposals made by Bacon two years earlier--spoke mainly of religion, the need to naturalize his son-in-law, the Palsgrave, and the expenses incurred in marrying his only daughter to a Protestant prince. He asked for an expression of their affection for him in the form of a grant, denied that rumoured undertakers had tried to pack Parliament with government supporters, promised to curb the excesses of his prerogative, and expressed a desire to rectify grievances. This, he declared, was to be a Parliament of Love, wherein he would answer the members' complaints after they had satisfied his wants.⁵

Following the King's speech, the lower House met to organize itself. The selection of a speaker was the first order of business. After a long, awkward silence, Winwood gathered his courage and rose to make the royal nomination. His maiden speech was generally well accepted and commended, though his uneasiness was clearly apparent. His "manner of delivery was somewhat strange, being in a kind of academical tune." Winwood described the importance of the office of speaker and put forth Randall Crew as an able

⁵HMC Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawden Hastings (London, 1928-1947), 4:230-4. Spedding, 5:24-30. Moir, 71-3, 80-2. Edward Phillips Statham, A Jacobean Letter Writer (London, [1920]), 114, suggests that Winwood framed the King's speech.

candidate. Crew--who had last sat in the Parliament of 1597-1598 and knew little about the temper of the House--was accepted unanimously. The Secretary and Sir Julius Caesar, a respected Councillor, conducted Crew to the Speaker's chair. Two days later, on 7 April, Winwood and Lake presented the new Speaker to the King before a joint meeting of the Lords and Commons.⁶

Thus far Winwood had done well enough; but the real issues had not yet arisen. The disputes over impositions and revenues, which had troubled the Parliament of 1604-1610, had not disappeared during the four-year lull. As a result the government had to step warily during the current session. Factionalism continued, as before, to harass Sir Ralph. His lodgings at court and his place at the King's table were not secured easily and, though he was principal Secretary in name, Somerset retained the seals and conducted much of the diplomatic correspondence. In a letter to Carleton, John Chamberlain warned of the many dangers involved with Winwood's unstable position. "You must thinke," he wrote, that

he had need walke warilie, having all
men's eyes upon him, all eares open,
and beeing set as yt were a butt for
all detracting tounques to shoot at,
and indeed he is followed with the

⁶CJ, 1:155-6. HMC Hastings, 4:234-6. Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:523. Moir, 83-5.

same malignitie that opposed him at the first, so that unless he carrie yt constantly and temperatly, and be continually supported by his founders, he is in a hard case.

There were other problems, unique to this parliament, which would soon test the Secretary. Chamberlain was, wisely, not optimistic.⁷

On 8 April Edward Duncombe, a member of the opposition, moved for the exclusion from the lower House of Attorney General Bacon, on the grounds that Bacon, as a royal official, had no legal right to sit in the Commons. The motion received strong support, and neither Winwood nor his fellow Councillors rallied to defend their beleaguered colleague. Only the appointment of a committee to study precedents saved Bacon his seat.⁸

The King's speech on the following day failed to divert the members' assault. James offered eleven bills of grace for consideration, but the Commons would not be put off and the controversy was resolved on 11 April. After the committee reported that it had found no applicable cases of exclusion, Winwood finally came to Bacon's defense. The Secretary maintained that the Attorney General was

⁷Chamberlain to Carleton, 7 and 14 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:523, 526. Throckmorton to Trumbull, 20 April 1614, Flushing; _____ to [Throckmorton], 23 April 1614, London; HMC Downshire, 4:381, 389.

⁸CJ, 1:456-7. Moir, Addled Parliament, 85-6.

eligible for admission under the same rules as other officials, such as the King's Serjeant and the Solicitor General, who performed similar duties. However, because Bacon had already been returned and sworn, he should be retained as a favor to his Majesty. Thereafter the House could determine the standing of future Attorney Generals. After further discussion it was decided that Bacon would remain, but that no subsequent officer could sit in the Commons. Unknowingly, Winwood let a powerful argument slip away and the crown suffered its initial defeat of the session.⁹

On 12 April, while the House debated ecclesiastical reforms, Winwood moved inopportunately for a grant of supply. In a carefully-prepared statement he outlined the King's extensive needs (especially regarding foreign commitments), spoke to the public good, and asked for immediate consideration of a grant. His delivery had improved considerably, although his timing had not. The members were shocked. It was unheard of to make grants before discussing bills of grace. Winwood, through inexperience, had blundered badly in requesting a vote so early. Despite his mistake, the Secretary was doing his best, for he was hard-pressed

⁹CJ, 1:458-60. Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:524-6. Holles to Lord Rycott, 28 April 1614; HMC Portland, 9:27-8. Moir, 86-9.

by an impatient sovereign. Almost no royal officials came to Winwood's support. His resolution failed miserably for a decision on it was postponed until after the Easter recess.¹⁰

During the next week--from 13 to 20 April--Winwood's time was filled with parliamentary business. A bill to allow the royal title to pass through the Palatine's heirs necessitated a conference between the two Houses. Winwood served as the Common's principal messenger to the Lords, and as a Privy Councillor he sat on the joint committee concerning the Palsgrave. Another committee was appointed to consider a letter to the King on the subject of undertakers. It ironically included Neville, who had first suggested the matter to James. Additionally, there arose the question of impositions. Winwood worked on these and other committes. He was rarely inactive. John Chamberlain saw little of his close friend, who seems to have been unaware of his perplexing situation. Dreadfully overtaxed by excessive work, the petty jealousies of courtiers, and

¹⁰CJ, 1:461. HMC Downshire, 4:366-9. Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:527. Moir, 90-4. Gardiner, 2:236. [William Cobbett (ed.)], Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England (New York, 1966), 1:1163, erroneously identifies Winwood as "Mr. Secretary Herbert." Sir John Herbert served without distinction as assistant Secretary of State under Salisbury. Lee describes him as "an unimportant man with no particular ability or political weight" (DC to JC, 46, n15). He died in July 1617. See Chamberlain to Carleton, 19 July 1617, London; LJC, 2:90.

the demands of the opposition, Winwood somehow managed to maintain the support of the King. But James was anxious for a sizable grant of supply, and Winwood's actions were easily overemphasized and misconstrued.¹¹

The Easter recess--from 21 April to 1 May--gave the hard-pressed Secretary a brief respite, but upon resumption of the session the opposition reopened debate on the question of undertakers. After the failure of the last parliament, Neville had drawn up a plan for the summoning of another. In his scheme he offered to undertake the task of placating the opposition with a few minor concessions, thus assuring an early vote of supply. No mention was made of electoral interference (an element in Bacon's plan for a new parliament) and, though Neville's proposal was never adopted, rumors circulated that the crown had sought to manage the election of 1614. The issue had been discussed before the break. On 2 May the Commons took up the question in earnest.¹²

Sir Roger Owen's committee on undertakers gave a report which compensated for skimpy evidence by a violent

¹¹CJ, 1:463-70. HMC Hastings, 4:242-3. Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 April 1614, London; LJC, 1:527. Moir, 94-5. Willson, Privy Councillors, 138.

¹²More to [Winwood], 29 October 1611, London; HMC Buccleugh, 1:102. Spedding, 4:279-80, 369-70; 5:24-30. Gardiner, 2:204. CJ, 1:470-1. Moir, 17, 22-3, 97-9.

delivery. The motion was carried to debate the question as a committee of the whole on the afternoon of 4 May, but a hasty summons by the King postponed the meeting. James's address to the House was mostly a repetition of his first two speeches, except that he now laid more emphasis on denying that anyone had undertaken to affect the election. The members were unconvinced.¹³

On 5 May, during a debate on impositions and supply, Winwood called for the establishment of a definite date for the granting of money to the King. The Commons wisely voted to inform James that a grant would be made only at the end of the session, thus thwarting the Secretary's efforts to force a decision. According to a contemporary observer, Winwood's failure was the turning point of the parliament, for it showed that James was unable to demand funds from the Commons. The next day Winwood and Lake tried to boost their declining prestige by moving for a committee on recusants, to hold its first meeting on 9 May. By this move they hoped to divert discussion of the prerogative. The motion was seconded by an opposition leader, Sir Dudley Digges, and accepted by the full House.¹⁴

¹³CJ, 1:470-2. Moir, 97-100.

¹⁴CJ, 1:472-5. Lorkin to Puckering, 28 May 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:315-6. Moir, 100-1, 105, 109. Conrad Russell, "Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604-1629," History, 61 (1976), 19.

When the committee on rescusants convened, Winwood made an energetic speech against both Catholics and the Protestant clergy's general neglect of catechizing and preaching. He condemned the latter's low morals along with a variety of clerical abuses, even accusing one official of misappropriating fines collected from English Catholics. The Secretary's ardent address raised his stature among the faithful Protestant members, but he was assailed bitterly by the clergy meeting in Convocation, many of whom declared him either a Puritan or a Brownist. Despite this Winwood continued to enjoy the King's confidence.¹⁵

On the morning of 9 May the House initiated proceedings against Sir Thomas Parry, sequestered for alleged unlawful interference in the Stockbridge elections. This was the same Parry who had replaced Winwood in Paris in 1602; and, on the next day, the former ambassador rose in defense of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. While acknowledging the seriousness of the charge, Winwood contended that, if the House did not intercede for Parry, the King intended to punish him. Sir Ralph's speech caused general annoyance, with several members protesting James's offer.

¹⁵Wallace Notestein, F. H. Relf, and H. Simpson (eds.), Commons Debates 1621 (New Haven, 1935), 7:636. Chamberlain to Carleton, 12 and 19 May 1614, London; LJC, 1:528-31. Moir, 102-3.

The Commons decided to judge the Councillor itself and asked Winwood to thank his Majesty for his generous offer.¹⁶

The following day Winwood announced the suspension of Parry from the Privy Council. The Commons then directed him to inform James of its satisfaction with the punishment and its earlier censure. The event passed on but its detrimental effect on the role of the executive was not soon forgotten. This, the second major concession made to the Commons, established a dangerous precedent. Initially Parry's dismissal diminished the effective power of the Council in the lower House, both symbolically and in actual strength of numbers. Ultimately the case would contribute to the rise of parliamentary supremacy in England.¹⁷

Throughout May Winwood struggled under pressure from the court and the House. "He hath now," remarked Chamberlain, "his head and his handes full of business what with the parlement where he is all the morning, and at committees in the afternoone, and with other affaires pertaining to his place, wherin he is yet scant warme and

¹⁶CJ, 1:477-9. Winwood to [Carleton], 10 May 1614; CSPD, 1611-1618, 233. Lorkin to Puckering, 28 May 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:315. Moir, 102-3.

¹⁷CJ, 1:480-1. Commons Debates 1621, 7:637. Lorkin to Puckering, 28 May 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:315. Moir, 103-4. Gardiner, 1:238, n2.

not thoroughly." By the 19th the Commons had agreed on a statement concerning impositions. Winwood was sent up to the Lords to request a conference but, finding them already risen, was unable to complete his assignment until 21 May. As the Commons continued to debate impositions Winwood seconded Sir Henry Wotton's contention that James, as an hereditary monarch, had the legal right to tax his subjects. This was significant as the first instance of a concerted defense of the prerogative by officials in the lower House.¹⁸

The 21st was more memorable for Bishop Neile's infamous statement in the Lords, to the effect that impositions were Noli me tangere--not fit for discussion by loyal subjects. Neile, whom Gardiner termed the worst sycophant in early Stuart England, urged his peers to refuse to confer with the Commons. These were powerful and frightening words--portents of later days. David Mathew refers to them as "the most dangerous words used in the reign by any English politician." Gardiner considered this, rather than Winwood's failure of 5 May, as the turning point of the Parliament of 1614.¹⁹

¹⁸Chamberlain to Carleton, 19 and 26 May 1614, London; LJC, 1:530, 532-3. CJ, 1:481-7, 490, 492-3. HMC Hastings, 4:249. Moir, 114-6.

¹⁹In 1613 Chamberlain had written of "the great entail which is a kind of noli me tangere." Chamberlain to Carleton, 9 September 1613, London; LJC, 1:474. Lorkin to

Neile's speech created quite a stir in the lower House, but only after several days had elapsed. On 23 May the members were involved with the naturalization of Scots and legality of the order of baronets--the latter in reality a moot point which Winwood defended very ably. On that day and the next the upper House discussed and finally rejected the proposed conference. Yet on 25 May the Commons appointed an investigating committee and demanded an explanation from the Lords as to reported slanders. Winwood, fresh from a show of confidence by the House against the clerical attacks on him, tried vainly to restore order. He urged the members not to forego regular business, as a few had suggested. Delays, especially of this nature, only compounded his own difficulties. Much to his disappointment a motion was carried to postpone discussions on other affairs until the Lords replied. Winwood was selected for the committee to consider the alleged speech.²⁰

Puckering, 28 May 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:316-7. HMC Hastings, 4:249. Moir, 117. David Mathew, James I (University, 1968), 228. Gardiner, 2:243.

²⁰CJ, 1:493-8. HMC Hastings, 4:249-59. Winwood to Trumbull, 23 May 1614, London; HMC Downshire, 4:408-9. Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 23 May 1614, London; CSPV, 1613-1615, 121-2. State Trials, 2:865-70. Moir, 118-24. Katherine S. van Eerde, "The Jacobean Baronets: An Issue between King and Parliament," Journal of Modern History, 33 (1961), 142.

The questions of impositions and supply were forgotten for several days as the Commons concentrated on Bishop Neile. Winwood, a member of the committee to draft a message to the Lords, attempted to direct the House toward fulfilling the King's needs. On 27 May the Speaker read a letter from James, who demanded to know why regular business had ceased. Many insisted that Winwood or Crew had misinformed the King of their intentions--a charge denied by Crew and Lake. When the Commons informed James that they were merely in recess, he replied, through his Secretary, by summoning the Speaker and forty others to Whitehall. All royal officials were, however, excluded from the delegation. More speeches and messages passed between the crown and the House until finally, on 31 May, Neile pleaded tearfully that he had been misquoted and abused. The Commons rejected his partial apology and appointed another committee. By now the King was furious over the whole affair.²¹

Winwood was disillusioned. Attacked by the clergy and the House, and hounded by his ruler, he struggled to maintain his composure and authority. John Chamberlain

²¹Winwood spoke to the question of the King's message. Unfortunately, his words are not recorded in the House journals. CJ, 1:498-504. HMC Portland, 9:133-5. HMC Hastings, 4:265-77. More and Packer to Trumbull, 26 May 1614, Whitehall; HMC Downshire, 4:410. Lorkin to Puckering, 28 May 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:316-7. Moir, 124-33.

was much concerned about his friend. On 1 June he wrote that the Secretary

is neither idle nor always well occupied, neither greatly giving nor receiving satisfaction, but held opiniastre and peremptory to the proof, which kind of carriage is nothing pleasing, which makes him subject to much censure; neither do they forebear him a whit. I am of the opinion that this Parliament will mend him or quite mar him. Yet hitherto it fadges but ill-favoredly; and though he be an old scholar, yet he never was in such a school before.²²

By this juncture parliament was close to dissolution. On 3 June the King sent a message threatening such a course. Winwood and Lake assured the Commons that he desired no answer, except for an immediate grant of supply. Instead the House criticized government expenditure and imposition, and formed yet another committee to reply to the King's letter. Winwood worked furiously to save the session. By 6 June the King had resolved to dismiss the members until Winwood and Lord Chancellor Ellesmere persuaded him to allow them one more day. The Secretary then pleaded with the Commons to make a grant, promising that compliance might bring a prorogation rather than a dissolution. But the opposition refused to be coerced by

²²Chamberlain to Carleton, 1 June 1614, London; LJC, 1:536.

such a threat and, on 7 June, the parliament ended. It had sat for only two months.²³

In the wake of the dissolution, the crown moved quickly to punish those responsible for sabotaging the session. Nearly a dozen men were brought before the Council to answer charges of treason and sedition. Six were imprisoned for at least a year, and all were subjected to restrictions long after their hearings. Accounts of the imposition debates were gathered and burned before the King. On the other hand, a few men were rewarded for their support of the government. Among these was Speaker Crew who, on the day after the dissolution, was knighted and made a royal serjeant. Winwood's efforts seemingly passed without outward recognition.²⁴

²³CJ, 1:504-6. Commons Debates 1621, 7:653. HMC Portland, 9:136-8. HMC Hastings, 4:277-83. Chamberlain to Carleton, 9 June 1614, London; LJC, 1:537-8. Lorkin to Puckering, 18 June 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:323. Moir, 138, 141-2. D. H. Willson, "Summoning and Dissolving Parliament, 1603-25: The Council's Advice to James I," American Historical Review, 45 (1940), 290. W. J. Jones, "Ellesmere and Politics, 1603-1617," in Howard S. Reinmuth, Jr. (ed.), Early Stuart Studies (Minneapolis, 1970), 42-3. Elizabeth Read Foster, Proceedings in Parliament, 1610 (New Haven, 1966), 2:414-22.

²⁴APC, 1613-14, 459-60, 465-8, 476, 479, 490, 548-9, 664-5; 1615-1616, 191-4, 274, 299, 356-7. HMC Portland, 9:138-9. Winwood to Carleton, 16 June 1614, St. Bartholomew's' CSPD, 1611-1618, 237, and Louise Brown Osborne, The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638 (New Haven, 1937), 233, n13. Lorkin to Puckering, 18 June, 2 July, and 11 September 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:324, 331, 346. Chamberlain to Carleton, 30 June 1614, London; LJC, 1:541. Moir, 146-9.

Contemporaries soon gave this brief legislative meeting the sobriquet of "the Addled Parliament." For Winwood it was both a personal and a professional failure. Many explanations have been advanced as to why the parliament was terminated so abruptly. The Secretary unhesitatingly blamed seditious words spoken in the Commons, which he claimed had made James fearful for his life. Winwood himself, quick to condemn others, seemed to accept little responsibility for himself. He had in fact, worked very hard, if not altogether skillfully, those two months, serving on fifteen committees, attending the royal program, and conducting the normal affairs of state. The ending of the parliament, whether by the intrigues of Northampton, Sarmiento and the pro-Spanish faction, or by the dissension caused by a series of royal blunders, cut severely into both the crown's and Winwood's credibility. But one cannot avoid the conclusion that, given the circumstances and the participants involved, there was little chance of a different outcome for this deplorable tragi-comedy.²⁵

²⁵Chamberlain to Carleton, 9 June 1614, London; LJC, 1:538-9. Lorkin to Puckering, 18 June and 11 September 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:323, 346. Winwood to Carleton, 16 June 1614, St. Bartholomew's; CSPD, 1611-1618, 237, and Osborne, Hoskyns, 233, n13. Moir, 60, 108-9, 150-69. F. H. Lyon, Diego de Sarmiento de Acuna, Conde de Gondomar (Oxford, 1910), 29-30. Also see: Wallace Notestein, "The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons," Proceedings of the British Academy, 11 (1924-1925), 125-75; and Harold Hulme, "The Winning of Freedom of Speech in the House of Commons," American Historical Review, 61 (1956), 825-53.

CHAPTER IV

'PRESENT NECESSITIE': 1614-1616

A financial crisis of staggering proportions threatened the government of James I. The already deteriorating situation in the Exchequer was only aggravated by the failure of the Parliament of 1614. Impositions in themselves were insufficient to curb the spiraling debt, and so Secretary Winwood and others on the council were soon urging the King to summon another parliament. But James had had his fill of legislatures for the time being. He was not to call another one during that decade. Yet, because he refused to reduce expenditure, the councillors of necessity experimented with a variety of economic schemes and projects. Sir Ralph displayed a somewhat sounder sense of finance than most of his colleagues, but he, like them, never made a concerted effort to stabilize the government's spending.

Upon the dissolution of parliament in June the bishops offered the King benevolences equal in value to their best plate. The temporal lords and officers of the court soon followed their example by giving James outright gifts of money. Winwood himself contributed £100. James was intrigued by the idea of expanding the number of givers

and had his council dispatch letters calling for similar offerings from his lesser subjects. The council must have expected opposition, for the letters promised that all funds contributed would be employed solely for the payment of royal debts. The scheme succeeded initially. By 18 July some £23,000 had been collected, but thereafter contributions dropped off sharply. Winwood and the council harassed delinquent counties and towns with more messages, filled with woeful tales of the pressing need for military expansion and slightly veiled threats. The controversy over Cleves-Julich had flared up again, and the Catholic powers in Germany posed an imminent danger to the Palsgrave. James ordered a general muster of the English troops to be held, the navy strengthened, and recusants disarmed. None of these measures was effective, but they placed a great strain on the resources of the Exchequer. Winwood, no doubt, owing to his familiarity with European affairs, composed most of this second letter from the council. But the second wave of solicitation proved no more successful than the first.¹

¹Waldegrave to Trumbull, 17 June 1614, London; HMC Downshire, 4:431. Lorkin to Puckering, 18 June 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:323-4. Chamberlain to Carleton, 30 June and 7 July 1614, London; LJC, 1:542, 546. Winwood to Carleton, 5 July 1614, Whitehall; CSPD, 1611-1618, 241. Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 14 August 1614, London; CSPV, 1613-1615, 175.

More direct action was ultimately taken by the council. Letters were sent to important individuals whose names did not appear on the list of donors to the royal cause. Pledges which were only partially fulfilled were rejected by the council as insulting to the King's honor. Pleas of poverty were brushed aside. Renewed efforts in 1615 and 1616 produced more benevolences, but the total collected was slight. At the high cost of alienating many of its leading subjects, the crown profited by only £66,000--hardly enough to make a dent in James's debt. A single parliamentary subsidy with its accompanying fifteenth would have brought the King at least £100,000.²

The council was sensitive about criticism of this project, and at least two Englishmen were imprisoned in connection with the benevolence. Early in 1614 Oliver St. John of Marlborough was arrested for writing a seditious letter in which he refused to contribute. Convicted in the Star Chamber, St. John was fined £5000 and imprisoned during the King's pleasure. He was freed only after

APC, 1613-1614, 491-3, 552-4, 557-60, 562, 565-7, 584-5; 1615-1616, 228-31, 516-9. Gardiner, 2:261-2. Frederick C. Dietz, English Public Finance, 1558-1641 (London, 1964), 2:158.

²APC, 1613-1614, 582-3, 655-7; 1615-1616, 49-50, 269-70. Gardiner, 2:261-8. Dietz, English Public Finance, 2:158 and n25.

making his submission in July 1615. Edmund Peacham was less fortunate than St. John. The aged rector of Hinton St. George was more opposed to the corruption in the ecclesiastical courts than to the royal levy, but his intemperate outbursts brought a sharp reaction by the government. On 18 January 1615 Winwood was directed to interrogate Peacham. If necessary he was "to put him to the manacles." He deemed such torture necessary. On the 19th Sir Ralph conducted the investigation, and the uncooperative Peacham was stretched on the rack. In his official report Winwood wrote that Peacham "was examined before torture, in torture, between torture, and after torture; not withstanding, nothing could be drawn from him, he still persisting in his obstinate and insensible denials, and former answers." In August 1615 Peacham was convicted of treason and thrown into prison, where he died seven months later.³

³APC, 1613-1614, 641, 647, 653-5, 660; 1615-1616, 17-8, 37, 40-1, 59, 61-2, 157, 176, 181, 256-7. State Trials, 2:869-80. Chamberlain to Carleton, 5 January and 9 February 1615, London; LJC, 1:568, 577. Lord Hailes, Letters and Memorials Relating to the History of Britain in the Reign of James the First (Glasgow, 1762), 25. Martain J. Havran, Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington (London, 1973), 46. Gardiner, 2:268-70, 272-83. Spedding, 5:93-4 and nl, 100, 107. For the relationship of the council to the Star Chamber see A. T. Carter, "Council and Star Chamber," Law Quarterly Review, 18 (1902), 247-54; and Edward Raymond Turner, The Privy Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1603-1784 (Baltimore, 1927-1928), 1:90-1.

An even less successful venture than the benevolence was the "Cockayne Project," a private enterprise designed to usurp the prosperous trade of the Merchant Adventurers. Alderman William Cockayne, a prosperous London merchant, headed an association which proposed to dye and dress white cloths in England before selling them abroad. The Merchant Adventurers had traditionally exported only unprepared cloth to Germany and the Low Countries, where they were then colored and sold. Cockayne claimed that he could increase profits by preparing the cloths in England. The failure of the Addled Parliament made Cockayne's proposal extraordinarily attractive to James, who was promised additional customs revenues of at least £47,000. Winwood and most of the council were skeptical, however. The current trade was flourishing, while the new scheme was at best a gamble.⁴

Secretary Winwood had dealt with Alderman Cockayne some years before. In 1605 the Alderman had paid £120--presumably to Sir Ralph--to free his brother, who was currently imprisoned in The Hague. Now, a decade later, Winwood opposed Cockayne's plan to increase the cloth

⁴Astrid Friis, Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade (London, 1927). B. E. Supple, Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642 (Cambridge, 1964), 33-51. J. P. Cooper, "The Fall of the Stuart Monarchy," The New Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1970), 4:547-8.

trade. The Secretary considered the proposal both unfair and irresponsible, and his criticisms of the scheme further antagonized his enemies at court, some of whom--like Suffolk--stood to profit from it. In February 1615 the Merchant Adventurers were forced by the King to remit their charter to Cockayne's group, now styled "the King's Merchant Adventurers." But within two years Winwood's predictions came true and the new company collapsed. The old merchants' charter was restored for a payment of £80,000, and Sir Ralph himself received £550 in return for his faithful support.⁵

Meanwhile the crown's financial decline continued unabated, with the debt increasing to £700,000. Between 24 and 28 September the council met repeatedly at Greenwich to discuss expenditure reduction and debt repayment. Most

⁵"Notification by William Cockayne," 23 April 1605; "The Cloth Trade," 16 September 1616; Lake to Winwood, 8 April 1617, Worsop; HMC Buccleugh, 1:54, 176, 195. APC, 1613-1614, 538-9, 583-4, 586-7; 1615-1616, 30, 167-8, 176, 190, 217-22, 367-8, 374-6, 385, 410-2, 416-7, 456-60, 477-9, 615-6, 622-3, 658-9; 1616-1617, 2-3, 7-13, 16-8, 22-3, 25-7, 53-7, 61, 63, 67-9, 108-10, 112-5, 123. Chamberlain to Carleton, 25 May 1615, London; LJC, 1:600. Holles to Sir George Holles, 15 and 18 July 1615; Holles, Letters, 1:73, 76. Bacon to George Villiers, 23 November 1616; Spedding, 6:14. Winwood to Buckingham, 29 July [1617], St. Bartholomew's; HMC Eglinton, 103. "Accounts [of the Company of Merchant Adventurers] [c. 1616-1617];" HMC Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections (London, 1901-1913), 8:13. Friis, Alderman Cockayne's Project, 253, 261, 271, 274, 281-3. Supple, Crisis and Change, 33-51. Cooper, "Fall of the Stuart Monarchy," 547-8.

of the councillors favored the summoning of another parliament. Winwood argued that only by the good will of the English people, as expressed in a parliament, could James hope to refill the Exchequer. All other schemes served only to postpone the inevitable solution. Speaking from experience, Winwood urged that the crown and councillors be better prepared for the next session than they had been for the last. As for the sore point of impositions, he proposed that a committee consider the means whereby this grievance could be eliminated. Winwood further suggested that a list of royal expenses be drawn up and justified, the great offices of state cleansed of corruption, and the Commons assured that all grants would be used to supply pressing public demands. Several other councillors agreed with Winwood's proposals, but James still shrank from calling another parliament.⁶

During the fall of 1615 the search for economic solutions halted abruptly after Secretary Winwood discovered information linking Somerset to the death of Sir Thomas Overbury. When Overbury died in 1613 it was widely rumored that he had been poisoned. Winwood heard these stories while in London, and, two years later, he was

⁶Spedding, 5:194-207. CSPD, 1611-1618, 310. Gardiner, 2:364-8. Willson, "Summoning and Dissolving Parliament," 291-2.

instrumental in proving their validity. Sir Ralph professed that he uncovered the plot out of his zeal for justice, but he was undoubtedly motivated in part by a desire to be revenged on Somerset. Certainly his actions were not prompted by love for the memory of Overbury, who had once blocked his advancement to the secretaryship.⁷

Until 1617 Winwood's position as principal Secretary of State was far from secure, and Somerset, through whom the office had been granted, did not fully support Sir Ralph after he received the seals. Indeed, for some time after Winwood's appointment, the Earl had insisted on retaining the seals and had continued to receive foreign correspondence. As late as the summer of 1615 Winwood was sorely disappointed to learn that even Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice posted his letters to Somerset. Winwood's bluntness had made him few friends at court, and he frequently quarreled with important royal servants. Late in 1614 and again in 1616 it was rumored that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Fulke Greville, would soon replace Winwood as Secretary. Sir Ralph gave little credence to this story, but a disgruntled John Chamberlain was alarmed by it, writing that "yf this fall out, yf I were Master Secretarie I should breake up schoole and go to play: for this is no

⁷For a different interpretation see McElwee, Murder of Overbury, 152-3.

world to thrive in by plaine dealing." However, by the summer of 1615 Chamberlain was more hopeful for his friend:

He wins upon the world dayly as well as in court as abroad, by his upright and sincere cariage (wherof he makes profession) and is very like to weare out all disadvantages that he came in withall, and to overcome the malice and malignitie of his emulators.⁸

In July 1615 Sir Robert Cotton, the well-known antiquarian, composed a general pardon for Somerset, covering any crimes which he might have committed while in office. One clause--"being an accessory before the fact of murder"--raised suspicions about his connection with the death of Overbury. Lord Chancellor Ellesmere refused to approve the pardon under the Great Seal, and, despite the King's protestations, was supported by most of the council. Winwood probably sided with the majority on this point.⁹

⁸Chamberlain to Carleton, 15 December 1614, 15 June, 13 and 20 July 1615, London; LJC, 1:564, 602, 605-6, 608-9. Carleton to Chamberlain, 6-11 June 1615, Venice; DC to JC, 181-2. Lorkin to Puckering, 21 July 1614, London; Birch, Court and Times, 1:337. Menna Prestwich, Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts (Oxford, 1966), 158. Holles to Norris, 31 May 1615; Holles to Sir George Holles, 18 July 1615, London; Holles to Somerset, 31 July 1615; Holles, Letters, 1:71, 74, 77-8. John Finett, Finetti Philoxenis (London, 1656), 27-8, 34-5. Gardiner, 2:317. Rebholz, Fulke Greville, 237. Evans, Secretary of State, 69. Joseph Allen Matter, My Lords and Lady of Essex: Their State Trials (Chicago, 1969), 99, 138.

⁹Gardiner, 2:329-30. James to Abbot, Suffolk, Winwood, and Lake, 20 October 1615, Royston; Birch, Court and Times, 1:371-2.

The precise manner in which Secretary Winwood discovered the Overbury murder plot is difficult to reconstruct. Sir Ralph was silent about his role, and contemporaries differed as to the exact chain of events which culminated in his revelations. However, certain facts can be drawn together to give us a general idea of what transpired.

Winwood's suspicions of Somerset were confirmed--probably early in August 1615--by a close acquaintance, Mary Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury. Lady Shrewsbury had been imprisoned in the Tower since 1610 for her part in the secret marriage of the King's cousin, Arabella Stuart, to William Seymour. In 1615 she contrived to inform Winwood that the former lieutenant of the Tower, Sir Gervase Hewlys, had been involved in Overbury's death.¹⁰

More tangible information came from William Trumbull in Brussels. Trumbull apprised Winwood that he had news too dangerous to impart in a letter and asked for leave to return to London. James at first refused but then granted the request. Once Sir William arrived, he told Winwood of

¹⁰In December 1615 Lady Shrewsbury was released from the Tower through Winwood's efforts. When the Earl died five months later Sir Ralph served as an executor of the troubled estate. APC, 1615-1616, 357. Chamberlain to Carleton, 18 May 1616 and 18 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:2, 40. Anthony Weldon, Court and Character of James the First; [Walter Scott (ed.)], Secret History of the Court of James the First (Edinburgh, 1811), 1:403.

an apothecary's assistant in Flushing who, believing himself to be dying, confessed to the poisoning of Overbury. In 1613 the boy had been apprenticed to William de Lobell, a French druggist who attended Overbury during the absence of the King's regular physician. The testimony implicated several important courtiers, but the evidence was deemed insufficient to show to the King. Therefore, Winwood moved with great care and discretion in building his case.¹¹

The breakthrough came on 1 September 1615, at a dinner held by Lord Shrewsbury. Both Winwood and Hewlys were in attendance. The ambitious Hewlys was anxious to befriend the Secretary, whom he approached through the Earl. But Sir Ralph replied that he could not embrace Hewlys's friendship as long as the shadow of Overbury's death hung over him. Winwood's manner was confident, as befitted one who appeared to have full knowledge of the murder. Upon hearing this answer, Hewlys quickly protested his innocence and related the details of the plot as he knew them. The next day, at the Secretary's instance, Hewlys put his confession in writing.¹²

¹¹Weldon, Court and Character; Secret History, 1:404-5. John Alfred Kempe (ed.), The Losley Manuscripts (London, 1836), 391.

¹²Spedding, 5:300-1. Halliwell, D'Ewes, 1:68-9, 78. James Howell to father, 1 March 1618, London; Joseph Jacobs (ed.), Familiar Letters (London, 1903), 1:5. White,

Now Windood had a case. On 10 September he presented the evidence he had collected to the King at Royston, and, on the following day, an official investigation into the greatest scandal of early Stuart England was set into motion. James, ever mindful of his favorites, directed Winwood and Lord Chief Justice Coke to confine their examinations to the lesser figures implicated in the murder, so as to allow the major ones to escape. But Somerset and his wife were too closely linked with the plot not to be involved, and Winwood, stung by the Earl's mistreatment of him, had built his case too carefully to allow Somerset to be exonerated. Sir Simonds D'Ewes tells of a confrontation between the Earl and the Secretary soon after Hewlys's statement was made public. According

Cast of Ravens, 239, n17. Philippe Erlanger, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham (London, 1953), 41-3. Edward A. Parry, The Overbury Mystery (London, 1925), 191-200. Parry's chapter on this episode is entitled "Sir Ralph Winwood Dines Out." Matter, My Lords and Lady of Essex, 142, states that Hewlys's confession was written on 10 September; but HMC Buccleugh, 1:160-1, clearly shows the date as 2 September. Roger Coke, A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns and the Inter-Regnum (London, 1696), 49, records another version, in which Somerset's servant, Sir Thomas [Lake?] told Sir Edward Coke about the poisoning. Later, Archbishop Abbot became aware of the plot and told Winwood "that by searching in a certain place he should find a trunk wherein were Papers, which would disclose the whole business, which Sir Ralph did, and found it so." The unlikelihood of Coke's account is demonstrated by James Spedding, "Review of the Evidence Respecting the Conduct of King James I. in the Case of Sir Thomas Overbury," Archaeologia, 41 (1867), 79-115.

to this story, Somerset upbraided Winwood for his ingratitude in repaying the gift of his present office with such ruinous revelations. Sir Ralph answered curtly that he had paid £7000 for the secretaryship. Moreover he could not in good faith have suppressed the facts of the poisoning.¹³

Viewed from a broader perspective, the timing of Winwood's revelations becomes clearer and more significant. The Secretary struck at Somerset once his power was declining. A handsome young courtier, George Villiers, had already caught the King's eye, and he was soon to be made a gentleman of the bedchamber, knighted, and granted a yearly pension of £1000. In less than a decade he would become Duke of Buckingham, the most powerful royal favorite of the early seventeenth century. In 1614 and 1615 Villiers was backed by such religious and political figures as Archbishop Abbot, the Earl of Pembroke, Sir Francis Bacon, and Winwood. Sir Ralph fully realized that the extraordinary favor shown Villiers by the King

¹³[Winwood] to [Coke], 11? September 1615; [Winwood] to Wake, 15 November 1615; CSPD, 1611-1618, 307, 329. George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, October 1615; John Maclean (ed.), Letters from George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mongul. 1615-1617 (New York, 1968), 16. Gardiner, 2:331. White, Cast of Ravens, 179. Amos Andrew, The Great Oyer of Poisoning (London, 1846), 26. Halliwell, D'Ewes, 1:70. Weldon, Court and Character; Secret History, 1:408.

would greatly increase faction at court, but he, like other Protestant courtiers, saw the handsome youth as a means by which the influence of the Howards might be reduced. Thus, the rise of Villiers--and the part played therein by Winwood--must be seen within the context of the discovery of the poison plot. The two schemes were well-coordinated and completely successful.¹⁴

Winwood appears to have faded into the background after revealing the details of the murder. He was not among the commissioners appointed to head the investigation, and, other than conferring with these and attending several examinations, he took no leading role in the legal proceedings. However, as one contemporary observed, "the game was not plaid above board." Sir Ralph clearly remained active behind the scenes, seizing opportunities to ruin Somerset and the Howards. One of his victims, Sir John Holles, complained that "never spanniell pursued his chase more eaguerly, then Mr. Secretary Winwood."¹⁵

¹⁴Winwood to Edmondes, 26 April 1615; Birch, An Historical View, 383. Lloyd, State Worthies, 827. Gardiner, 2:323. White, Cast of Ravens, 90. Parry, Overbury Mystery, 176, 181. McElwee, Murder of Overbury, 213-4, 233-4. Erlanger, Villiers, 12.

¹⁵Holles to son, 5 October 1615, London; Holles, Letters, 1:82. "Queries [by Winwood] to be proposed to Alderman Jones," [6 October 1615]; "Declaration of Alderman Jones," [6 October 1615]; Coke to Winwood, 21 and 22 October 1615, York House; Winwood to the Commissioners in Overbury's Cause, 23, 24, and 30 October, and 3 November 1615, Royston

In late October Winwood moved against several of Somerset's servants, forbidding them to dispark or sell wood or lands at Brancepeth Park. The Earl's agents were infamous for their harsh treatment of his tenants, and Winwood's decree was welcomed by the community. On the 25th of October, the first conspirator to be tried, Richard Weston, the underkeeper of Overbury, was executed at Tyburn after implicating Lord and Lady Somerset. Before Weston died, Holles, Sir John Wentworth, and several other followers of Somerset, seeing this as a last chance to clear their lord, questioned the condemned man on the scaffold. Weston refused to recant his testimony, however. Soon afterwards Holles, Wentworth, and Thomas Lunsden, the author of a libelous essay on Weston's trial, were arrested and sentenced in the Star Chamber to heavy fines and imprisonment in the Tower. On 10 November Winwood attended the proceedings against Holles, who maintained that he was being persecuted as a follower of the fallen earl.¹⁶

and Theobalds; Commissioners to Winwood, 24, 25 and 26 October 1615, York House; Winwood to Lord Chancellor [Ellesmere], 26 October 1615, Royston; Winwood to Coke, 1 November 1615; CSPD, 1611-1618, 314, 319-21, 323-5. James to Winwood, 16 October 1615, Royston; HMC Buccleugh, 1:161. State Trials, 2:911-36. Spedding, 5:297. White, Cast of Ravens, 114-5. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, 193, incorrectly lists Winwood among the commissioners.

¹⁶Bishop of Durham to Winwood, 29 October 1615, Bishop's Auckland; Henry Sanderson to Winwood, 12 November 1615, Brancepeth Castle; [Winwood] to Henry or Samuel Sanderson, [November] 1615, [Newmarket]; CSPD, 1611-1618, 323, 328. State Trials, 2:1021-34. Holles to son, 26 November 1615, The Fleet; Holles, Letters, 1:xxix and n3, xlii-sliv, 94.

Winwood's official duties were reduced by the elevation of Sir Thomas Lake to serve as co-Secretary of State in January 1616. The decision to appoint Lake was not welcomed by Sir Ralph, who considered his new colleague to be both a Catholic and a pensioner of Spain. Winwood might have opted for Sir Thomas Edmondes, who had had extensive diplomatic experience. Sir Ralph retained the seals, his table at court, and responsibility for foreign correspondence. With Lake, however, he shared domestic affairs, which included the on-going investigation into the Overbury murder plot.¹⁷

The struggle for power during the trials spread into the North, and especially into Northumberland. In November 1615 Sir Henry Anderson was, with Winwood's help, chosen high sheriff of that county. The appointment of the opportunistic Anderson strengthened the Secretary's influence in the north of England against the Howards. Early in March 1616 reports from church wardens and clergymen in Northumberland complained about the rising number of recusants. Anderson blamed this increase on

¹⁷Gregoria Barbarigo to the Doge and Senate, 14 January 1616, London; CSPV, 1615-1616, 104. Samuel Hopton to John Coke, 18 January 1616; HMC The Manuscripts of the Earl of Cowper, K. G., Preserved at Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire (London, 1888-1889), 1:91. Carew to [Roe], 24 January 1616, Savoy; CSPD, 1611-1618, 345. Winwood to Edmondes, 26 March 1616; Birch, An Historical View, 393. Lyons, Gondomar, 48.

Roger Widdrington, a Catholic land agent with ties to the Howards. In mid-April the sheriff wrote Winwood and Archbishop Abbot of a death-bed confession which implicated Widdrington in the Gunpowder Plot. With visions of reviving the anti-Catholic spectre of 1605, the two councillors eagerly questioned a number of witnesses sent to London by Anderson. The results were a serious disappointment. After several sessions Winwood and Abbot found little of relevance to either the Powder Plot or the current proceedings and were forced to end their fruitless investigations.¹⁸

The Earl and Lady Somerset were finally brought to trial on 24 and 25 May 1616. Winwood probably attended the trial for his account of the proceedings is very detailed. Moreover, John Chamberlain saw Lady Winwood among the crowd during the second day. The court, as Sir Ralph expected, found both defendants guilty of plotting the murder of Overbury and condemned them to die.

¹⁸ William Morton to Winwood, 19 March, 17 April, 7 May, and 24 September 1616, and 9 May 1617, Newcastle and Durham; Sir Henry Anderson to Winwood, 1 April and 5 August 1616, Newcastle; Abbot to Winwood, 31 May 1616, Lambeth; Examinations of Richard Copeman, Alexander Ridley, Thomas Fenwick, Roger Wodrington, and Francis Ratcliffe, 2, 3, 7, and 30 May, and 18 November 1616; CSPD, 1611-1618, 355, 360, 362, 365-6, 369-70, 389, 395, 406, 465. "Re-examination of Fenwick," 5 July 1616; HMC Buccleugh, 1:174-6. S. J. and Susan J. Watts, From Border to Middle Shire: Northumberland, 1586-1625 (Leicester, 1975), 186-9.

But within two months James pardoned the hapless couple, though they remained incarcerated in the Tower until 1621. With the elimination of the former royal favorite, the final obstacle was removed to the emergence of an even more powerful courtier, Sir George Villiers.¹⁹

Winwood profited little from his investment in Villiers's controversial career. The new intimate of the King did him as little service as Somerset, and Sir Ralph's position remained precarious. In 1616 Winwood hoped to be named to succeed Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. James may even have given him a verbal promise of the office. But shortly before the Chancellor's death in March 1617, Winwood and Villiers together retrieved the Great Seal. Once Ellesmere had died, James entrusted it to Bacon, whom he created Lord Keeper. Winwood also failed to obtain the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, which he sorely wanted although it had already been granted in reversion to someone else. During the fall of 1616 Winwood exchanged harsh words with the young Villiers. The unfortunate breach

¹⁹Winwood to Coke, 9 February 1616, Newmarket; [Winwood] to Wotton, May 1616, Greenwich; Sherburn to [Carleton], 13 July 1616; "Grant to the Countess of Somerset of Pardon," [13 July 1616]; CSPD, 1611-1618, 349, 370, 381-2. Holles to son, 26 March 1616, London; Holles, Letters, 1:124. Chamberlain to Carleton, 25 May 1616, London; LJC, 2:5. Winwood to Sir George More, 18 June 1616, Greenwich; Kempe, Loseley Manuscripts, 414-5. State Trials, 2:951-1022. APC, 1615-1616, 504-5. Gardiner, 2:175.

could only hurt the elder statesman. Winwood's public frustrations were compounded by private difficulties. Throughout most of September his wife lay desperately ill, and in November he cited one James Stone before the Court of Star Chamber. Stone and forty others were charged with the destruction of property, riot, and conspiracy. Lady Winwood recovered, but the outcome of the trial is unknown.²⁰

The quest for increased revenues, delayed by the fall of Somerset, resumed in the spring of 1616, when, in a highly significant move, James sold the cautionary towns back to the United Provinces. The States's ambassador in England had long urged James to return Brill and Flushing to the Dutch, but it was financial necessity which ultimately prompted the King's decision. The English garrisons were so poorly paid and the fortifications so weak that the situation demanded either large-scale expenditure or sale. In April the King agreed to part with the two towns for £215,000--£15,000 of which would go directly to the commanding officers. Winwood played a

²⁰Sherburn to [Carleton], 14 March 1616, London; Carew to [Carleton], 11 September 1616, London; Vere to Carleton, 19 September 1616, Thistleworth; CSPD, 1611-1618, 354, 393-4. Chamberlain to Carleton, 24 March, 3 September, and 12 October 1616, and 8 March 1617, London; LJC, 2:19, 22-3, 27, 59. Aulicus Coquinarlae; Secret History, 2:265. Jones, "Ellesmere and Politics," 55. Catherine Drinker Bowen, The Lion and the Throne (Boston, 1957), 394. Barnes, List and Index, 2:150.

major role in the sale. His close ties with Holland made him a valuable negotiator for both the English and the Dutch. The cautionary towns were too great a liability for the crown to maintain, and, by returning them, James was in effect recognizing the sovereignty of the Dutch Republic. However, few of Sir Ralph's contemporaries were far-sighted enough to realize the need for such an agreement. Many criticized both the treaty and Winwood. A few even maintained that the Dutch had paid as much as £20,000 for the Secretary's support. That charge was in fact partially true, for he received £5000 from one Hollander after the sale. Despite its unpopularity, however, the sale of the cautionary towns was the most successful financial scheme undertaken during Winwood's secretaryship.²¹

Another project--the sale of titles--proved far more costly to the prestige of Stuart monarchy. James's numerous creations between 1603 and 1611 were largely

²¹Chamberlain to Carleton, 20 April 1616, London; LJC, 1:623-4. "Commission and Treaty with Noel Caron;" Winwood to Carleton, 23 May 1616, Greenwich; Carleton, Letters, 28-34. [Winwood] to Wotton, May 1616, Greenwich; CSPD, 1611-1618, 370. Mons. Gilles Vande Put to Winwood, 25 July 1616, London; James to Winwood, 6 December 1616, Newmarket; HMC Buccleugh, 1:176-7. APC, 1615-1616, 514-6, 523, 541-2, 545-8, 551. Sir Edward Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuart; Secret History, 2:358. Halliwell, D'Ewes, 1:93. Clark and Eysinga, Colonial Conferences, 2:122. Gardiner, 2:382-5.

justified, for Elizabeth had been parsimonious in granting peerages. As a result titles were still held in high esteem. But in 1611 James began to sell the new distinction of baronet for £1095. At least £1200 of Winwood's salary while he was stationed at The Hague was derived from this source. In 1615 James allowed a few courtiers to disperse even higher titles. According to Professor Stone, the resulting increase in the number of titled Englishmen led to a sharp decline in their status and directly contributed to the outbreak of the civil wars of the 1640s.²²

In 1616 the cost of a lordship was £10,000. Two titles were sold in July: one to Sir John Roper, created Baron of Teynham, and the other to John Holles, who became Baron of Haughton. Most of their fees went toward Lord Hay's extravagant procession to Paris to discuss a royal marriage. Winwood had been promised the profits from Holles's sale, "but the present necessitie wold not permit yt," and he was instead given half of Roper's and the rights to the next creation. In September, as compensation

²²Munck to [Winwood], [c. 1611?]; HMC Buccleugh, 1:104. Spedding, 4:116-26. Gardiner, 1:435; 2:112. Somers Tracts, 2:252-62. APC, 1613-1614, 651-2; 1615-1616, 637-8. Katherine S. van Eerde, "The Creation of the Baronetage in England," Huntington Library Quarterly, 22 (1959), 313-22. Lawrence Stone, "The Inflation of Honours, 1558-1641," Past and Present, 14 (1958), 56-7. K. W. Swart, Sale of Offices in the Seventeenth Century (The Hague, 1949), 51-3.

for his failure to obtain the Chancellorship of the Duchy, he was granted sole possession of a nomination to the peerage. At first he bargained with a relative of Carleton's, Sir William Cope, but, when Cope delayed, he sold it for the customary amount to Sir Philip Stanhope, who became Lord Shelford.²³

The transaction was not popular. According to Lord Houghton, who found the purchase particularly offensive, Stanhope had twice appeared in the Star Chamber on charges of sodomy and had recently been pardoned for a murder committed by his servants in his presence. Stanhope had also been dismissed from the local commission of the peace. Several times the council had summoned him before them. Even John Chamberlain questioned Winwood's selection. "I could have wisht," he confided to Carleton, "he had met with a more worthy subject, and where he might better have bestowed his favor." Ironically, Stanhope was elevated on 4 November--the same day that James's only surviving son, Charles, was created Prince of Wales. Much later the sale would prove a sound investment for the

²³Chamberlain to Carleton, 20 July, 3 September, 12 October, and 9 November 1616, London; LJC, 2:18, 22, 25, 33. Winwood to Carleton, 9 November 1616, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 69. Sherburn to [Carleton], 9 November 1616, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 404. Carew to Roe, November 1616; Maclean, Letters, 55. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 3:222-3. Gardiner, 3:30-5. Prestwich, Cranfield, 162. Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965), 108.

Stuarts. During the civil wars Stanhope, as Earl of Chesterfield, distinguished himself against the parliamentary armies. However, in 1616, Winwood's choice was anything but distinguished.²⁴

Beyond whatever reflections the Stanhope sale may have had on Sir Ralph's judgment of character, the fact remains that this type of scheme was inadequate as a means of reducing the royal debt. Individuals--such as Winwood--made large windfalls and, to an extent, James was able to grant nominations in lieu of paying money he did not have. But such measures served only to widen the gap between court and country without addressing the real issues. Thus Winwood enriched himself through machinations which greatly undermined the prestige of the English crown.

Winwood's role in the cheapening of peerages raises some interesting questions as to his reputed honesty and wealth. No less an historian than Gardiner called Sir Ralph "the most honest official statesman of the age." In an era when gifts and bribes were a necessary lubricant

²⁴Holles to Suffolk, 21 October 1616, Houghton; Holles, Letters, 1:141-2. Throckmorton to Carleton, 5 November 1616, Whitefriars; CSPD, 1611-1618, 402. Winwood to Carleton, 9 November 1616, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 69. Chamberlain to Carleton, 9 November 1616, London; LJC, 2:33. Carew to Roe, November 1616; Maclean, Letters, 55 and nl. APC, 1615-1616, 136, 144, 204, 251. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 3:212, 222-3. DNB, 18:909. Charles R. Mayes, "The Sale of Peerages in Early Stuart England," Journal of Modern History, 29 (1957), 24.

for the machinery of government, Winwood's integrity must be discussed in relative rather than absolute terms. Instances of "corruption" have been noted previously, particularly the Antwerp plate, Ogle's offer for an ambassadorship, Cockayne's bribe, money given to Somerset for the secretaryship and to Winwood for the sale of the cautionary towns, and the conferral of Stanhope's peerage. Other examples are easily documented. In 1614 the company of pin-makers sought to win Sir Ralph's favor with a gift of £4000. In 1616 a courtier offered Carleton £400 for his help in securing an office in Ireland. Sir Dudley, in turn, solicited Winwood's aid, but the post had already been promised and the deal collapsed. And in 1617 the Duke of Savoy, to insure the Secretary's continued support, sent him several pieces of furniture. Furthermore, Winwood was told that he could expect a large part of £40,000, if James decided to assist Savoy against Spain. Venice reputedly considered similar gifts.²⁵

²⁵More to Winwood, 5 October [1604], London; Enno to Winwood, [7 January] 1606, Essens; Calbert to Winwood, 5 April 1606, London; "Edzardus Adolphus" to Winwood, 21 July 1606, Aurick; HMC Buccleugh, 1:50, 59, 62, 65. Carleton to Winwood, 31 October 1616; Winwood to Carleton, 26 November 1616, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 65-6, 75. Sir Thomas Bartlett to Winwood, 31 December 1614; Brent to [Carleton], 19 November 1616, Bow Lane; CSPD, 1611-1618, 263, 406. Chamberlain to Carleton, 23 November 1616, London; LJC, 2:37 and n3. Carleton to Chamberlain, 2 December 1616, The Hague; DC to JC, 227. Lionello to the Doge and Senate, 11 August 1617, London;

Details about Winwood's personal wealth are sketchy; but they show that, at least in later life, he enjoyed a comfortable income. Diplomatic agents--when they were paid--received a daily wage of no more than thirty to forty shillings. Important missions meant higher pay, in addition to the customary presents. The salary of the Secretary of State remained at £100 a year throughout the seventeenth century, but in Winwood's day the office was worth an additional £2000 in allowances at table, fees, perquisites, and gifts. And even that figure is doubtless too conservative. One can easily trace Winwood's official salary. The difficulty lies in determining his extraordinary income and how, if at all, gratuities affected his policies. Jacobean politicians probably accepted Bacon's contention that a gift which did not change one's decision was not a bribe in the strict sense of the term. The intent

CSPV, 1615-1617, 571-2. Anthony Weldon, "The Character of King James;" Secret History, 2:10-1. Clark and Eysinga, Colonial Conferences, 2:19. Parry, Overbury Mystery, 171-2. Nina B. Baker, Sir Walter Raleigh (New York, 1950), 139. Joel Hurstfield, "Political Corruption in Modern England: The Historian's Problem," History, 52 (1967), 16-34; "The Political Morality of Early Stuart Statesmen," History, 56 (1971), 235-43; and "The Politics of Corruption in Shakespeare's England," Shakespeare Survey, 28 (1975), 15-28. James C. Scott, "Proto-Corruption in Early Stuart England," Comparative Political Corruption (Englewood Cliffs, 1972), 37-55. Lawrence Stone, "The Fruits of Office: The Case of Robert Cecil, First Early of Salisbury, 1596-1612," F. J. Fisher (ed.), Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England in Honour of R. H. Tawney (Cambridge, 1961), 89-116.

of the receiver was of fundamental importance, and that is extremely difficult to determine on the basis of available information. But Winwood clearly lived beyond his means both as an ambassador and as Secretary.²⁶

Sir Ralph apparently had an independent source of income. In 1610, when pressed to approve his bill of expenses, Salisbury refused, saying, "Sir Ralph Winwood is no poor man, he can stay well enough." In later years Winwood gave expensive presents to his friends, lent several thousand pounds to trusted associates, and contributed to several colonial enterprises. Above all,

²⁶Neville to Cecil, [c. October 1600]; HMC Salisbury, 10:371. Cecil to Winwood, 7 March 1601; Winwood to Neville, 16 March 1601, Paris; More to Winwood, 8 October 1609 and 15 December 1610, London; Memorials, 1:302, 306; 3:80, 329. "Expenses of Winwood in Holland, 15 July 1603-25 September 1604;" More to Winwood, 6 May [1606], 5 May 1609, 2 February 1610, 24 March and 20 October 1611, [January], 1 (or 2) March, 24 March, and 9 August 1613, London; Munck to [Winwood], [c. 1611?]; HMC Buccleugh, 1:42, 64, 80, 85, 98, 102, 104, 123-4, 128-9, 141-2. Edmondes to Trumbull, 17 May, 14 and 27 September 1609, Brussels and London; Beaulieu to Trumbull, 20 September 1609, London; More to Trumbull, 27 September 1609, 27 September and 13 December 1610, 24 October 1611, and 18 March 1613, London; Williams to Trumbull, 11 August 1613, London; Winwood to Trumbull, 14 October 1613, London; HMC Downshire, 2:101, 127-8, 139, 145, 406; 3:168; 4:67, 178, 223-4. Chamberlain to Carleton, 31 December 1612 and 9 September 1613, London; LJC, 1:399, 474. Winwood to [Carleton], 28 September 1613, London; Bartlett to Winwood, 31 December 1614; CSPD, 1611-1618, 200, 263. Somers Tracts, 2:386. Frederick Devon, Issues of the Exchequer (London, 1846), 38, 44, 61, 123-4, 149. F. M. G. Evans, "Emoulements of the Principal Secretaries of State in the Seventeenth Century," English Historical Review, 35 (1920), 513-28.

he was interested in property. Throughout his life he displayed an insatiable appetite for lands and houses. In 1599 Winwood's assignment to Paris abruptly frustrated his efforts to purchase Delshanger Manor in Northampton. John More's letters to Winwood during his ambassadorship were filled with details about available properties. In 1612 Sir Ralph took over Bodley's London house for a yearly rent of £5 6s. 8d. Two years later he acquired a small house and some land at Thistleworth for £56 a year--which John Chamberlain considered to be twice what it was worth--and Ditton Park in Buckingham, worth £150 in annual rents. Later Winwood paid an additional £1100 for the keeping of Ditton Manor. Subsequent repairs on the estate totaled another £500. In 1615 and 1616 he bought Quainton Dundon and Fulbrook Manor in Berkshire. At his death in 1617 his heirs inherited £14,000 and lands worth £1600 a year. He left, as Chamberlain noted, "a very good estate."²⁷

²⁷ Neville to Cecil, 28 July 1599; Neville to Winwood, 21 June 1608, London; More to Winwood, 1 December 1610, London; Memorials, 1:81, 2:412; 3:235. Savile to Winwood, 26 October 1599, Weston; Bodley to Winwood, 13 April 1605; London; More to Winwood, 5 May 1609, 28 March, 5 and 28 July 1610, 24 March and 20 October 1611, 10 and 23 (or 13) May 1612, and 8 February 1613, London; HMC Buccleugh, 1:28, 53-4, 80, 82, 87, 90-1, 98, 101, 106-7, 125-6. Chamberlain to Carleton, 20 April 1609, 3 March, 21 July, and 24 November 1614, 29 March, 9 August, and 31 October 1617, Ware Park and London; LJC, 1:290, 303, 551, 558-9; 2:66, 90-1, 93, 109. CSPD, 1611-1618, 225 errs in denoting Somerset for Winwood in Chamberlain's letter of 3 March 1614. Lionello to the Council of Ten, 19 January 1617,

Land transactions, gifts, and emoluments accounted for much of Winwood's wealth. However, a great deal remains unknown about his personal finances. He had, no doubt, an independent source upon which to draw, but the size and nature of that fund is a mystery. Certainly, the corrupt world of early seventeenth-century English politics allowed Sir Ralph to indulge his expensive tastes and live far beyond his official means. But in this he was only reflecting the spirit of the age.²⁸

London; CSPV, 1615-1617, 416. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 2:446, n6. CSPD, 1611-1618, 447. William Page and P. H. Ditchfield (eds.), The Victoria History of the County of Berkshire (Folkstone and London, 1972), 3:201, 229. William Page (ed.), The Victoria History of the County of Buckingham (London, 1969), 3:304, 308; 4:55-6, 94. Moore, History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, 2:226, 264-5. Gibson, "An Interior," 132-9. T. I. Jeffreys Jones, Exchequer Proceedings Concerning Wales in Tempore James I (Cardiff, 1955), 296. Alexander Brown, The Genesis of the United States (Boston and New York, 1891), 1056. "Court Minutes of the East India Company, 27 February 1618;" Calendar of State Papers Colonial, 1617-1621 (Vaduz, 1964), 135.

²⁸Chamberlain to Alice Carleton, 30 October 1614, 1 February and 6 April 1615, London; Chamberlain to Carleton, 1 February 1615, 9 August, and 16 March 1618, London; LJC, 1:544, 574, 594; 2:90-1, 148-9. Statham, Jacobean Letter-Writer, 159.

CHAPTER V

'THE BOISTROUS SECRETARIE'

The final year of Winwood's secretaryship was his most successful. With the passing of Somerset and the rise of Villiers, new directions in foreign policy were forged. The current royal favorite, not yet enamored with the romantic notion of a Spanish wife for Prince Charles, generally shared Winwood's hostility toward Spain. To antagonize the Spanish the aged Sir Walter Raleigh was unleashed to search for treasure in South America. In England, Sir Ralph brought about a compromise which re-established the fallen Sir Edward Coke and discredited Sir Francis Bacon, who consequently made common cause against the former Chief Justice and the Secretary.

One of the first projects of 1617 to concern Winwood was James's plan to visit his northern kingdom after an absence of fourteen years. Winwood had no wish to go and was relieved when Lake volunteered to attend the King and Villiers, now Earl of Buckingham. However, Winwood was instructed to be in Edinburgh by mid-July 1617.¹

¹Chamberlain to Carleton, 21 December 1616 and 29 March 1617, London; LJC, 2:45, 66. Lionello to the Doge and Senate, 9 March 1617, London; CSPV, 1615-1617, 460. Nichols, Progresses of James I, 3:233. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, 259-60. G. A. Sinclair, "The Scottish Progress of James VI," Scottish Historical Review, 10 (1912), 21-8.

The King's Scottish progress, begun in mid-March 1617, gave the councillors a rare opportunity for leisure. They often gathered together to worship--once hearing a sermon by the poet John Donne in St. Pauls'--and to feast. Each took his turn at providing the dinner and, in early May, the council was lavishly entertained at St. Bartholomew's. James's journey also occasioned a fierce struggle for power among the courtiers who remained in London. The particular instance over which the fight began was, on the surface, at least, a minor one involving a projected marriage between Coke's daughter and Buckingham's elder brother. But it was in reality much more than that.²

Coke had fallen from the King's grace in the summer of 1616. In his famous assaults on the Court of Chancery and on Commendams, Lord Chief Justice Coke called into question the extent of the royal prerogative. Incensed, James had Coke suspended from the council, prohibited from conducting assizes, and ordered to revise his official reports. Winwood stood by his friend until it was clear that Coke could not be saved from the King's wrath. Not the least of Sir Edward's sins was his opposition to the

²Chamberlain to Carleton, 29 March, 5 and 19 April, and 10 May 1617, London; LJC, 2:67-8, 71, 73-5. Donne's first benefice, the rectory of Keyston in Huntingdon, was procured by Winwood on 16 January 1616. R. C. Bald, John Donne: A Life (New York and Oxford, 1970), 317, n2.

proposed marriage of his daughter, Frances, to the weak-minded Sir John Villiers. Villier's mother, Lady Compton, and James both were active in promoting the match. In a rare moment of unanimity, Coke and his wife, Lady Elizabeth, resisted it.³

By February 1617 Coke recanted and drew up a list of proposals whereby he would consent to the marriage. James was delighted; Lady Elizabeth was not. Winwood and the council later mediated some of the major differences between Coke and his wife; but the Secretary could not soften the excessive demands of the French ambassador against Coke. He claimed £4800 compensation from Coke who, as Chief Justice, had released a pirate on bail. However, Coke was determined to recover his political honor by arranging a reconciliation with the King. The wedding was the key to his revival. On 16 June Winwood, at Coke's instance, informed Buckingham of Sir Edward's desires. The negotiations were immediately reopened.⁴

³APC, 1615-1616, 595-609, 648-50. Spedding, 5:357-69. Chamberlain to Carleton, 8 and 22 June, and 6 July 1616, London; LJC, 2:7, 11, 14. Winwood to Carleton, 13 July 1616, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 45. John P. Dawson, "Coke and Ellesmere Disinterred: The Attack on the Chancery in 1616," Illinois Law Review, 36 (1941-1942), 127-52. Bowen, Lion and Throne, 370-90.

⁴"Sir Edward Coke's Proposals," 10 February 1617; HMC Buccleugh, 1:181. Spedding, 6:219-21. Chamberlain to Carleton, 4 June 1617, London; LJC, 2:80.

In July the match between Coke and Villiers became entangled in a growing political battle between Bacon and Winwood. Upon the King's departure for Scotland, Lord Keeper Bacon assumed virtual control of the government and usurped much of Winwood's rightful authority. In conscious imitation of the high style of royalty, Bacon made a pretentious display of his newfound wealth and influence. He perceived the rehabilitation of Coke as a direct threat to his position and strongly opposed the marriage that would unite his enemy with Buckingham. Because the blunt Secretary actively supported the marriage, the two statesmen clashed. Bacon was unable to warn the King in person of the dangers involved in the proposed union, so he vented his wrath on Winwood. Sir Ralph, for his part, acted no better. His manner was never conciliatory, and he did not shrink from the quarrels that soon arose.⁵

Early in July Winwood entered the council chamber and, finding Bacon's dog in his chair, struck the animal. The Lord Keeper, who was sitting nearby, commented sarcastically that every gentleman loved a dog. Later, as the council deliberated, Bacon felt that his antagonist was seated too close to him and demanded that Winwood keep his distance, whereupon the Secretary stormed out of the

⁵Chamberlain to Carleton, 10 May 1617, London; LJC, 2:72-3. Gardiner, 3:89.

meeting. The two men were irreconcilable, and their friends feared they they would come to blows. Later, when asked by Queen Anne why they would not cooperate, Bacon blamed their excessive pride. Perhaps that best sums up the cause of their rivalry. The King supported Winwood throughout the affair and assured Bacon "that neither by word nor writing did [Sir Ralph] ever suggest ought to any particular mans prejudice, either to me, or to Buckingham."⁶

Winwood complained bitterly to the Queen of Bacon's appalling behaviour in council. Anne was sympathetic. Both men wrote to Buckingham: Winwood that the Lord Keeper fancied himself a king, and Bacon that the Secretary backed the marriage in order to create faction among the councillors. The King found Winwood's letter humorous but sent assurances of his favor. In mid-July the struggle erupted into open warfare. Lady Coke would in no way accept the elder Villiers as her son-in-law and, to save her daughter, fled with Frances into the countryside. Winwood gladly issued a warrant--which Bacon had refused--for Coke to recover her. The subsequent rescue was a farce that entertained the gossips at St. Paul's for

⁶Chamberlain to Carleton, 5 July and 11 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:85, 102. Spedding, 6:222. Godfrey Goodman, The Court of King James the First, ed. John S. Brewer (London, 1839), 1:283. Weldon, Court and Character; Secret History, 1:438-9.

several weeks. Coke was summoned before the council to answer for the violence of the rescue and the Secretary was criticized for illegally granting the license. Bacon, who probably directed the close questioning of Winwood on 19 July, must have savored his enemies' misfortune. But Bacon's victory was short-lived, for Winwood now played his trump: a letter from the King sanctioning all his actions. Bacon was devastated. He had thought that James could be made to see the folly of the marriage and the treason of his Secretary. But Winwood had long known how deeply the King was committed to the Villiers family and had withheld that knowledge from Bacon until the proper moment.⁷

Winwood's decisive victory over the Lord Keeper was completed by a council request to James that the Secretary remain in London. The King was undecided as to whether Winwood should meet him in Scotland as planned earlier, and finally left the decision up to Winwood himself. Sir Ralph prepared to travel north, but the council petitioned the King to allow him to stay in England. The affairs of government, they argued, required the service of a Secretary. In another vote of confidence the council,

⁷Chamberlain to Carleton, 19 July 1617, London; LJC, 2:88-90. James to Canterbury, Bacon, Winwood, and Grevill, 16 July 1617, Fawkland; HMC Buccleugh, 1:205-6. Bowen, Lion and Throne, 403.

in an official report to James concerning Coke's abduction of his daughter, said nothing of Winwood's role. Bacon was undaunted. He continued to reason with the King and Buckingham, but to no avail. His warnings against the "eloquent persuasions or pragmatics" of "the boistrous Secretarie" went unheeded. On 24 September, at the King's command, Winwood restored Coke to the council. Five days later Sir John Villiers and Lady Frances Coke were wed, with James himself giving the bride away.⁸

Another marriage proposal figured heavily in Jacobean politics in 1617: the projected marriage of Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta. Again Bacon and Winwood disagreed, with the Lord Keeper favoring it and the Secretary, of course, opposed. The King was merely pragmatic. Sarmiento, now Count of Gondomar, led James to believe that the Infanta would bring with her a dowry of £600,000. The French Princess, Christina, promoted by the anti-Spanish

⁸Chamberlain to Carleton, 4 June, 5 and 19 July, 9 and 27 August, and 11 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:79, 84, 88, 91-2, 98, 100-1. Winwood to Carleton, 7 and 26 July 1617, St. Bartholomew's; Carleton, Letters, 148, 155-6. Carleton to Chamberlain, 7 July 1617, The Hague; DC to JC, 240. Gerrard to Carleton, 22 July 1617, Hatfield; Lake to [Winwood], 28 August 1617, Tixall; CSPD, 1611-1618, 477, 484. Winwood to Buckingham, 29 July [1617], St. Bartholomew's; HMC Eglinton, 103. Adam Newton to Puckering, 28 September 1617, Deptford; Birch, Court and Times, 2:34. APC, 1616-1617, 310-1, 315-7, 329. Evans, Secretary of State, 225. Turner, Privy Council, 1:105, errs in citing the Council's letter to James as 10 June.

faction, could only provide one-third as much. After several years of preliminary talks, James's financial plight and the ambassador's friendly persuasions convinced him that a Spanish marriage would be the most advantageous. On 2 March 1617 a commission was appointed to review the terms of the contract and determine the sincerity of Philip III. Archbishop Abbot, Sir Thomas Edmondes, and Winwood were excluded from the deliberations because of their known animosity toward Spain. They stood alone against the wishes to the royal family and the commission, which reluctantly approved the proposals from Madrid. The Secretary favored neither a Spanish nor a French bride for Charles. Instead, he preferred that the Prince marry an English subject. He rightfully believed that herein lay a temporary solution to the economic dilemma facing the crown, for "neither Spain nor France can give so large a dower to the prince in ready money as this people will provide if he takes one of themselves." Throughout the summer of 1617 Winwood attempted to undermine the negotiations which were being conducted by Sir John Digby. He took advantage of James's absence to delay Digby's departure for Spain on the pretext of reports of Spanish marriage talks with Bohemia. Digby did not leave until the King's return in August 1617. Meanwhile Winwood advocated a

bolder scheme: the release of Raleigh from the Tower.⁹

Sir Walter Raleigh had been imprisoned since 1603 for conspiring with Catholics to dethrone James--a bizarre charge against a man who offered, at his own expense, to fight the Spanish. Before his imprisonment and trial Raleigh was kept at Bodley's house in St. Bartholomew's, at the time Winwood was married to Sir Thomas's step-daughter. With the rise of the anti-Spanish faction in 1614 Raleigh grew hopeful of his release. Early in 1615 he wrote to Secretary Winwood, who openly sympathized with the great Elizabethan adventurer. Sir Walter vigorously explained to Winwood his plans for an expedition to mine gold in Guiana, where he had journeyed twenty years earlier. He pleaded for Winwood's support with the King. Recalling the injustice of his sentence, Raleigh concluded that "to die for the King, and not by the King is all the Ambition I have in the world." Again, in July 1615, he wrote to Winwood of the untapped riches of the Orinoco basin. Winwood effectively promoted Raleigh's cause with James,

⁹Cottington to Winwood, 3 March 1617, Madrid; [Thomas Rossiter] to _____, 29 July 1617, St. Bartholomew's; HMC Buccleugh, 1:183-4, 206-7. Chamberlain to Carleton, 29 March and 9 August 1617, London; LJC, 2:66, 93. Lionello to the Doge and Senate, 6 April, 11 and 25 May, and 22 August 1617, London: CSPV, 1615-1617, 484, 503, 509-10, 533. Winwood to Buckingham, 29 July and 15 August [1617]; HMC Eglinton; 102-4. Gardiner, 2:323-6; 3:61-2. Spedding, 6:146, 148. Lyon, Gondomar, 33, 42. Samuel Rawson Gardiner (ed.), "The Earl of Bristol's Defence of His Negotiations in Spain," The Camden Miscellany (New York, 1968), 6:9-10.

who was intrigued by visions of South American gold. On 19 March 1616 his efforts were rewarded. Raleigh was released to prepare for the voyage to Guiana.¹⁰

Winwood advanced Raleigh's cause for a variety of reasons. Primarily, the expedition was a more acceptable alternative to the Infanta. At worst, as he explained to James, Raleigh would strengthen the crown's bargaining position in the marriage negotiations. There were other considerations as well. The early seventeenth century was an era of intensive, if not altogether successful, colonization by England. Winwood was a long-time proponent of overseas enterprise. At The Hague he often mediated trading disputes between the States and the English East India Company, and James repeatedly sought his advice during the Anglo-Dutch conferences in 1613 and 1615. His interest in the American colonies was considerable. An acquaintance of Captain John Smith and Sir Thomas Dale, Winwood briefed James prior to the royal audience with Pochantas and Uttamatakin in 1616. Winwood also served on the board of directors of the Bermuda Company and

¹⁰Sir Walter Raleigh to Winwood, [1615] and July 1615; V. T. Harlow, Raleigh's Last Voyage (New York, 1971), 113-5. APC, 1615-1616, 456. Chamberlain to Carleton, 27 March 1616, London; LJC, 1:617-8. Gardiner, 2:379-82. Norman Lloyd Williams, Sir Walter Raleigh (Harmondsworth, 1965), 182-4. Edward Edwards, The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh (London, 1868), 1:563; 2:334-5, 339-41.

subscribed to the London and East India Companies. The Jacobean gentry were a powerful impetus to colonial expansion. Winwood, as one of the more active participants, especially favored the plantation of an English settlement in South America. To further Raleigh's project he offered to contribute several thousand crowns of his own money.¹¹

A third consideration--one sharply criticized by historians--was the chance to reopen the war against Spain. Winwood and Raleigh shared a common hatred of the Catholic empire of Philip III and would have liked the opportunity to destroy it. In 1617 the time seemed ripe. Raleigh's commission from the King specifically limited

¹¹Lionello to the Council of Ten, 19 January 1617, London; CSPV, 1615-1617, 413-7. Edwards, Raleigh, 1:586. Southampton to Salisbury, [1608], HMC Salisbury, 20:311. More to Winwood, 29 November 1611, London; Abbot to Winwood, 1 June 1613, Lambeth; Memorials, 3:309, 459. Salisbury to Winwood, 17 January 1611, Whitehall; [The Council for Virginia] to Winwood, [1611?]; Sir Thomas Smythe to Winwood, 10 August and 12 December 1612, 16 May 1613, and 29 January 1617, London; John Sheler to Winwood, 26 January 1613, Middleburg; "A Brief of the Proceedings which have been past betwixt his Majesty's Commissioners and those others of the States touching the Trade into the East Indies;" HMC Buccleugh, 1:97, 103, 110, 119-20, 122, 132-3, 166-70, 180. Chamberlain to Carleton, 8 February 1617, London; LJC, 2:53. CSP Colonial, 1617-1621, 135. John Smith, The Generall Historie of Virginia (Ann Arbor, 1972), 1:266, 371. Brown, First Republic, 145. 219; Genesis of America, 446-51, 543, 770, 783-4, 870-1, 1056. G. N. Clark, "Grotius's East India Mission to England," Transactions of the Grotius Society, 20 (1935), 45-84. Clark and Eysinga, Colonial Conferences. Frances Mossiker, Pocahontas: The Life and the Legend (New York, 1976), 239, 244, 264. Bradford Smith, Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend (Philadelphia, 1943), Rabb, Enterprise and Empire, 406.

his mission to exploration of the Orinoco River, but Winwood worked to allow Sir Walter more sway. In the Mediterranean, Savoy and Milan, which was backed by Spain, were engaged in sporadic fighting. Winwood saw this as England's best opportunity to strike at the Spanish system. Early in 1617 he introduced Raleigh to a French agent through whom secret negotiations were conducted with Count Scarnafigi, the ambassador of Savoy. Raleigh was willing to exchange his dreams of gold for a proposed assault on the "neutral" city of Genoa. He even suggested that four ships from the royal navy accompany his small fleet of eight vessels; but Winwood countered that sixteen might be more effective. Initially James favored this scheme, but later he refused when a more lasting settlement appeared imminent.¹²

The crux of the criticism of Winwood's relationship with Raleigh is the Secretary's motive. Most historical accounts portray Winwood as ruthless and cynical, willing to sacrifice Raleigh in order to instigate a new war with Spain. By the same token, Sir Walter is seen as an instrument of the anti-Spanish faction under the direction

¹²Somers Tracts, 2:424-6. Barbarigo to the Doge and Senate, 28 May 1616, London; Lionello to the Council of Ten, 19 and 27 January, and 3 February 1617, London; CSPV, 1615-1617, 210, 413-7, 428-9. Also see 154-5, 162-3, 169, 176-80, 189, 194, 243-4, 249, 362-3. Gardiner, 3:42, 50-2. Edwards, Raleigh, 1:577, 579.

of Winwood. This interpretation seems unfair to both men. If Raleigh was released in order to break the Anglo-Spanish peace, his eagerness for an attack on Genoa demonstrates that he needed little encouragement. Winwood may have supported this project, but it originated with Scarnafigi rather than with him. When the scheme collapsed there was no lack of others. Citing the reports of foreign ambassadors in England, Gardiner long ago asserted that Winwood encouraged Raleigh's idea of an attack on the Spanish fleet at Mexico. When Raleigh told Bacon of his daring plan, the Lord Keeper exclaimed that that would make him and his followers pirates. Raleigh replied simply: "Who ever heard of men being pirates for millions?"¹³

The story of the exchange between Raleigh and Bacon is probably apocryphal. It seems unlikely that Sir Walter would confide so closely in Winwood's bitter enemy. But Raleigh later contended that the seizure of Spanish treasure ships was discussed--though he blamed Winwood and others for the proposal. Nevertheless, Bacon's biographer, James Spedding, remained skeptical:

¹³Martain A. S. Hume, Sir Walter Raleigh (New York, 1926), 213-4, 218, 223. Irvin Anthony, Raleigh and His World (New York, 1934), 287, 289-90. William Stebbing, Sir Walter Raleigh (New York, 1972), 293, 303-4, 306-9. Harlow, Raleigh's Last Voyage, 25, 48, 279. Leopold von Ranke, A History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1966), 1:480. Gardiner, 3:53.

A Secretary who was capable of such a plot against the government he was serving must have been a very dangerous man to employ, and though it seems too much to believe of any man on no better authority than the report of an ambassador, yet the very rumour can hardly have gained currency respecting one in his place, unless he had been really implicated in some questionable transaction.¹⁴

Historians have generally overlooked two final aspects: friendship and common cause. Though he was barred from attending the court, Sir Walter often dined at St. Bartholomew's, and Winwood invested large amounts of his own money in the Guiana enterprise. In addition both men sought to undermine Spanish influence at home and abroad. Genoa, Mexico, and the Orinoco basin were merely separate aspects of a common goal. Cooperation and not exploitation characterized the relationship between Raleigh and Winwood, and Sir Ralph's part in the tragedy of Raleigh's last voyage must be understood in this light.¹⁵

Gondomar naturally denounced the Guiana project, but James, whose mind raced with thoughts of gold, refused to revoke Raleigh's charter. However, the King, as usual,

¹⁴Spedding, 6:170.

¹⁵Edwards, Raleigh, 1:586. Williams, Raleigh, 247. The statements on this point in Philip Magnus, Sir Walter Raleigh (New York, 1956), 130-1, and Irwin, That Great Lucifer, 239, are strikingly similar both in content and form.

sought refuge in compromise. Raleigh could sail to South America to explore the Orinoco basin, but he was forbidden to attack any foreign troops. His freedom was conditional, and the original sentence of death remained in force. To further placate the Spanish ambassador, James ordered Winwood to present Gondomar with Raleigh's letter of intent and a list of ships in his fleet. The information was grudgingly given by the Secretary after a sharp reminder from Buckingham. Raleigh later complained of the Spaniards' foreknowledge of the voyage, but he was not betrayed by Winwood, as many historians have argued. The purpose of Raleigh's mission was well-known (though Gondomar chose not to believe it), and the ships could easily have been counted while in preparation.¹⁶

In June 1617 Raleigh set sail from England, but bad weather and a series of accidents delayed his arrival at Guiana until November. Within the next four months Sir Walter saw his grand scheme fall apart. Too ill to explore inland, he remained at the mouth of the Orinoco while his second-in-command, Laurence Keymis, searched for the mines. Instead of gold they captured a Spanish

¹⁶Buckingham to Winwood, 28 March 1617, Lincoln; HMC Buccleugh, 1:189. Raleigh to Winwood, 21 March 1618, St. Christopher's; Harlow, Raleigh's Last Voyage, 238-42. Sir Walter Raleigh, The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh (Oxford, 1829), 1:634. Edwards, Raleigh, 1:586-7. Gardiner, 3:56-7.

settlement. Raleigh's own son perished during the assault. Keymis returned to tell the captain of their failure and then committed suicide. In late March 1618 Raleigh informed his friend Winwood of the disasters and begged pity for his poor wife. But Raleigh had not lost all hope of destroying Spanish power in the new world. "I have founde," he wrote, "many things of importance for discovering the estate and weaknes of the Indies, which, if I live I shall hereafter impart your Honor, to whome I shall ever remaine a faithful servant." This, too, was destined to fail. In June 1618 Raleigh stopped over in Ireland on his way back to England. It was there that he learned of Winwood's death eight months earlier.¹⁷

¹⁷ Cottington to [Winwood], 21 October and 4 November 1617, Madrid, CSPD, 1611-1618, 489, 493. Raleigh to Wife, 14 November 1617 and 22 March 1618, Cayenne River and St. Christopher's; Raleigh to Winwood, 21 March 1618, St. Christopher's; Raleigh to Lord Carew, 21 June 1618; Harlow, Ralegh's Last Voyage, 159, 238-44, 247. Stebbing, Ralegh, 328. Irwin, That Great Lucifer, 286.

EPILOGUE:

'THREE HUNDRED WINWOODS'

Winwood died in late October following a brief illness. Until his demise, the year 1617 had seen his finest service under the crown. Coke was restored, Bacon defeated, the Spanish marriage delayed if not terminated, and Raleigh released to search for gold and war. Winwood's death marked disaster for all these personal and public triumphs. One cannot presume that their success or failure hinged lightly on the Secretary, for he was never so pivotal a figure in English politics to demand that description. But his death marked a turning point in the reign of James I somewhat analogous to that when Salisbury died. Winwood's influence, to be sure, was on a lesser scale than that of his predecessor.

Secretary Winwood had never stood higher in the Jacobean political world than he did during the fall of 1617. But the struggle to achieve that position took a heavy toll and he vowed not to meddle further in the complex intrigues at court. John Chamberlain, who worried for his friend's health, was much relieved. "In truth," Chamberlain maintained, "he could never leave in a better time, for he hath taken downe all that stode in his way . . . which I impute not altogether to his fortune, but to courage and foresight what he undertooke." Highly regarded by many at

court, Winwood had seldom enjoyed such importance and influence. Possibly he thought that it might be an appropriate time to retire from government service and live out the rest of his days at Ditton Park. Increasingly of late he had been attracted to the leisure of the countryside. Then, suddenly, his health failed.¹

On Friday afternoon, 10 October, Winwood became violently ill while at a council meeting in the Star Chamber. After a short rest and some medication he recovered enough to return. The next morning he attended the King at Royston. The attack of sickness recurred within a week. On the 18th he was present in the Court of Chancery to hear his case involving the executorship of the late Earl of Shrewsbury's estate. The issue had dragged on for over a year and a half as the Countess, whom Winwood had released from the Tower, contested the settlement. In 1616 Chamberlain had warned Sir Ralph of the difficulties involved in the will, but Winwood stubbornly accepted the commission. In October Chamberlain was particularly concerned, because the case "doth trouble him very much, and yf he end yt not in time may trouble

¹Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:102.

those that come after him." Those words had a ring of truth which Chamberlain did not realize at the time.²

On the 19th he developed a lingering fever which quickly worsened. On the 24th the King's personal physician, Theodore de Mayerne, bled Winwood--doubtless to poor effect. The blood was foul, and he succumbed to fainting spells. His condition appeared hopeless. Mayerne, although competent, had lost such illustrious patients as Prince Henry, Salisbury, and Overbury. Winwood's friends were not optimistic. Chamberlain noted that he talked incessantly--"an yll signe in a man otherwise so silent." His waking hours were bothered by numerous nobles who came in person to pay their respects or sent messengers to inquire after his health. On the afternoon of 27 October Winwood was given up for lost, though he lived on until 7 o'clock the next morning. Three days later he was quietly buried in the chapel at St. Bartholomew's.³

²Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 and 18 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:102, 104. APC, 1616-1617, 342.

³Chamberlain to Carleton, 24 and 31 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:106-8. Vere to Chamberlain, 27 October 1617, Thistleworth; Sherburn to Carleton, 28 October 1617, York House; Nathaniel Darell to Carleton, 28 October 1617, London; Sir Benjamin Rudyard to Carleton, 28 October 1617, Hanworth; Richard Harrison to Carleton, 29 October 1617, London; Savile to Carleton, 29 October 1617, Eton; Brent to [Carleton], 30 October 1617, London; Williams to Carleton, 31 October 1617, Whitehall; Sir Francis Blundell

Secretary Winwood's death was much lamented. The royal family expressed their deep regret at having lost so capable a servant. After his immediate family, the person most affected by Winwood's death was John Chamberlain, with whom he had shared a long and amiable acquaintance. A compulsive, yet discerning, gossip, Chamberlain had spent his happiest years during his friend's tenure of high office. He was grief-stricken at Winwood's death:

You may thincke what a losse I have of so goode a friend, now in my latter age when I have most need of comfort, and indeed yt was a kind of new life to me to see his kindnes increase dayly towards me, and that we still grew neerer; but God knowes what is best, and I hope by this meanes and the like wold more and more weane me from the world.⁴

to Carleton, 31 October 1617, Whitehall; CSPD, 1611-1618, 490-2. Lake to Carleton, 30 October 1617, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 194. John Hoskyns to wife, 30 October; Osborn, Hoskyns, 78. Carew to Roe, October 1617; McClure, Letters, 130. Brown, First Republic, 252, incorrectly lists Winwood's death as having occurred on 7 November. G. E. C. (ed.), Complete Peerage (London, 1887-1898), 5:342, nf, says Winwood died in his thirty-sixth year. He was actually fifty-four. Notestein, Four Worthies, 64, gives the year as 1616. Henry B. Wheatly, London, Past and Present (Detroit, 1968), 1:116-7.

⁴Chamberlain to Carleton, 31 October 1617, London; LJC, 2:108-10. Harrison and Brent to Carleton, 30 October 1617, London; Sir Gerard Herbert to Carleton, 4 November 1617, London; Dr. George Carleton to Carleton, 28 November 1617, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 491, 493, 500. Buckingham to Carleton, 31 October 1617, Whitehall; Carleton, Letters, 193.

Chamberlain, who corresponded for nearly another decade with Sir Dudley Carleton, later Viscount Dorchester, leaving an invaluable record for historians, often sadly recalled his departed friend. Chamberlain remained a close friend of the Winwood family and spent many pleasant days at Ditton. Upon his death in 1628 he bequeathed to Lady Winwood a silver basin and ewre worth £30.⁵

Winwood died before completing his will. When he expected to travel to Scotland he began to draw one up, but he put it off after the council requested him to remain in London in July. However, the King was benevolent towards the family. Lady Winwood was granted administration of her husband's estate as well as the wardship of their eldest son, Richard. Each of Winwood's five children received a generous portion: Richard inherited Ditton and other lands in Buckinghamshire reputedly worth £1500 a year; the second son, Frederick, received land in Norfolk which sold for £6000; Henry, the youngest, had property in Essex worth £4000; and Winwood's two daughters, Anne and Elizabeth, were each given £4000. The Secretary had died in his fifty-fourth year, evidently quite well-to-do.⁶

⁵Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 February and 14 March 1618, 6 February, 15 July, 10 and 23 August, and 11 September 1621, 10 August 1622, 26 July 1623, London; "The Will of John Chamberlain;" LJC, 2:138, 148-9, 209-10, 252-3, 256-7, 259-60, 262, 286, 325, 511, 633. Notestein, Four Worthies, 41n.

⁶Chamberlain to Carleton, 31 October 1617, London: LJC, 2:109.

Lady Winwood continued to live at St. Bartholomew's and at Ditton until her death in September 1659. She was buried in the chapel, along with her husband and daughter Elizabeth, who outlived Sir Ralph by less than a year. Richard Winwood grew prosperous and secured for himself a small niche in English politics. During the Civil War he fought in the Parliamentary armies against Charles I. After the Restoration he served in the House of Commons and died in 1688. The inscription on his tomb erroneously reads that his father was principal Secretary of State to Charles I. In 1633 Winwood's daughter Anne married Edward, later second Baron of Montagu. She died in 1642. Her son, Ralph, was born at St. Bartholomew's in 1638. He served as Charles II's ambassador to Louis XIV and was later created first Duke of Montagu.⁷

In 1617, as in 1612, numerous courtiers competed for the secretaryship even before the office fell vacant. Five

⁷G. E. C., Complete Peerage, 5:342-3 and nf. Moore, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, 2:301. Chamberlain to Carleton, 13 August 1618, London; LJC, 2:165. John Hase to Lady Winwood, 5 June 1630 and 10 September 1632, Bawdswell; Richard Feueryere to Lady Winwood, 28 October 1633, Foxley; Edward Bagshaw to Lord Montagu, 20 August 1635; Edward Montagu to Lord Montagu, 20 February 1639, Ditton; HMC Buccleugh, 1:279; 3:349, 366-7, 374. Lady Winwood to Lord Montagu, 13 February 1633, 5 and 25 July, 4 and 5 August [1648?], Ditton; S. Ball to [Edward] Montagu, 20 October 1642, Ditton; Richard Winwood to Lord Montagu, 26 April [before 1684]; HMC Beaulieu, 117, 158-9, 161-4, 186-7. Page, Buckinghamshire, 4:92, 98. Christopher Hill, The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution (Oxford, 1965), 154.

and a half years had changed nothing. Among the hopefuls were several familiar supplicants--Lake, Wotton, and Edmondess--as well as a few new faces, including Carleton, Naunton, Sir John Bennet, and Sir Humphrey May. Lake was the strongest contender. By mid-November he had obtained Winwood's diet and lodgings at court, along with his warrant for secret service funds. The competitors all sought the favor of Buckingham, whom Carleton aptly styled "the principal verb." Promises of large sums of money were made. Lord Houghton offered as much as £10,000--ironically the amount he had paid for his title. But once again, as in 1612, the King proclaimed that he was never better served than when he was his own secretary and entrusted the seals to Buckingham. Within two months James transferred the responsibilities to Sir Robert Naunton. Naunton was related to the favorite and may also have been a cousin of the late Secretary. He shared Sir Ralph's ultra-Protestantism but was much more easily manipulated than his predecessor. The replacement of Winwood by the weaker-willed Naunton was particularly detrimental to Raleigh, who returned in June 1618 only to find his most zealous supporter gone.⁸

⁸Chamberlain to Carleton, 31 October, 8 and 29 November 1617, and 10 January 1618, London; LJC, 2:109-10, 113, 119, 128-9. Carleton to Chamberlain, 8 November 1617, The Hague; DC to JC, 247-9 and n5-6. Sherburn to Carleton,

Raleigh's bereavement was genuine. Twice before he had lost friends in high places with the deaths of Queen Elizabeth in 1603 and Prince Henry in 1612. The loss of Winwood was disastrous for him. Upon his return to England, Raleigh was arrested and examined by a special commission appointed to question him about the Orinoco fiasco. The commissioners pressed Raleigh closely about his responsibility and, at one point, he in desperation shifted the blame to his supporters, particularly the late Secretary. Raleigh's revelations were ignored at the time, since Winwood's "traitorous" role in the Guiana expedition was well-known. After Raleigh's execution in October, the King, to shield himself against the great public outcry, published a declaration which explained Raleigh's crimes and implicated other Englishmen. Winwood

28 October and 7 November 1617, and 4 January 1618, York House; Rudyard to Carleton, 28 October 1617, Hanworth; Harrison to Carleton, 29 October 1617, London; Savile to Carleton, 29 October 1617, Eton; Brent to Carleton, 30 October and 14 November 1617, London; Williams to Carleton, 31 October 1617, Whitehall; Cecil to Carleton, 31 October 1617, London; Thomas Murry to Carleton, 2 November 1617, St. James's; Carleton to Chamberlain, 3 November 1617, The Hague; Privy Seal Warrant, 6 November 1617, Westminster; Vere to Carleton, 20 November and [November] 1617, London and Thistleworth; Sir Edward Harwood to Carleton, 5, 22 and 27 December 1617, and 7 January 1618, London; CSPD, 1611-1618, 490-8, 501-2, 504, 511-2. Pory to Carleton, [8 November 1617]; William S. Powell, John Pory, 1572-1630 (Chapel Hill, 1977), microfiche supplement, 34. APC, 1617-1619, 6. Dale to Carleton, 6 November 1617; Brown, Genesis of America, 871. Brown, First Republic, 264, gives Naunton's appointment as 18 January. Edwards, Raleigh, 1:614-5. Gardiner, 3:100-1. Wilson, Privy Councillors, 18.

was mentioned four times in connection with efforts to promote the voyage against the King's better judgment. Early in the pamphlet he was linked directly with the "myth" of the gold mines: "This proposition of [Raleigh's], was presented and recommended to his Majestie by Sir Ralph Winwood, then secretary of state, as a matter not in the aire, or speculative, but reall, and of certainte." Statements such as these indicate the King's frustration and anger over Raleigh's failure and prompted Gardiner's conjecture that had Winwood lived until the summer of 1618, he would doubtless have shared Raleigh's fate on the scaffold.⁹

The death of Raleigh brought Winwood's remaining influence over Jacobean policies to a close. Coke soon fell out of royal favor, the negotiations for the Spanish marriage continued apace, and Bacon remained Lord Keeper until his impeachment for corruption in 1621. Nevertheless, Winwood's shadow lingered on the scene for a few more years. Late in 1617 Bacon found it expedient to cast slurs on the character of the late Secretary by

⁹Edwards, Raleigh, 1:614-5. Harlow, Raleigh's Last Voyage, 279. Somers Tracts, 2:438-51. A Declaration of the Carriage of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, as well in His Voyage, as in, and sithence His Return; And of the True Motives and Inducements which Occasioned His Majestie to Proceed in doing Justice upon Him, as Hath Been Done (New York, 1970), 2-3, 5-6. Hill, Intellectual Origins, 154. Gardiner, 3:144-5. Evans, Secretary of State, 71, n3.

declaring that "yf you trusted to him you trusted to a rotten reede who wold have failed you in the end."

Chamberlain was among the many who resented Bacon's unnecessary slanders; but he realized that such talk was to be expected of the Lord Keeper, for "a live dog hath the vantage of a dead lion." His characterization of Sir Ralph is touching but inaccurate. It did, however, reflect the deep feelings which Winwood occasionally inspired in those who knew him well. The King had altogether different memories of his late Secretary. In 1620, when James was being pressed to terminate the Spanish marriage and send an expedition to Bohemia to aid his son-in-law, the Palsgrave, he complained to Gondomar that "he was surrounded by three hundred Winwoods." Such a simple epitaph was not undeserved by the boistrous Secretary.¹⁰

¹⁰Chamberlain to Carleton, 20 December 1617, London; LJC, 2:123. Statham, Jacobean Letter-Writer, 168. Willson, King James VI and I, 413.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CALENDARS OF THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, East Indies, China, and Japan, 1513-1616, Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, and Elsewhere. Ed. W. Noel Sainsbury. Rpt. 1862; Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1964.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1598-1601, with Addenda, 1547-1565; Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office. 2 vols. Ed. Mary Anne Everett Green. Rpt. 1869-1870; Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1967.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, 1603-1618; Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. 2 vols. Ed. Mary Anne Everett Green. Rpt. 1857-1858; Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1967.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, Addenda, 1580-1625; Preserved by Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Ed. Mary Anne Everett Green. Rpt. 1872; Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1967.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Arrairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, 1607-1619. 5 vols. Ed. Horatio F. Brown and Allen B. Hinds. Rpt. 1904-1909; Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1970.

Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office: Elizabeth I, 1558-1572. 5 vols. London: His/Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1939-1966.

REPORTS OF THE HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K. P., Preserved at Kilkenny Castle. ns. 8 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1902-1920.

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, K. G., &c., &c., &c., Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. 23 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1883-1973.

Eighth Report of the Royal Commission of Historical Manuscripts. Report and Appendix (Part I). London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1881.

The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, G. C. B., Preserved at Belvoir Castle. 4 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1888-1905.

The Manuscripts of Lincoln, Bury St. Edmund's, and Great Grimsby Corporations; and of the Deans and Chapters of Worcester and Lichfield, &c. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1895.

The Manuscripts of the Earl of Westmorland, Captain Stewart, Lord Stafford, Lord Muncaster, and Others. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1885.

The Manuscripts of the Hon. Frederick Lindley Wood; M. L. S. Celments, Esq.; S. Philip Unwin, Esq. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1913.

The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1678-1690. 2 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1887-1889.

The Manuscripts of the Marquess Townshend. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1887.

The Manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde, Preserved at the Castle, Kilkenny. 2 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1895-1899.

Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, K. G., Preserved at Welbeck Abby. 10 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1891-1931.

Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu of Beaulieu. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1900.

Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, K. G., K. T., Preserved at Montagu House, Whitehall. 3 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1899-1926.

Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq., of the Manor House, Ashby de la Zouch.
4 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1928-1947.

Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire, Preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berks. 4 vols.
London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1924-1940.

Report on the Manuscripts of the Right Honourable Viscount De L'Isle, V. C., Preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent.
6 vols. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1925-1966.

Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Eglinton, Sir J. Stirling Maxwell, Bart., C. S. H. Drummond Moray, Esq., C. G. Weston Underwood, Esq., and G. Wingfield Digby, Esq. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1885.

Supplementary Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Montagu Bertie, Twelfth Earl of Lindsey, Formerly Preserved at Uffington House, Stamford, Lincolnshire, A. D. 1660-1702. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1942.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

Adair, E. R. The Exterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1929.

_____. "The Privy Council Registers," English Historical Review, 30 (October 1915), 698-704.

_____. "The Rough Copies of the Privy Council Registers," English Historical Review, 38 (July 1923), 410-22.

_____. The Sources for the History of the Council in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: SPCK, 1924.

Aikin, Lucy. Memoirs of the Court of King James the First. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822.

Akrigg, G. P. V. Jacobean Pageant: Or, The Court of James I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

- Amos, Andrew. The Great Oyer of Poisoning: The Trial of the Earl of Somerset for the Poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury, in the Tower of London, and Various Other Matters Connected Therewith, from Contemporary Manuscripts. London: Richard Bentley, 1846.
- Anthony, Irvin. Raleigh and His World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Arber, Edward, ed. Travels and Works of Captain John Smith, President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England, 1580-1631. 2 vols. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1910.
- Ashley, Maurice. Life in Stuart England. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1964.
- _____. The Stuarts in Love; With Some Reflections on Love and Marriage in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- Ashton, Robert. The Crown and the Money Market, 1603-1640. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- _____. "Deficit Finance in the Reign of James I," Economic History Review, 2nd. ser., 10, 1 (1957), 15-29.
- _____, ed. James I by His Contemporaries; An Account of His Career and Character as Seen by Some of His Contemporaries. London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1969.
- Bachrach, A. G. H. "Some Dutch Contacts with the Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth Century," Bodleian Library Record, 4, 3 (December 1952), 149-60.
- Bakeless, John. The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe. 2 vols. Rpt. 1942; Hamden: Archon Books, 1964.
- Baker, Nina B. Sir Walter Raleigh. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1950.
- Bald, R. C. John Donne: A Life. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.

- Barnes, Thomas G., comp. and ed. List and Index to the Proceedings in Star Chamber for the Reign of James I (1603-1625) in the Public Record Office, London, Class STAC 8. 3 vols. Chicago: American Bar Foundation, 1975.
- Bevan, Bryan. The Real Francis Bacon. London: Centaur Press, 1960.
- Bindoff, S. T. "The Stuarts and Their Style," English Historical Review, 60, 237 (May 1945), 192-216.
- Biographia Britannica: Or, The Lives of the Most Eminent Persons Who Have Flourished in Great Britain and Ireland, from the Earliest Ages, down to the Present Times; Collected from the Best Authorities, both Printed and Manuscript, and Digested in the Manner of Mr. Bayle's Historical and Critical Dictionary. 6 vols. Rpt. 1747-1766; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1969.
- Birch, Thomas. The Court and Times of James the First; Illustrated by Authentic and Confidential Letters, from Various Public and Private Collections. [Ed. R. G. Williams]. 2 vols. Rpt. 1849; New York: AMS Press, 1973.
- _____. An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the Year 1592 to 1617. London: A. Miller, 1749.
- _____. The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I; Compiled Chiefly from His Own Papers, and Other Manuscripts, Never Before Published. London: A. Miller, 1760.
- Black, J. B. Elizabeth and Henry IV; Being a Short Study in Anglo-French Relations, 1589-1603. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914.
- Block, Petrus J. History of the People of the Netherlands. 5 vols. Trans. Ruth Putnam. Rpt. 1898-1912; New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Boas, Frederick S. Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Bowen, Catherine Drinker. Francis Bacon: The Temper of a Man. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

- Bowen, Catherine Drinker. The Lion and the Throne: The Life and Times of Sir Edward Coke (1552-1634). Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1957.
- Brightwell, Peter. "The Spanish System and the Twelve Years' Truce," English Historical Review, 89, 351 (April 1974), 270-92.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker. The Life of Marlowe and the Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage. Rpt. 1930; New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1966.
- Brown, Alexander. The First Republic in America; An Account of this Nation, Written from the Records Then (1624) Concealed by the Council, Rather than from the Histories then Licensed by the Crown. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1898.
- _____. The Genesis of the United States; A Narrative of the Movement in England, 1605-1616, which Resulted in the Plantation of North America by Englishmen, Disclosing the Contest between England and Spain for the Possession of the Soil Now Occupied by the United States of America. 2 vols. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1891.
- Brown, Michael J. Itinerant Ambassador: The Life of Sir Thomas Roe. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1970.
- Bruce, John, ed. Letters and Papers of the Verney Family, down to the End of the Year 1639. Printed from the Original Manuscripts in the Possession of Sir Harry Verney, Bart. Rpt. 1853; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.
- Brydges, Sir Egerton. Collin's Peerage of England: Genealogical, Biographical, and Historical. Greatly Augmented, and Continued to the Present Time. Rpt. 1812; New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970.
- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare. "The Foundations of the Elizabethan Language," Shakespeare Survey, 17 (1965), 223-39.
- Cabala, Sive Scrinia Sacra: Mysteries of State and Government, in Letters of Illustrious Persons, and Great Ministers of State, as Well Foreign as Domestick, in the Reigns of King Henry the Eighth, Queen Elizabeth, King James, and King Charles. 3rd ed. London, 1691.

- Carleton, Dudley. Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, Knt., during his Embassy in Holland, from January 1615/6, to December 1620. London, 1757.
- Carlyle, E. I. "Committees of Council under the Earlier Stuarts," English Historical Review, 21, 84 (October 1906), 673-85.
- Carter, A. T. "Council and Star Chamber," Law Quarterly Review, 18 (1902), 247-54.
- Carter, Charles H., ed. From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation; Essays in Honour of Garrett Mattingly. London: Jonathan Cape, 1966.
- _____. "Gondomar: Ambassador to James I," Historical Journal, 7, 2 (1964), 189-208.
- _____. The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Cecil Algernon. A Life of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury. Rpt. 1915; Westport: Greenwood Press, 1971.
- Chalmers, Alexander, ed. The General Biographical Dictionary; Containing an Historical and Critical Account of the Lives and Writings of the Most Eminent Persons in Every Nation; Particularly the British and Irish. 32 vols. Rev. ed. Rpt. 1817; New York: AMS Press, Inc., and Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.
- Chudoba, Bohdan. Spain and the Empire, 1519-1643. Rpt. 1952; New York: Octagon Books, 1969.
- Clark, G. N. "Grotius's East India Mission to England," Transactions of the Grotius Society, 20 (1935), 45-84.
- _____, and W. J. M. van Eysinga. The Colonial Conferences between England and the Netherlands in 1613 and 1615. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1940-1951.
- [Cobbett, William, ed.] Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the Year 1803. 36 vols. Rpt. 1806-1820; New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966.

Coke, Roger. A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns, and the Inter-Regnum. Consisting of Private Memoirs and Reflections, and an Appendix, Discovering the Present State of the Nation. 2 vols. in 1. 2nd ed. London, 1696.

Collier, J. Payne. The Egerton Papers; A Collection of Public and Private Documents, Chiefly Illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I; From the Original Manuscripts, the Property of the Right Hon. Lord Francis Egerton, M. P., President of the Camden Society. Rpt. 1840; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.

Cooper, J. P. "The Fall of the Stuart Monarchy," The New Cambridge Modern History, 4:531-84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

_____, ed. Wentworth Papers, 1597-1628. London: Royal Historical Society, 1973.

The Creation of Baronets, London, 1611. Amsterdam and New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.

Crowther, J. G. Francis Bacon: The First Statesman of Science. London: Cresset Press, 1960.

Cunningham, Peter, ed. Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court, in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I, from the Original Office Books of the Masters and Yeomen. London: Shakespeare Society, 1842.

Dasent, J. R., et. al., eds. Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1542-1628. 43 vols. Rpt. 1890-1947; Washington: Microcard Editions, Inc., 1963.

Davies, Godfrey. "The Character of James VI and I," Huntington Library Quarterly, 5, 1 (October 1939), 33-63.

_____. The Early Stuarts, 1603-1640. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Dawson, John P. "Coke and Ellesmere Disinterred: The Attack on the Chancery in 1616," Illinois Law Review, 36 (1941-1942), 127-52.

- A Declaration of the Demeanor and Cariage of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, as well in His Voyage, as in, and Sithence His Returne; And of the True Motives and Inducements Which Occasioned His Majestic to Proceed in Doing Justice upon Him, as Hath Bene Done. Rpt. 1618; New York: Da Capo Press, 1970.
- Deford, Miriam Allen. The Overbury Affair: The Murder Trial that Rocked the Court of King James I. Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1960.
- Devereux, Walter B. Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646. 2 vols. London: J. Murray, 1853.
- Devon, Frederick. Issues of the Exchequer; Being Payments Made out of his Majesty's Revenue during the Reign of King James I. Extracted from the Original Records Belonging to the Ancient Pell Office, in the Custody of the Right Honourable Sir John Newport, Bart., Comptroller-General of His Majesty's Exchequer. London: John Rodwell, 1846.
- Dickerman, Edmund H. "Henry IV and the Juliers-Cleves Crisis: The Psychohistorical Aspects," French Historical Studies, 8, 4 (Fall 1974), 626-53.
- Dietz, Frederick C. English Public Finance, 1558-1641. Rpt. 1932; London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd., 1964.
- _____. "The Receipts and Issues of the Exchequer during the Reigns of James I and Charles I," Smith College Studies in History, 13, 4 (July 1928), 117-71.
- Edmundson, George. Anglo-Dutch Rivalry during the First Half of the Seventeenth Century; Being the Ford Lectures Delivered at Oxford in 1910. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Edwards, Edward. The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh; Based on Contemporary Documents Preserved in the Rolls House, the Privy Council Office, Hatfield House, and Other Manuscript Repositories, British and Foreign. Together with His Letters; Now First Collected. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1868.
- Eerde, Katherine S. van. "The Creation of the Baronetage in England," Huntington Library Quarterly, 22, 4 (August, 1959), 313-22.

- Eerde, Katherine S. van. "The Jacobean Baronets: An Issue Between King and Parliament," Journal of Modern History, 33, 2 (June 1961), 137-47.
- Egerton, J. E. "King James's Beasts," History Today, 12, 6 (June 1962), 405-15, 445.
- Erlanger, Philippe. George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Trans. Lionel Smith-Gordon. London: Hodderand Stoughton, 1953.
- Evans, F. M. G. "Emoluments of the Principal Secretaries of State in the Seventeenth Century," English Historical Review, 35, 140 (October 1920), 513-28.
- _____. The Principal Secretary of State; A Survey of the Office from 1558 to 1680. Manchester: University Press, 1923.
- Farnham, Edith. "The Somerset Election of 1614," English Historical Review, 46, 184 (October 1931), 579-99.
- Finett, Sir John. Finetti Philoxenis: Som Choice Observations of Sr. John Finett, Knight, and Master of Ceremonies to the Two Last Kings. Touching the Reception, and Precedence, the Treatment and Audience, the Puntillios and Contests of Forren Ambassadors in England. London, 1656.
- Firth, C. H., and S. C. Lomas, comps. Notes on the Diplomatic Relations of England and France, 1603-1688; Lists of Ambassadors from England to France and from France to England. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1906.
- Fisher, F. F., ed. Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England in Honour of R. H. Tawney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Foster, Elizabeth Read. "The Painful Labour of Mr. Elsyng," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, ns, 62, 8 (1972).
- _____. Proceedings in Parliament 1610. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966.

- Foster, Joseph, ed. Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714; Their Parentage, Birthplace, and Year of Birth, with a Record of Their Degrees. Being the Matriculation Register of the University. 4 vols. in 2. Rpt.; Nendeln: Kraus Reprinted Limited, 1968.
- [Frankland, Thomas]. The Annals of King James and King Charles the First, Both of Happy Memory. Containing a Faithful History, and Impartial Account of the Great Affairs of State, and Transactions of Parliaments in England, from the Tenth of King James, M. DC. XII. to the Eighteenth of King Charles, M. DC. XL. II. Wherein Several Material Passages, Relating to the Late Civil Wars, Committed in Former Histories, Are Made Known. London, 1681.
- Friis, Astrid. Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade: The Commercial Policy of England in Its Main Aspects, 1603-1625. Trans. A. Fausboll. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- Fuller, Thomas. The History of the Worthies of England. Ed. P. Austin Nuttall. 3 vols. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.
- G. E. C., ed. Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct, or Dormant. Alphabetically Arranged. 8 vols. London: G. Bell, 1887-1898.
- Gairdner, James, and James Spedding. Studies in English History. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1881.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. "Britain Under James I," The Cambridge Modern History, 3:549-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- _____, ed. "The Earl of Bristol's Defence of His Negotiations in Spain," The Camden Miscellany, 6. Rpt. 1871; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1978.
- _____. History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols. Rpt. 1884; New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965.
- _____, ed. and trans. Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty. Rpt. 1869; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.

- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. "On Certain Letters of Diego Sarmiento de Acuna, Count of Gondomar, Giving an Account of the Affair of the Earl of Somerset, with Remarks on the Career of Somerset as a Public Man," Archaeologia, 41, 1 (1867), 151-65.
- Geyl, Pieter. The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century, 1609-1648. 2nd ed. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1966.
- _____. The Revolt of the Netherlands, 1555-1609. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1970.
- Gibbs, Philip. King's Favorite: The Love Story of Robert Carr and Lady Essex. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, nd.
- Gibson, S. "An Interior," Bodleian Library Record, 1, 8 (February 1940), 132-9.
- Goodman, Godfrey. The Court of King James the First. Ed. John S. Brewer. 2 vols. in 1. London: R. Bentley, 1839.
- Gough, Charles E. The Life and Characters of Sir Thomas Overbury. Norwich: East of England Printing Works, 1909.
- Hailes, Sir David Dalrymple, Lord. Letters and Memorials Relating to the History of Britain in the Reign of James the First. Published from the Originals. Glasgow, 1762.
- Halliwell, James O., ed. The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the Reigns of James I and Charles I. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.
- Handover, P. M. Arabella Stuart: Royal Lady of Hardwick and Cousin to King James. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1957.
- _____. The Second Cecil: The Rise to Power, 1563-1604, of Sir Robert Cecil, later First Earl of Salisbury. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1959.
- Hardy, B. C. Arabella Stuart: A Biography. London: Constable & Company, Ltd., 1913.

- Harlow, V. T. Raleigh's Last Voyage; Being an Account drawn out of Contemporary Letters and Relations, both Spanish and English, of Which the Most Part Are Now for the First Time Made Public, Concerning the Voyage of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, to Guiana in the Year 1617 and the Fatal Consequences of the Same. Rpt., 1932; New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.
- Harris, Bernard. "A Portrait of a Moor," Shakespeare Survey, 11 (1969), 89-97.
- Harrison, G. B. The Elizabethan Journals; Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked about during the Years 1591-1603; Comprising: An Elizabethan Journal, 1591-4; A Second Elizabethan Journal, 1595-8; A Last Elizabethan Journal, 1599-1603. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1939.
- _____. A Jacobean Journal; Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of during the Years 1603-1606. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1946.
- _____, ed. The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.
- _____. A Second Jacobean Journal; Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of during the Years 1607-1610. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.
- Havran, Martain J. Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington. London: Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1973.
- Hawks, Francis L., ed. Appletons' Cyclopedia of Biography: Embracing a Series of Original Memoirs of the Most Distinguished Persons of All Times. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1856.
- Hayden, J. Michael. "Continuity in the France of Henry IV and Louis XIII: French Foreign Policy, 1598-1615," Journal of Modern History, 45, 1 (March 1973), 1-23.
- _____. "Deputies and Qualities: The Estates General of 1614," French Historical Studies, 3, 4 (Fall 1964), 507-24.
- Henderson, T. F. James I and VI. London: Goupil & Co., 1904.

- Hill, Christopher. Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1974.
- _____. "The Commons," Past and Present, 18 (November 1960), 111-2.
- _____. Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- _____. The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- _____. Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Hinton, R. K. "Government and Liberty under James I," Cambridge Historical Journal, 11, 1 (1953), 48-64.
- Hirst, Derek. "Elections and Privileges of the House of Commons in the Early Seventeenth Century: Confrontation of Compromise?" Historical Journal, 18, 4 (December 1975), 851-62.
- _____. The Representative of the People?: Voters and Voting in England under the Early Stuarts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Holles, John. Letters of John Holles, 1587-1637, Vol. 1. Nottingham: Thoroton Society, 1975.
- Holmes, Martain. "Shakespeare's London," History Today, 14, 2 (February 1964), 88-97, 146.
- Houston, S. J. James I. London: Longman Group Limited, 1973.
- Howat, G. M. D. Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1974.
- Howell, Thomas B. Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. 33 vols. Rpt. 1809-1826; Washington: Microcard Editions, 1971.

Hulme, Harold. "The Sheriff as a Member of the House of Commons from Elizabeth to Cromwell," Journal of Modern History, 1, 3 (September 1929), 361-77.

_____. "The Winning of Freedom of Speech in the House of Commons," American Historical Review, 61, 4 (July 1956), 825-53.

Hume, Martain A. S. Sir Walter Raleigh: The British Dominion of the West. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.

Hurstfield, Joel. Freedom, Corruption and Government in Elizabethan England. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

_____. "Political Corruption in Modern England: The Historian's Problem," History, 52, 174 (February 1967), 16-34.

_____. "The Political Morality of Early Stuart Statesmen," History, 56, 187 (June 1971), 235-43.

_____. "The Politics of Corruption in Shakespeare's England," Shakespeare Survey, 28 (1975), 15-28.

Irwin, Margaret. That Great Lucifer: A Portrait of Sir Walter Raleigh. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1960.

Jacobs, Joseph, ed. Familiar Letters; Or, Epistolae Ho-Eliauae, by James Howell. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1903.

Jesse, John H. Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts, including the Protectorate. 4 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1840.

Johnson, Cuthbert William. The Life of Sir Edward Coke, Lord Chief Justice of England in the Reign of James I; With Memoirs of His Contemporaries. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1845.

Johnson, Robert C. "The Lotteries of the Virginia Company, 1612-1621," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 74, 3 (July 1966), 258-92.

_____. "The 'Running Lotteries' of the Virginia Company," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 68, 2 (April 1960), 156-65.

- Jones, Howard Vallance. "The Journal of Levinus Munck," English Historical Review, 68, 267 (April 1953), 234-58.
- Jones, J. R. Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1966.
- Jones, T. I. Jeffreys. Exchequer Proceedings Concerning Wales in Tempore James I: Abstracts of Bills and Answers and Inventory of Further Proceedings. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.
- Journals of the House of Commons, from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2nd 1628, in the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First. Rpt. 1803; Readex Microprint Edition, nd.
- Judson, Margaret A. The Crisis of the Constitution: An Essay in Constitutional and Political Thought in England, 1603-1645. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.
- Kempe, Alfred John, ed. The Loseley Manuscripts; Manuscripts and Other Rare Documents, Illustrative of Some of the More Minute Particulars of English History, Biography, and Manners, from the Reign of Henry VIII. to That of James I., Preserved in the Muniment Room of James More Molyneux, esq., at Loseley House, in Surry. London: J. Murray, 1836.
- Kenny, Robert W. "Parliamentary Influence of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1536-1624," Journal of Modern History, 39, 3 (September 1967), 215-32.
- Kent, Joan R. "Attitudes of Members of the House of Commons to the Regulation of 'Personal Conduct' in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 46, 113 (May 1973), 41-71.
- Kingsbury, Susan M., ed. The Records of the Virginia Company of London; The Court Book, from the Manuscript in the Library of Congress. 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906.
- Knafla, Louis A. Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

- Lacey, Robert. Sir Walter Raleigh. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973.
- Langer, William L., ed. An Encyclopedia of World History; Ancient, Medieval, and Modern; Chronologically Arranged. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Le Comte, Edward. The Notorious Lady Essex. New York: Dial Press, Inc., 1969.
- Lee, Maurice, Jr., ed. Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972.
- _____. "The Jacobean Diplomatic Service," American Historical Review, 72, 4 (July 1967), 1264-82.
- _____. James I and Henri IV: An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603-1610. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- _____. "James VI's Government of Scotland after 1603," Scottish Historical Review, 55, 1 (April 1976), 41-53.
- Lefuse, M. The Life and Times of Arabella Stuart. London: Mills and Boon, Limited, 1913.
- Lloyd, David. State-Worthies; Or, the Statesmen and Favorites of England since the Reformation; Their Prudence and Policies, Successes and Miscarriages, Advancements and Falls; During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles I. 2nd ed. London, 1670.
- Lodge, Edmund. Life of Sir Julius Caesar, Knt. London: John Hatchard and Son, 1827.
- Lomas, S. C. "The State Papers of the Early Stuarts and the Interregnum," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, ns, 16 (1902), 97-132.
- [Longueville, Thomas]. The Curious Case of Lady Purbeck; A Scandal of the XVIIth Century. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
- Loomie, Albert J. "A Crypto-Catholic: Lord Wotton," The Catholic Historical Review, 53, 3 (October 1967), 328-45.

- Loomie, Albert J. "King James I's Catholic Consort," Huntington Library Quarterly, 34, 4 (August 1971), 303-16.
- Lyon, F. H. Diego de Sarmiento de Acuna, Conde de Gondomar; The Lothian Historical Essay for 1909. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1910.
- Lyon, Hastings, and Herman Block. Edward Coke: Oracle of the Law. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929.
- Magnus, Philip. Sir Walter Raleigh. New York: Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Mallett, Charles E. A History of the University of Oxford. 3 vols. Rpt. 1924-1927; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968.
- Maltby, William S. The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660. Durham: Duke University Press, 1971.
- Marston, Jerrilyn Greene. "Gentry Honor and Royalism in Early Stuart England," Journal of British Studies, 13, 1 (November 1973), 21-43.
- Mathew, David. The Jacobean Age. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1971.
- _____. James I. University: University of Alabama Press, 1968.
- Matter, Joseph Allen. My Lords and Lady of Essex: Their State Trials. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1969.
- Mattingly, Garrett. Renaissance Diplomacy. London: Jonathan Cape, 1955.
- Mayes, Charles R. "The Early Stuarts and the Irish Peerage," English Historical Review, 73, 287 (April 1958), 227-51.
- _____. "The Sale of Peerages in Early Stuart England," Journal of Modern History, 29, 1 (March 1957), 21-37.
- Maclean, John, ed. Letters from George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mongul, 1615-1617. Rpt. 1860; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.

- McClure, Norman Egbert, ed. The Letters of John Chamberlain. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.
- McElwee, William. The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1952.
- _____. The Wisest Fool in Christendom: The Reign of King James I and VI. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958.
- McGowan, A. P., ed. The Jacobean Commissions of Enquiry, 1608 and 1618. London: The Navy Records Society, 1971.
- MacRay, William Dunn, ed. A Register of the Members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, from the Foundation of the College. New Series. 8 vols. London: H. Frowde, 1894-1915.
- Mitchell, Williams M. The Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the English House of Commons. Rpt. 1957; Westport: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- Moir, Thomas L. The Addled Parliament of 1614. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Molyneux, James More. "Message from King James I. to the Earl of Somerset, in the Case of Sir Thomas Overbury, Sent on the 29th of December, 1615, Through Sir George More, Lieutenant of the Tower," Archaeologia, 41, 1 (1867), 75-8.
- Moore, Norman. The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. 2 vols. London: C. Arthur Pearson Limited, 1918.
- Mossiker, Frances. Pocahontas: The Life and the Legend. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- Motley, John L. History of the United Netherlands from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce--1609. 4 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1861-1863.
- Neale, J. E. "The Diplomatic Envoy," History, ns, 13 (October 1928), 204-18.
- Neill, Edward D. History of the Virginia Company of London, with Letters to and from the First Colony, Never before Printed. Rpt. 1869; New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

- Nichols, John. The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. Among Which Are Interspaced Other Solemnities. Public Expenditures, and Remarkable Events during the Reign of that Illustrious Princess. Collected from Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, &c., &c.; Illustrated with Historical Notes. 3 vols. New ed. London, 1823.
- _____. The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court; Collected from Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, &c., &c. Illustrated with Notes, Historical, Topographical, Biographical, and Bibliographical. 4 vols. London: J. B. Nichols, 1828.
- Notestein, Wallace. Four Worthies: John Chamberlain, Anne Clifford, John Taylor, Oliver Heywood. London: Jonathan Cape, 1956.
- _____. The House of Commons, 1604-1610. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- _____. "The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons," Proceedings of the British Academy, 11 (1924-1925), 125-75.
- _____. F. H. Relf, and H. Simpson, eds. Commons Debates 1621, 7 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- O'Brien, Terence H. "The London Livery Companies and the Virginia Company," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 68, 2 (April 1960), 137-55.
- Oldys, William, and Thomas Park, eds. The Harleian Miscellany: A Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts, as well in Manuscript as in Print. Selected from the Library of Edward Harley, Second Earl of Oxford. Interspaced with Historical, Political, and Critical Annotations. 10 vols. Rpt. 1808-1813; New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965.
- Osborn, Louise B. The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Page, William, ed. The Victoria History of the County of Buckingham, vols. 3-4. Rpt. 1925-1927; London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1969.

_____, and P. H. Ditchfield, eds. The Victoria History of the County of Berkshire, vols. 2-3. Rpt. 1907-1923; Folk-Stone and London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1972.

Parker, John. Van Meteren's Virginia, 1607-1612. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Parry, Edward A. The Overbury Mystery: A Chronicle of Fact and Drama of the Law. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1925.

Peachan, Henrie. A Most True Relation of the Affaires of Cleves and Gulick, as also of all what hath passed this last Summer, since the Most Excellent and Victorious Prince, Maurice of Nassau, tooke the Field with his armie, encamping before Rees in Cleveland: and the loss of Wesel, taken by the Marques Spinola: unto the breaking up of our Armie in the beginning of December last past, 1614. With the Articles of the Peace, propounded at Santen. Rpt. 1615; Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1973.

Peck, Linda L. "Problems in Jacobean Administration: Was Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, a Reformer?," Historical Journal, 19, 4 (December 1976), 831-58.

Plumb, J. H. "The Growth of the Electorate in England from 1600 to 1715," Past and Present, 45 (November 1969), 90-116.

Plummer, Charles, ed. Elizabethan Oxford; Reprints of Rare Tracts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887.

Powell, William S. John Pory, 1572-1636: Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.

Power, D'Arcy. "Sir Thomas Bodley's London House," Bodleian Quarterly Review, 8, 90 (1935-1937), 203-5.

Prestwich, Menna. Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

- Rabb, Theodore K. Enterprise and Empire: Merchants and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- _____. "Investment in English Overseas Enterprise, 1575-1630," Economic History Review, 2nd ser., 19, 1 (April 1966), 70-81.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh, Kt., Now First Collected: To Which Are Prefixed the Lives of the Author by Oldys and Birch. 8 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1829.
- Ranke, Leopold von. A History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century. 6 vols. Rpt. 1875; New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- Rebholz, Ronald A. The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Reinmuth, Howard S., Jr., ed. Early Stuart Studies: Essays in Honor of David Harris Willson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970.
- Reliquiae Bodleianae: Or Some Genuine Remains of Sir Thomas Bodley. Containing His Life, the First Draught of the Statutes of the Publick Library at Oxford, (in English) and a Collection of Letters to Dr. James, &c. Published from the Originals in the Said Library. London: John Hartley, 1703.
- Rex, Millicent Barton. University Representation in England, 1604-1690. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1954.
- Riddell, Edwin, ed. Lives of the Stuart Age, 1603-1714. London: Osprey Publishing Limited, 1976.
- Rimbault, Edward F., ed. The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury, Kt., Now First Collected. London: John Russell Smith, 1856.
- Roberts, Clayton. The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Rowen, Herbert H., ed. The Low Countries in Early Modern Times. New York: Walker and Company, 1972.

- Rowse, A. L. Raleigh and the Throckmortons. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1962.
- Russell, Conrad. "Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604-1629," History, 61, 201 (February 1976), 1-27.
- Sams, Conway W. The Conquest of Virginia: The First Attempt; Being an Account of Sir Walter Raleigh's Colony on Roanoke Island, Based on Original Records, and Incidents in the Life of Raleigh, 1584-1602. Norfolk: Keyser-Doherty Printing Corporation, 1924.
- Sawyer, Edmund, ed. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (chiefly) from the Original Papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood, Knt., Sometime One of the Principal Secretaries of State. 3 vols. Rpt. 1725; New York: AMS Press, 1972.
- Schepper, Hugo de, and Geoffrey Parker. "The Formation of Government Policy in the Catholic Netherlands under 'the Archdukes,' 1596-1621," English Historical Review, 91, 359 (April 1976), 241-54.
- Schochet, Gordon J. "Patriarchalism, Politics and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England," History Journal, 12, 3 (1969), 413-41.
- Scott, James C. Comparative Political Corruption. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Scott, Otto J. James I. New York: Mason/Charter, 1976.
- Scott, Walter, ed. A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts, on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects: But Chiefly Such as Relate to the History and Constitution of These Kingdoms. Selected from an Infinite Number in Print and Manuscript, in the Royal, Cotton, Sion, and Other Public, as well as Private, Libraries; Particularly that of the Late Lord Somers. 2nd ed. 13 vols. Rpt. 1809-1815; New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965.
- [_____, ed.]. Secret History of the Court of James I. 2 vols. Edinburgh: James Ballantyne and Co., 1811.
- Seddon, P. R. "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset," Renaissance and Modern Studies, 14 (1970), 48-68.

- Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life and Manners of His Age. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916.
- Shriver, Frederick. "Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair," English Historical Review, 85, 336 (July 1970), 449-74.
- Sims, Catherine S. "'Policies in Parliaments': An Early Seventeenth-Century Tractate on House of Commons Procedure," Huntington Library Quarterly, 15, 1 (November 1951), 45-58.
- Sinclair, G. A. "The Scottish Progress of James VI," Scottish Historical Review, 10, 37 (October 1912), 21-8.
- Smith, Alan G. R., ed. The Reign of James VI and I. London: Macmillan Press, 1973.
- _____. "The Secretariats of the Cecils, circa 1580-1612." English Historical Review, 83, 328 (July, 1968), 481-504.
- Smith, Bradford. Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953.
- Smith, John. The General Historie of Virginia, New England and the Summer Isles, Together with the True Travels, Adventures and Observations, and a Sea Grammar. 2 vols. Rpt. 1907; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1972.
- Smith, Logan Pearsall. The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Spedding, James. "Review of the Evidence Respecting the Conduct of King James I in the Case of Sir Thomas Overbury," Archaeologia, 41, 1 (1867), 79-115.
- _____, Robert L. Ellis, and Douglas D. Heath, eds. The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord Chancellor of England. 14 vols. Rpt. 1858-74; Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1963.
- Statham, Edward Phillips. A Jacobean Letter-Writer: The Life and Times of John Chamberlain. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., [1920].
- Stebbing, William. Sir Walter Raleigh: A Biography. Rpt. 1889; New York: Lemma Publishing Corporation, 1972.

- Stephan, Sir Leslie, and Sir Sidney Lee, eds. The Dictionary of National Biography; From the Earliest Times to 1900. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922.
- Steuart, A. Francis. "The Scottish 'Nation' at the University of Padua," Scottish Historical Review, 3, 9 (October 1905), 53-62.
- Stock, Leo Francis, ed. Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments Respecting North America, 1542-1688. Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1924.
- Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- _____. "The Inflation of Honours, 1558-1641," Past and Present, 14 (November 1958), 45-70.
- Stow, John. A Survey of London, Written in the Year 1598. New ed. Ed. William J. Thomas. London: Chatto & Windus, 1876.
- Stoye, J. W. "An Early Letter from John Chamberlain," English Historical Review, 62, 245 (October 1947), 522-32.
- Supple, B. E. Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642; A Study in the Instability of a Merchantile Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Swart, K. W. Sale of Offices in the Seventeenth Century. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1949.
- Tanner, J. R. English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century, 1603-1689. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Tawney, R. H. Business and Politics Under James I: Lionel Cranfield as Merchant and Minister. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Tex, Jan den. Oldenbarnevelt. 2 vols. Trans. R. B. Powell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Thirsk, Joan, and J. P. Cooper, eds. Seventeenth-Century Economic Documents. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Thomas, J. Universal Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography and Mythology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1883.

- Thompson, Elizabeth McClure, ed. The Chamberlain Letters: A Selection of the Letters of John Chamberlain Concerning Life in England from 1597 to 1626. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.
- Thomson, Alexander. "John Holles," Journal of Modern History, 8, 2 (June 1936), 145-72.
- Thomson, [K. B.] The Life and Times of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. From Original and Authentic Sources. 3 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1860.
- Trevor-Roper, H. R. Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1963.
- _____. "Five Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley," Bodleian Library Record, 2, 23 (May 1945), 134-9.
- _____. "King James and His Bishops," History Today, 5, 9 (September 1955), 571-81, 654.
- Turner, Edward R. The Privy Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1603-1784. 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1927-1928.
- Waite, P. B. "The Struggle of Prerogative and Common Law in the Reign of James I," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 25 (May 1959), 144-53.
- Wallace, Willard M. Sir Walter Raleigh. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Watts, S. J. and Susan J. From Border to Middle Shire: Northumberland, 1586-1625. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1975.
- Weaver, F. J. "Anglo-French Diplomatic Relations, 1558-1603," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 4 (1926-1927), 73-86; 5 (1927-1928), 13-22; 6 (1928-1929), 1-9; 7 (1929-1930), 13-26.
- Webster's Biographical Dictionary: A Dictionary of Noteworthy Persons with Pronunciations and Concise Biographies. 1st ed. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1953.
- Welsby, Paul A. George Abbot: The Unwanted Archbishop, 1562-1633. London: SPCK, 1962.

- Welsby, Paul A. Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Wheatley, Henry B. London, Past and Present; A Dictionary of Its History, Associations, and Traditions. 3 vols. Rpt. 1891; Detroit: Singing Tree Press, 1968.
- Wheeler, G. W., ed. Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, First Keeper of the Bodleian Library. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- White, Beatrice. Cast of Ravens: The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury. New York: George Braziller, 1965.
- Wiener, Carol Z. "The Beleagured Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," Past and Present, 51 (May 1971), 27-62.
- Wilkinson, Henry. The Adventurers of Bermuda: A History of the Island from Its Discovery until the Dissolution of the Somers Island Company in 1684. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Williams, Charles. James I. London: Arthur Baker Ltd., 1951.
- Williams, Ethel Carleton. Anne of Denmark, Wife of James VI of Scotland: James I of England. London: Longman Group Limited, 1970.
- Williams, Norman Lloyd. Sir Walter Raleigh. Rpt. 1962; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965.
- Williams, Sarah, ed. Letters Written by John Chamberlain during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Rpt. 1861; New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.
- Williamson, Hugh Ross. George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham: Study for a Biography. London: Duckworth, 1940.
- Willson, David Harris. James VI and I. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1956.
- _____. The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629. Rpt. 1940; New York: Octagon Books, 1971.

- Willson, David Harris. "Summoning and Dissolving Parliaments, 1603-25: The Council's Advice to James I," American Historical Review, 45, 2 (January 1940), 279-300.
- Wilson, Charles. England's Apprenticeship, 1603-1763. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- _____. Queen Elizabeth and the Revolt of the Netherlands. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Winton, John. Sir Walter Raleigh. New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1975.
- Wood, Anthony. Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford, from the Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh, A. D. 1500, to the Author's Death in November 1695. Representing the Birth, Fortune, Preferment, and Death of All Those Authors and Prelates, the Great Accidents of Their Lives, and the Fate and Character of Their Writings. To Which are Added, The Fasti, or Annals, of the Said University. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Rpt. 1821; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970.
- Woodward, John. "The Monument to Sir Thomas Bodley in Merton College Chapel," Bodleian Library Record, 5, 2 (October 1954), 69-73.
- Woolrych, Humphry W. The Life of the Right Honourable Sir Edward Coke, Knt., Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, &c. Rpt. 1826; South Hackensack: Rothman Reprints Inc., 1972.
- Wormuth, Francis D. The Royal Prerogative, 1603-1649: A Study in English Political and Constitutional Ideas. Rpt. 1939; Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1972.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

JACOBAN SECRETARY:
THE POLITICAL CAREER OF SIR RALPH WINWOOD
(1563-1617)

by

Charles Maffitt McAllister

(ABSTRACT)

Sir Ralph Winwood was a Jacobean politician who served the crown in several major capacities. Educated at Oxford, he was the English diplomatic agent at Paris and The Hague for fifteen years before his appointment as principal Secretary of State in 1614. His short tenure in office could not be described as successful, except in a personal sense, for although the post enabled him to die wealthy and well-respected, he made no concerted effort to stay the erosion of early Stuart government. Proud, arrogant, and conceited are terms which aptly characterize the man; but his sincere protestantism and hatred of Spain more clearly reflected the temper of his age than the vascillations of James I.

Except for a brief article in the Dictionary of National Biography little of consequence has been written about Winwood's life. This study attempts to focus on his political career, particularly between 1612 and 1617, and to analyze Winwood's role in the development of early seventeenth-century English government and administration.