Archbishop William Laud and the Early Stuart Church, 1633–1645

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from Keele University

by
Joseph Thomas Newall

Department of History – Keele University

March 2023

Rest thou then happy in the Sweets of Bliss,

Th'Elyzian, the Christian[']s Paradise,

Exempt from Worldly Cares, secure from Fears,

And let us have thy Prayers, as thou our Tears.[1]

[1] P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus, or, The History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1668), p. 547.

Abstract

Archbishop William Laud has attracted the historical attention of scholars ever since the seventeenth century, but no work has tried yet in any detail to assess his relationships with the major figures of the English court and administration. This thesis represents a close analysis of the religious policy and ecclesiastical practice of the early Stuart church under Laud between 1633 and 1645. Neither the close political partnership between Wentworth and Laud nor the nature of their lively friendship has been sufficiently scrutinized. In chapter two, a closer look at their joint harassment of the earl of Cork is used to familiarise ourselves with a systematic campaign to wage war on an important nobleman. Chapter three, meanwhile, reviews the so–called crypto–papists (Cottington, Weston and Windebanke) at court and their collective manoeuvres to bolster and strengthen their positions. Chapter four, finally, presents a new interpretation of William Prynne's trial in 1633–4 as an extraordinary insight into Laud's attitude to Puritan nonconformity. An archbishop who did not enjoy the full commitment (and confidence) of the king could not afford to strictly attach himself to a single group or even an individual, however. Vilified by many generations and yet canonized later by a particular type of Anglican, Laud's life was marked by so many contradictions that it renders it almost impossible to give a duly fair assessment of him. A biography is a complicated, though not impossible, task.

<u>Table of Contents</u>

Acknowledgements

Godfrey Davies, a historian of the seventeenth century, once wrote in a review of Hugh Trevor–Roper's magisterial account of *Archbishop Laud* that 'it raises the question whether some community of interest and sympathy is not necessary between a biographer and his subject, in order to produce a great biography.'[2] I must confess that I began this postgraduate study unsmitten with Laud and remain so to the present day, but this does not mean that he was not a formidable figure, an extraordinary man who 'deserves to rank among the greatest archbishops of Canterbury since the Reformation.'[3] I should also warn the unsuspecting reader that this work was neither conceived nor executed as a biography, but rather as a dense series of interconnected chapters about the Caroline court and Church. Indeed, it is a study of the nature of Laud's power through close and detailed surveys of his relations with prominent figures of the early Stuart era. All imperfections, errors both of fact and interpretation, remain my own. Beside the crimes and the many follies, however, can be set Laud's individual heroism, full endurance and creative achievement.

Although a historian always has his or her first – and most important – dialogue with the sources, it is through conversation and correspondence with other scholars that we refine and reformulate the very questions that we ask. I have benefited enormously from the advice and sometimes material of David Cressy, Kenneth Fincham and Fiona Pogson. I have met with each of them – sometimes on more than one occasion – and have garnered much from their invaluable criticism. Much of this dissertation, however, rests on original research and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the archives and libraries, too many to name, which I visited during my tenure as a postgraduate

[2] G. Davies, [Review of H.R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645*], *EHR*, 57 (1942), p. 383: 'this is not a great biography.

[3] N. Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), p. 51: 'Indeed one is hard pressed to think of others in the same league, save the obvious Thomas Cranmer.'

student. There is simply no substitute for going back to the original documents and sources.

My first influence to record is Roger Greaves, whose peerless teaching of twentieth–century history during my GCSE years – and dramatic re–enactments of armed combat during the First World War ('the Great War') – were truly second to none. His infectious enthusiasm and encouragement, above all else, inspired me to study History. I trace the origin/s of my desire to pursue scholarship to him, who was an avid reader and keenly critical student of early twentieth–century history. My second debt of gratitude is owed to Dr George Southcombe, whose knowledge, generosity and care knows no bounds. He has generated more of my ideas than I dare to admit and is responsible for my deep interest in early seventeenth–century religion. I first became fascinated with Laud(ianism) back in 2014 when I wrote a dissertation on Laud's sermons of the 1620s. I was an undergraduate at St Catherine's College, Univ. of Oxford, then. It was George who first introduced me to the archbishop. He cannot, however, be held responsible for the interpretation/s advanced half a decade later here, although his generous approach to the past remains thoroughly influential.

A grateful thanks must be reserved for my supervisors, Ian Atherton and Ann Hughes, who have been so kind and warm in their support for this dissertation. Their diligent attention and invariably thought–provoking comments have been extraordinary. Both of them never doubted its completion, despite complications with my health. Saving me from fits of despair as the submission date loomed large, they have offered unrivalled levels of advice and encouragement. Their expertise is unparalleled, whether in terms of suggestions, proof–reading or even simply encouragement at important stages. They have both read late drafts, offering numerous comments and particular criticisms, contributing to the refinement and exposition of the argument, the shortcomings of which remain all my own. I would as well like to thank Dr Alexandra Gajda for her support during my stay at Jesus College, Oxford during my Masters year. A special thanks must also be saved for the librarian of Worcester College, Oxford, Mark Bainbridge, who undertook many a tremendous effort for my perusal of Clarke MS 71, and Oliver House, a specialist at the Bodleian library, Oxford. I would like to extend my thanks to all of the staff of the Institute of Historical Research (IHR) for their efforts as well. I would, too, like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research

Council (AHRC) for funding my research; without which, it would never have been possible to complete my doctorate. I have separated Laud's relationships into chapters and hopefully aided the cause of clarity in the process. One remark is necessary about the vocabulary of this dissertation, however: I employ the terms 'Calvinist' and 'Reformed' interchangeably, though their meanings vary according to the immediate context. The terms will be used interchangeably in this dissertation merely as convenient labels for a complex and by no means homogenous tradition. This is in full awareness of the semantic traps that they can often set for the unwary. The assistance of many groups, including 'the Religious History of Britain, 1500–1800' seminar at the IHR in London at which I delivered a paper in December 2018, has been nothing short of brilliant. I have benefited from the advice – as well as the criticism – offered on each occasion, especially the deep scrutiny under which my paper on Wentworth was subjected by, in particular, Professors Fincham and Tyacke at the IHR. For ease of reference, I have written words as they appear on the page or folio, which includes 'with' and 'which' with the 'i' or 'hi/c' sometimes omitted. Indeed, one has found Lord Deputy Wentworth's use of 'himself' and 'himselfe' frustrating, among much else, often spelling the reflexive pronoun differently in the very same letter![4] It need hardly be added that any sins of commission and omission are the author's alone.

Last, but by no means least, I must also express my thanks to my lovely parents for their caring attention and countless trips to the railway station: Alsager, Congleton, Crewe and Kidsgrove, to name just a few. I am more grateful to them than I can say. My mother, especially, has done so with few, if any, complaints and her sacrificial affection and support throughout have been utterly unwavering. She has supported my academic obsession for years. The period in which I underwent chemotherapy – twenty–six doses over 2017, 2019 and 2021 – provided memories, if not always pleasant but surely life–affirming. It is something that one will never understand until experienced; it is a club in which one does not wish to be a member, but it arrives unexpected and defines the remaining duration of life. I apologise for all the stress and sanctimony it duly caused. I can remember nothing but encouragement for my interest

[4] See, e.g., WWM, Str P 5/162: Thomas Wentworth to John Coke, 16 Dec. 1634. He complained about 'all such Libertines as himselfe [Piers Crosby]', but a few sentences earlier he speaks of a feeling of mutiny 'ariseing from an overweaning in himself' [Crosby]. See also for the same rule: WWM, Str P 3/95: same to Charles I, 26 May 1634.

in a discipline so impractical as History. Their unreserved encouragement has managed to keep me relatively sane throughout the entire process of researching and writing this thesis. My ultimate gratitude goes to my parents and close family. On a much happier note, I have thoroughly enjoyed the warm and ever–so peaceful climate of postgraduate study. There is nowhere I'd rather be than in a silent library, surrounded, as it were, by books, journals and microfilm – only the brief and occasional murmur or cough. It could only be improved by the wise counsel, advice and guidance of my co–supervisors, but my deep thanks here for my parents is a poor return, indeed, for all the help they gave me throughout. I dedicate this thesis to them with much love and gratitude.

I have sought to appraise the work and career of Archbishop Laud (1633–1645) from the perspective of an impartial historian, not a curious theologian. I recognise the myriad of boundaries to knowledge that exist in academia at the present day, but also accept the merits of cross–disciplinary endeavours. Laud did not exist in a rarefied atmosphere of philosophical speculation; he was a man of practical politics. I hereby present the results of my labours for six years. My chief concern has been *not* to fly in the face of scholarly tradition represented by such eminent historians as Patrick Collinson and Nicholas Tyacke, but to test it by the touchstone of seventeenth–century evidence and to gather from contemporary sources the available data regarding the archbishop. A biography is long overdue. Though dissertations bear the names of their authors, they are nurtured and cared for by many before they see the light of day. In the pursuit of my task, I have received aid and counsel from various bodies and individuals, all of which and whom, at least one hopes, have received a bare mention above. The lack of mention of so many others does not in any way evidence a lack of gratitude.

A *very* special note of thanks and acknowledgement of debt is recorded in the preface.

Abbreviations

Additional Add.

British Library, London BL

Bodleian Library, Oxford Bodl.

Braye BRY

Circa c.

Cheshire Archives and Local Studies CALS

Compare Cf.

Chapter ch.

Chapters chs

Calendar of State Papers Domestic CSPD

Calendar of State Papers Ireland CSPI

Calendar of State Papers Venetian CSPV

Cambridge University Library, Cambridge CUL

Deposited Dep.

Diocesan DIOC

Deposit Leicester–Warren of Tabley DLT

Deposit Shakerley of Somerford DSS

The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Dispatches, ed. W. Knowler (2 vols, 1739) *Earl of Strafforde's Letters*

Ecclesiastical Diocesan Administration EDA

Ecclesiastical Diocesan Consistory Court EDC

For example e.g.

English History Eng. Hist.

English Poetry Eng. Poetry

Essex Record Office ERO

Et cetera etc.

Folio fo.

Folios fos

Harleian Harl.

Historical Journal *HJ*

Huntington Library Quarterly *HLQ*

Historical Manuscripts Commission *HMC*

Journal of Ecclesiastical History *JEH*

Kent History and Library Centre KHLC

Knyvett–Wilson Family Collection KNY

The Further Correspondence of William Laud, ed. K. Fincham (Woodbridge, 2018) Laud, *Corresp.*

The Works of ... William Laud, eds W. Scott and J. Bliss (7 vols, Oxford, 1847–60) Laud, *Works*

Lambeth Palace Library, London LPL

Manuscript MS

Manuscripts MSS

National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London NRS, V&A Museum

No date n.d.

Number no.

National Records of Scotland, Gifts & Deposits NRS, GD

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography *ODNB*

To be found throughout the text *passim*

Pages pp.

Part pt.

Rawlinson Rawl.

Erroneous *sic.*

Staffordshire Record Office SRO

Trinity College, Dublin TCD

The National Archives, State Papers TNA SP

University Archives UA

University Univ.

University College London UCL

Volumes Vols

West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds WYAS

Sheffield City Archives, Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Strafford Paper/s WWM, Str P/s

Unless otherwise stated, the place of publication is London. The original spelling of all quotations has been retained. Dates are also given according to the Julian calendar and the pre–modern year, starting on the 25 March, e.g. Laud was executed on 10 Jan. 1644–5. In all transcripts of manuscript material, standard abbreviations have been extended and modernized and the use of ‘i’ and ‘j’ standardised.

To my Mum, Dad and Sister,

Karen, Paul and Sophie,

With the greatest affection

xxx

Introduction: 'The Bishop will aspire to be absolute in Church Affaires'[5]

'Among the most controversial appointments in the history of the British church', there has been surprisingly little disagreement about William Laud's defining characteristics.[6] 'Overworked, fussy, unimaginative and outspoken,'[7] Archbishop Laud was apparently a recluse who shaped his own ecclesiastical policies with administrative flair and efficiency,[8] not intellectual prowess.[9] He has been criticised for 'undeviating universal pedantry',[10] intolerance[11] and even 'authoritarianism',[12] but has been duly praised for possessing attributes 'of irreproachable life, of unquestionable learning, and of daring courage'.[13] The rare works that attempt to query parts of this entrenched consensus are either dismissed or distorted. Alan Cromartie's recent picture is an instructive case in point: here is an understated apologetic, a portrait of the archbishop as he himself would have chosen to be painted[14] – 'Laud's views were in no way

---

[5] 'I doe beleeve it, but in truth … no further': WWM, Str P 3/58: Wentworth to Francis Cottington, 7 Feb. 1633–4.

[6] L. James, ''I Was No "Master of this Work" But a Servant to it'? William Laud, Charles I and the Making of Scottish Ecclesiastical Policy, 1634–6', *Historical Research*, 90 (2017), p. 506. See also H.R. Trevor–Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (1987), p. 40: 'the most controversial Primate in the history of the English Church.' He is presented as a man unable to withstand the forces of nascent capitalism.

[7] C. Hibbert, *Charles I* (2001), p. 141. Michael Questier also describes the archbishop as overly 'fussy': idem, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', *HJ*, 49 (2006), p. 53.

[8] L.M. Hill, 'County Government in Caroline England 1625–1640', in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (1973), p. 77: 'Laud was a very demon for detailed administration.'

[9] J. Sears McGee, 'William Laud and the Outward Face of Religion', in R.L. DeMolen (ed.), *Leaders of the Reformation* (1984), p. 322: 'a brusque, businesslike administrator, not an intellectual or a theologian.' See T. Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–1643* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 205 ('an administrator with a strong practical programme rather than any sort of theologian') and H.R. Trevor–Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645* (1965), pp. 6–7: 'We must therefore regard Laud here not as a theologian who must stand or fall by the accuracy of his theological opinions, but as a politician whose material was English society in the early seventeenth century.' See also L.J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 202: Laud was 'an ambitious clerical administrator'. See as well D. Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603–1658* (1986), p. 165. See, too, M. Hawkins, 'The Government: Its Role and its Aims', in Russell (ed.), *Origins*, p. 61: 'Laud had the simplicity of the academic but none of the deviousness of the cleric.' See also C.H. and K. George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570–1640* (Princeton, 1961), p. 206: 'He was a politician, the last of the great ecclesiastical statesmen in England.'

[10] H.R. Trevor–Roper, 'The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century', in T. Aston (ed.), *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660* (1965), p. 95. See also idem, *Laud*, p. 304: 'Laud's lack of political imagination'.

[11] C. Cross, *Church and People, 1450–1660: The Triumph of the Laity in the English Church* (1976), p. 174.

[12] B. Worden, *The English Civil Wars, 1640–1660* (2009), p. 24. See H. Hulme, 'Charles I and the Constitution', in W.A. Aiken *et al.* (eds), *Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein* (1960), p. 111: 'a dictator of the worst sort'. See also W. Hutton, *William Laud* (1895), p. 32: 'the religious policy of Charles was practically dictated by Laud.'

[13] J. Bruce, 'Biographical Fragment', in *Documents Relating to the Proceedings Against William Prynne, in 1634 and 1637*, ed. S.R. Gardiner (Camden Soc., vol. 18, 1877), p. xvi. He was never a favourite, though he closely conformed to the *parvenu* stereotype (being of modest origins at Reading). He belonged to that 'capacious category of the political prelate', that is, both an over–mighty subject and low–born evil counsellor, a figure bent on arrogating, even monopolizing, power to and for himself. According to some studies, a tyrant in temperament: L. Brockliss, 'The Anatomy of the Minister–Favourite', in J.H. Elliott *et al.* (eds), *The World of the Favourite* (1999), p. 281.

[14] Mark Kishlansky, a revisionist *par excellence*, considers the essay 'sparkling' (idem, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *Renaissance Quarterly*, 65 (2012), p. 969), a collision with the field's collective wisdom as he writes that 'only Alan Cromartie meets the challenge head on'.

exceptional'.[15] Nevertheless, apart from a few overtly critical reviews,[16] the work has largely been neglected in much scholarship. This dissertation reassesses the evidence, finding Laud to be far more radical and uncompromising a theologian than this recent exercise in hyper–revisionism implies.[17] It has long been presumed, however, that he was a moderate Calvinist at St John's College, Oxford before experiencing a somewhat gradual reversal of opinion during which he was elevated to St David's[18] – an account which contradicts Edward Dering's contemporary depiction of Laud as 'un–mov'd, unchanged' throughout his life.[19] He was charged with popery – '*If they do at any time*

---

[15] A. Cromartie, 'The Mind of William Laud', in G. Burgess *et al.* (eds), *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited* (Aldershot, 2011), p. 86: 'they seem to have fallen within a broadly acceptable spectrum.'
[16] K. Fincham, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *EHR*, 128 (2013), pp. 684–6, at p. 686. See also N. Tyacke, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *JEH*, 64 (2013), 187–9, at pp. 188–9, which criticises the neglect of Laud's time in the Tower of London (1641–5), when Laud fiercely attacked, *inter alia*, Calvinist teaching on predestination and perseverance.
[17] Cf. Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 76: 'he was never truly isolated and his ideas were never marginal.' Cromartie, with Nicholas Tyacke, accepts Laud as a '*theologian*' unlike the view expressed in n. 8: ibid., p. 99 and Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 57. Cf. 'I shall try to look at Laud first as a man of ideas, then as a man of action, seeking to realize those ideas': H.R. Trevor–Roper, *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (1992), p. 133. We should not assume, however, that his ideas were fully matured or developed by the time of his ordination in 1601, twenty years before his first bishopric. It would be wrong to attach too much significance to his early career. While Julian Davies, Kevin Sharpe and Peter White invite us to view events through Laud's own eyes (and/or testimony at his trial), Cromartie has attempted to revivify the argument with greater intellectual ballast, portraying the archbishop as an industrious, if somewhat idiosyncratic, defender of 'the Jacobean norm': Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 89 ('he was never truly isolated and his ideas were never marginal': ibid., p. 76). However, this hyper–revisionist model raises rudimentary interpretative questions. Should we assume Laud's terms of debate to be uncontested and unchanging? And is our understanding of the archbishop best served by his own account? Cromartie's approach, alluding to the 'popular reception' of Laud's views but ostentatiously avoiding direct engagement with it, means that some of his most provocative opinions, including a determinedly hostile interpretation of the Lambeth Articles, the canons of Dort and the privileges of Parliament, can be dismissed or distorted at will: ibid., p. 99. Cromartie's distaste for the anachronisms of academic debate – especially the 'two–party model' – might have carried greater force had he resisted the temptation to guide the reader's gaze in the direction of posterity, closing with the suggestion that 'Laud stood for cultural tendencies that were to dominate the long–term future': ibid., pp. 75 and 99. This impulse to interpret Laud's actions according to criteria yet to be invented – a defiant image of the archbishop defending the order of episcopacy in a manner propitious to its revival at the dawn of the Restoration – owes much to a triumphalist tradition in which the *zeitgeist* of Anglicanism attends Laud and his bishops like some sort of guardian angel.
[18] Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 58: 'there is evidence that he himself went through a Calvinist phase.' See also Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 84: 'Laud's successive divinity theses [at St John's College, Oxford] suggest an aggressive defender of basically acceptable positions'. However, a quick scan of Peter Heylyn's *Cyprianus Anglicus* may expose a very different picture. The early career of Laud was forever halted by the hostile minds of both Robert and George Abbot. In 1614, Laud was denounced from the pulpit by Robert Abbot as a cunning papist '*in the Points of Free Will, Justification, Concupiscence being a Sin after Baptism, Inherent Righteousness, and certainty of Salvation*': Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 67. George Abbot's influence at court was also used consistently to block Laud's career path and Laud was forced to rely almost entirely on the support of Bishop Richard Neile: ibid., pp. 53–68. See also ibid., p. 54: according to Heylyn, Abbot persecuted Laud at Oxford in the winter of 1606 branding him 'for a *Papist*, or at least very *Popishly* enclined, that it was almost made an *Heresie* (as I have heard from his owne mouth) for anyone to be seen in his company, and a *misprision* of *Heresie* to give him a civil Salutation as he walked the Streets.' In 1611, Abbot tried to prevent Laud's bid to become 'the *President* of St. *John's* Colledge' by telling the Chancellor of the Univ. that Laud was '*at the least a* Papist *in heart*'. These remarks reached the king and it was Bishop Richard Neile who persuaded James to discount and ultimately disregard them: ibid., pp. 60–1. See also C. Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (1987), p. 39: 'Laud was a theologian of no mean worth.' *Cyprianus Anglicus* posits an uninterrupted denominational ethos from Elizabethan times. Laud's appointment as a royal chaplain came in 1611, the same year in which King James I had Abbot appointed to Canterbury and settled the presidency of St John's College, Oxford in Laud's favour.
[19] 'He was alway[s] one and the same man, begin with him at *Oxford*, and so goe on to *Canterbury* … he never complied with the times, but kept his own stand, untill the times came up to him': E. Dering, *A Collection of Speeches*

speak against the Papists, *they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it*'[20] – and he considered 'how much of a Papist might bee brought in without Popery'.[21] This adverse verdict has been repudiated by a number of contemporaries as well as historians,[22] though the papacy held hopes, perhaps misguidedly, of his conversion.[23] The Venetian ambassador observed in 1637 that although Laud '*is pronounced by the generality to be the protector of the Catholic party ... the well informed know that his aims are very different*'.[24] Richard Smith, vicar apostolic of the Roman Catholic church in England, however, rated Laud quite highly, above all of his 'predecessors, for so many great and magnanimous exployts hitherto achi[e]ved to the admiration of the Christian world'.[25] The Oxford Tractarian movement, spearheaded by John Henry Newman,[26] re–valued the archbishop as a heroic figure, 'cast in a mould of proportions that are much above our own'.[27] He had enhanced the dignity of the cloth and entertained partially the correct Catholic doctrine of the Mass. The partisan strife between the Whigs and the Oxford Movement induced extremes.[28] Newman valorised the archbishop as a figure

---

... in Matter of Religion (1642), p. 5. Peter Heylyn retraces Laud's family history, finding his mother was sister to a former Mayor of London: 'He was not born therefore of such *Poor and ... obscure Parents*, as the Publisher of his *Breviat*[e] [William Prynne] makes him': idem, *Cyprianus*, p. 46. Laud wrote next to Prynne's disparaging remarks upon his infancy, 'All this if true is no fault of mine': Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 9r. See, however, W.M. Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (1969), p. 85: 'the zeal with which he [Dering] proceeded against Laud was a false index to his opinions.'

[20] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 67.

[21] L.C. Falkland, *A Speech Made to the House of Commons Concerning Episcopac*y (1641), p. 7. Viscount Falkland depicted the clergy as 'so absolutely[,] directly and cordially Papist': ibid.

[22] K. Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (1992), p. 285: 'a charge completely without foundation.' See also E. Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars* (8 vols, Oxford, 1826), i, p. 165 ('for want of another name, they had called him [Laud] a papist, which nobody believed him to be') and BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 42r: 'certainly had he been a Papist he would not have staid any longer here.'

[23] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 201. For papal hopes, see ibid., iii, p. 219.

[24] *CSPV, 1636–9*, p. 217. However, he does state unequivocally that 'the Catholics are no longer hated or persecuted with the old severity': ibid. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 100: 'the Church were exercised on the one side by the *Puritan* Faction, so were they no less troubled and disquieted by the *Popish* Party on the other.'

[25] *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–1638: Catholicism and the Politics of the Personal Rule*, ed. M.C. Questier (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 252–4, at p. 254: Richard Smith to Laud, 15/25 Apr. 1635.

[26] There are distinct similarities between both men besides their rampant hatred of Puritanism: they endeavoured to restore to their order the kind of influence it had maintained in the middle ages over the souls and consciences of men. While Laud recorded his dreams as prognostications of the future, Newman remarked 'that it would be a gain to the country were it vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion than at present it shows itself to be': idem, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of his Religious Opinions* (1875), p. 46. Both men were also determinedly set against that spirit of inquiry into the foundations of belief that the Reformation had introduced (i.e. liberalism). Laud tendered his resignation as chancellor to the university in mid–1641, having 'acquainted the King by my L[or]d. of London [Juxon], that I would resign': Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 242.
'I have found so much love from the University that I could not make myselfe willing to leave it': *The True Copie of a Letter* (1641), p. 2.

[27] F.W. Faber, 'Preface' in *The Autobiography of Dr. William Laud* (Oxford, 1839), p. xxvii. See also TNA, C 115/105/8158: John Flower to Viscount Scudamore, 21 Sept. 1633: the 'ArchB[isho]p of Canterburie was translated at Lambeth' a few weeks after being appointed in Aug. 1633.

[28] To avoid any repetition, I assume familiarity in what follows with the ideological positions which I call simply 'Whig' and the 'Oxford Movement'.

who sought to reverse the economic consequences of the Reformation, ‘that little active wheele’, as D’Ewes recorded, ‘that sett all the rest on worke by his active motion.’[29] The infamy which Laud achieved in the final decade and a half of his life contrasts with his relative obscurity in the years before then. Despite the best efforts of such distinguished historians as Kenneth Fincham almost nothing is known of Laud’s family background or of his early career.[30] This provides the overriding impetus to focus on Laud as a strategic courtier and politician rather than his theology *per se*. Laud was a complex character, indeed, whose reputation among contemporaries varied dramatically almost from the beginning of his episcopal tenure of St David’s in 1621.

The ecclesiastical past remains ‘one of the dark corners of the historical terrain’,[31] but it has been illuminated in recent years by, *inter alios*, Nicholas Tyacke, Peter Lake and Anthony Milton.[32] That the ascendancy of William Laud marked the triumph of an active ‘Arminian’ faction within the church,[33] committed to an anti–predestinarian theology of grace and intent on destroying the Calvinism that had previously enjoyed control, is a popular interpretation which has become widely endorsed, if not embraced wholesale.[34] Insisting upon a sacrament–centred style of piety, Laudianism emerged as

---

[29] BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 259r (25 Feb. 1640–1). When the archbishop during his primacy made a further determined endeavour to restore the pre–Reformation system of tithes, to recover impropriations and to increase the power of the sacred courts against the temporal in matters relating to tithes, he was defeated by a combination of political opposition, episcopal wavering, and finally of armed Scottish intervention.

[30] There has been much *ex post facto* scholarly speculation about Laud’s sexuality. See especially the remarks of D. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided, 1490–1700* (2004), p. 517, for his ‘erotic dreams’ and ‘homosexual leanings’.

[31] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 275. See also P. Collinson, ‘The Elizabethan Church and the New Religion’, in C. Haigh (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (1984), p. 175: ‘The task of the religious historian of England between the Elizabethan Settlement and the Civil War is thus one of daunting complexity’.

[32] To cite a few important examples, N. Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (Oxford, 1987); P. Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge: ‘Orthodoxy’, ‘Heterodoxy’ and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester, 2001); and A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 1995). Anthony Milton, especially, has looked at predestination’s relationship with other doctrinal *loci*. Kenneth Fincham alternatively shows how the differences between differing groups were not determined by concerns over predestination *per se* but were also over views on, *inter alia*, preaching, sacraments and conformity. While Calvinists believed the first – the ultimate and foremost – duty of a bishop was to be a preaching pastor, anti–Calvinists believed a bishop was a noble custodian of order. See further K. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990), esp. ch. 8. Fincham’s argument ought to be placed alongside Collinson’s emphasis of the tranquility and stability of the church under Abbot’s archiepiscopate, though: idem, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford, 1982), esp. pp. 89–90 and 283. The bishops had an increasing prominence in the royal counsels after 1603, along with the importance of their parliamentary role and their capacity for independent political action: ibid., pp. 58–66.

[33] One of Tyacke’s conclusions, that ‘Arminians … transformed the issue of Protestant nonconformity’ has bewilderingly large implications for the study of Ireland in the 1630s. See idem, *Anti–Calvinists*, p. 246 and ch. 1. In many ways, they were portrayed as the intellectual insurgents of the seventeenth century.

[34] Geoffrey Elton once praised Tyacke’s chapter for ‘its outstanding importance and essential rightness’: idem, [Review of C.S.R Russell’s *Origins of the English Civil War*], *HJ*, 17 (1974), p. 215. He is rightly regarded as the pioneer of the revisionist interpretation. This work supersedes all previous studies of the subject. See D.D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982), p. 220, n. 2: D.D. Wallace, Jr., is ‘in the strongest possible agreement with his [Tyacke’s] conclusions…’ Critics, however,

a radical departure from the prevailing theological paradigm whereby 'England in the early seventeenth century was doctrinally a part of Calvinist Europe'[35] – the placement and railing in of the altar, kneeling at the rail during communion and the usage of religious ornaments, such as candles and crucifixes,[36] evoked the Catholic Mass and, to many eyes and ears, marked a step on the path back to popery.[37] The archbishop has, since and now, been described as a 'little Pope',[38] but has not received enough scrutiny from students – the 'ism' to which he inspired many clerical and lay generations remains 'a more serious anomaly of historical scholarship in recent years'.[39] The archbishop has too often been dismissed as being 'hardly above mediocrity',[40] 'rash, irritable, [and] quick to feel for his own dignity'.[41] Even Hamon L'Estrange, a man not given to judicious understatement, said he was 'a learned, pious and morally a good man, but too full of fire … his zeal to order, that carried him thus far, transported him a little too far.'[42] David Hume could, in fact, 'shed a generous tear for the fate of Charles I and … Strafford',[43] but there was little lachrymosity over Laud. For Anglo–Catholic theologians, writing over a hundred years ago, Laud was a man to revere, admire and worship, a figure of diverse talents who by some divine intuition foresaw his church's

---

include P. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, 1992), p. xiii: 'the model of a polarity between Calvinist and Arminian is here rejected'.

35 N. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter–Revolution', in Russell (ed.), *Origins*, p. 129. See p. 119: 'religion became an issue … due primarily to the rise … of Arminianism'. The dethroning of Scripture and the restoration of idolatry created an awful scenario for Puritans.

36 LPL, MS 943, p. 475: Bishop of Bath and Wells, William Piers, who by Mar. 1633–4 had drawn up a schedule of 'Reasons why the communion table in every church should be sett close under the East[–]Window or Wall with the ends north & south and be railed in.'

37 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 40r: the seventh article of fourteen presented at Laud's trial read, 'He altered the true Religion established[,] set up Popery, urged new Ceremonies, and punished Refusers.' See also Lincolnshire Archives, DIOC Vj 30, fo. 182r: 'for a certificate of a com[un]ion table … [during a visitation of] 1638'. Laudianism represented a more wholesale approach to the renovation of the Church rather than simply opposing particular aspects of Calvinism. See also R. Clifton, 'Fear of Popery', in Russell (ed.), *Origins*, p. 152: Laudianism was 'a step on the road to Catholicism'. Margaret Stieg's close study of the diocese of Bath and Wells has shed light on the Laudian approach to the local. In this 'laboratory' of Laudian practice, she observes 'a new atmosphere' that was characterized as 'a general tightening up of activities', including 'the extirpation of unauthorized theology', tidying/streamlining church courts and harsher punishments for violations: eadem, *Laud's Laboratory: the Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Lewisburg, 1982), pp. 284, 284 and 287. 'When discussing the Laudian period,' Stieg writes, 'it is important not to overstate its distinctiveness': ibid., p. 283.

38 *Mercuries Message, or, The Coppy of a Letter Sent to William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, now Prisoner in the Tower* (1641), sig. A2v. See also *Mercurius Cambro-Britannus, the Brittish Mercury, or, the Welch Diurnall* (6–13 Jan. 1643–4), sig. A3 ('The Beshit of Canterbury … England[']s Pope') and *The Parliament Scout* (28 Mar. – 4 Apr. 1644), p. 342: 'his *Grace* was Pope, and lived at Lambeth'.

39 A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth–Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), p. 2. Laudianism remains a convenient and appropriate, if a little imperfect, shorthand.

40 H. Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England* (2 vols, 1827), i, p. 494.

41 T. Macaulay, *History of England* (5 vols, 1849–61), i, p. 88: 'slow to sympathize with the sufferings of others'.

42 H. L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (1655), pp. 184 and 137.

43 D. Hume, 'My Own Life', in *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary* (2 vols, 1889), i, p. 5.

destiny and laid its foundations.[44] To embrace, as Charles and Laud indeed did, many of the key points of Catholicism,[45] or to imitate, however distantly, many of its key practices, was to be a papist. Gardiner, in the late nineteenth century, identified the 'impatient violence' of Laud, ensuring the inevitability of conflict with 'the country gentlemen … [who] were Calvinists almost to a man',[46] but recognised the fulfilment of 'the needs of his age'.[47] An aggressively anti–clerical work by Henry Bell took aim at such impartiality, arguing for Laud's active involvement in secular politics as a 'dark and secret force behind the throne that dictated the fatal policy of the reign'.[48] The source of his personality is thought to have been a determined mind and a total lack of empathy, overcompensating with a rigid political style and an acute sense of self-righteousness – however, he was thought to be 'just, incorrupt … a rare Counsellor for integritye'.[49]

Revisionism again turned the tables in the 1970s and 'consumed itself', preparing the way for the reintroduction of a 'consensual, Hookerian, indeed Anglican … world picture'. [50] In Kevin Sharpe's account, Calvinism becomes not simply a deviant 'Other'

---

[44] W.L. Mackintosh, *Life of William Laud* (1907), p. vi ('I write frankly from the standpoint of an Anglo-Catholic'). He pleads 'the exigencies of space' for omitting all mention of 'the political aspect of Laud's life': ibid.
[45] The consanguinity of opinions between Charles and Laud is well–known. Cf. See Neile's plea that he would rather 'lose my life before I will join with the Church of Rome': Prior's Kitchen, Durham: Hunter MS 67, item 14: 'Richard Neile's Vindication of himself in the House of Lords from the charge of Popery carried up against him by the Commons, 1629.' The political and social malleability of the religion we now call Catholicism is virtually impossible to pursue within the topic of 'Catholic history' as it has been practised conventionally.
[46] S.R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649* (4 vols, 1901), iii, p. 200. As Mark Kishlansky has demonstrated, in the ever–increasingly wide space of secular politics, countrymen found the very existence of conflict difficult to accept and still harder to explain. They, as a result, turned to the twin languages of faction and consensus. The frequent resorts to such a lexicon cannot be taken as a sign of either moderation or agreement, however. See further idem, 'The Emergence of Adversary Politics in the Long Parliament', *Journal of Modern History*, 49 (1977), pp. 617–40, at p. 640: it was 'a reflection of meanings broader and deeper than its own dynamics.' See also C.W. Le Bas, *The Life of Archbishop Laud* (1836), p. 17: '[Laud] stood undaunted before the gathering hostility of the Calvinistic party.'
[47] Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, ii, p. 108: 'his refusal to submit his mind to the dogmatism of Puritanism … has received an ever-increasing response'. Originally published in three volumes between 1886–91, one quotes from a later edition. See also E.C.E Bourne, *The Anglicanism of William Laud* (1947), p. 112: 'In politics, as in religion, Laud stood for the ideals of the past.' See as well C. Hesketh, 'The Political Opposition to the Government of Charles I in Scotland' (King's College, London PhD thesis, 1999) p. 242: 'the impatient Laud'.
[48] H. Bell, *Archbishop Laud and Priestly Government* (1905), p. 5: 'whose power in the State enabled him to force upon the nation an ideal form of theocratic government'. See as well Carlton, *Laud*, p. 12: 'Laud preferred to confine his theology to political matters.'
[49] TNA, SP 16/278, fo. 69r: Thomas Roe to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 10 Dec. 1634: 'is an excellent man'. This retrograde impulse does little more than repurpose clashes of 'character' – some historians and scholars seeing him as good and others as bad, although both depend upon much cruder exaggerations of his profile.
[50] P. Lake, 'Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke', in K. Fincham *et al.* (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 9. Michael Questier has declared Laudianism to be 'one of revisionism's most historiographically inflammable topics': idem, [Review of *Politics, Religion and Popularity*], *JEH*, 55 (2004), p. 195. One scholarly category, however, is called 'second–wave revisionism', in which King Charles I *and* Archbishop Laud are effectively rehabilitated. It has been principally pioneered – and indeed led – by Kevin Sharpe and Mark Kishlansky *et al.*. It is still important, however,

but a proto–subversive ideology.[51] Failing to adopt a detached attitude of critical distance – 'a sceptical relativism', in modern parlance[52] – risks reproducing the terms and structures of contemporary debates. Peter White's *Predestination, Policy and Polemic* falls into this critical trap: 'a continuing spectrum' of views – 'a middle way, a way that concentrated on fundamentals and avoided extremes' – is offered to the reader, but the 'extremes' he charts, adopting the values and opinions of one party alone, were constructed by a conformist tradition of moderation, for want of a better term.[53] 'I have ever counselled moderation,' Laud reportedly said, 'lest turbulent spirits with no real care for religion should set the world at odds'.[54] He disturbed scholarly commonplaces by suggesting that religious reform in early Stuart England was fair. White thus finds it necessary to defend Laud – and Neile – at 'the bar of history', but doesn't address pastoral divinity or religion as experienced, lived and politicised by lay believers. His narrow preoccupation with soteriological dogma amid 'the rich complexity of Calvinism'[55] leaves much unanswered and his definition of a *via media* – the myth of Anglicanism struggling valiantly against doctrinal Puritanism at home and rigid Calvinism abroad[56] – is problematic. Indeed, it was a rhetorical caricature, a

---

to not over–rationalise the platform upon which the revisionists collectively stood. It could hardly be said to have represented a homogeneous historical school of thought or intellectual project.

[51] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, ch. 12, esp. p. 738: 'the puritans had a tradition and ideology of opposition … which could, under the pressure of events, formulate a theory of resistance.' See also idem, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth–Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000), ch. 2, esp. pp. 70–3.

[52] Lake, 'Introduction', p. 12: 'It is far from clear that many of the more negative responses to Tyacke's work … have altogether avoided this fate.'

[53] White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, pp. 11–12, 202 and *passim*. White seeks to 'distinguish theology from polemic', failing to accommodate the partisan outlook of Abbot and Montagu ('theological development had a momentum of its own, which was sometimes at odds with political circumstances and the interests of the court'): ibid., ch. 1, esp. p. 11. He is thus permitted to sketch a theologically indeterminate unity in the Church of England.

[54] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 265. Laud exploited a rhetoric of moderation in order to maintain – indeed, maximize – his position as the ultimate arbiter of orthodoxy, which placed his conscience at the eye of the ideological storm. He ably maintained the continuous existence of a distinctive Anglican identity, according to Peter White. In his attempt to supplant Tyacke's over–schematic characterisation, White revives a capacious, broadly based and all–inclusive version of Anglicanism.

[55] White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, pp. 286 and xii. Laud and Neile were appointed to the English Privy Council in April 1627 (Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 205); Neile was already responsible for Laud's promotion to the prebendal seat of Bugden in April 1614 and the archdeaconry of Huntingdon the following year: ibid., iii, p. 135. Richard Neile was a prominent and powerful member of the Arminian clique located at Durham House, London. See, e.g., Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, pp. 459–60 for his legacy and A.W. Foster, 'A Biography of Archbishop Richard Neile (1562–1640)' (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978), esp. chs 3 and 6. See also Le Bas, *Laud*, p. 21: Bishop Neile 'never, for a moment, relaxed in his kindness.' He very much acted as the ring–leader of the Arminian faction. See Bodl., MS Tanner 66, fo. 220v: it was not until the winter of 1641 that the bishops found it increasingly difficult to attend the Lords: 'the ArchB[isho]p of York [Neile] had that morning cal[le]d divers[e] of the B[isho]ps to him' and after a 'long and private Consultation … [decided] what should be fit for them to do.' See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 70r (24 May 1641): 'It is voted That B[isho]ps shall sit & vote in Parliam[en]t'.

[56] White claims 'not to use the word 'Anglican'' (idem, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. xii), but it reappears from time to time in various guises, most notably as a *via media*, 'a generously inclusive doctrine of the church': ibid., p. 138. He even places Bancroft 'in the centre': ibid., p. 140. For alternative views, see P. Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti–Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2013), esp. p. 13 ('Bancroft lived, worked and wrote at the coalface of this age of polemic'); Trevor–Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, p. 48 ('he [Bancroft] hated

powerful and propagandistic strategy aimed at silencing the voice of moderate Puritanism in the Church. There was simply no such expression of a coherent, univocal or carefully crafted *via media.*[57] Indeed, there are many alternative terms of art to be employed other than Laudian or Puritan,[58] but we should not resign ourselves to describing 'a soggy middle' between these mutually defining extremes, in which the variety of religious views is reflective – or rather indicative – of a seamless collection of uncategorisable shades of opinion and of the 'labile nature of religious identity in post–Reformation England.'[59]

The early Stuart church was in the process of changing rapidly, in terms of pastoral strategy, soteriology and liturgical practice. While the archbishop may have attempted to impose uniformity on a ceremonially diverse church, he did not have a similarly intense preoccupation with pure doctrine. This conviction, that there was 'something about these controversies … [that was] unmasterable in this life',[60] led the way for Laudianism to assume a defensive ethos.[61] Bemired in this mentality, Laud considered every slight moment of opposition, not simply the resistance of a small minority of Puritan subversives,[62] but as an attack upon his magnificent vision of the church and

Puritanism and the Presbyterian discipline'); and Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter–Revolution', p. 125: 'Bancroft, whose policies more than those of any other churchman prior to the Arminian Laud drove Puritan nonconformists to extremes.' Milton also suggests that 'the word [Anglican] … is more a shrug of the shoulders than an explanation': idem, 'Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans, and Revisionists: Back to Which Drawing Board?', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), p. 739. Puritanism also remains almost impossible to define ('that dragon in the path of every student of this period': C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (Oxford, 1956), p. xii). Nor is it given life by being retrofitted into rigid classificatory moulds by scholarly acts of taxonomy.

[57] The celebrated *via media* was a false note sounded by Elizabeth I for pragmatic reasons but which, with the passage of time, would seem a faithful expression of reformed Catholicity.

[58] See, e.g., Gloucestershire Archives, Gloucester Diocesan Records 93, fo. 242v, about Richard Maunsell's comments on non–preaching ministers in 1604 as 'murderers of Soules'. In a letter from the summer of 1638, Thomas Legh, the rector of Sefton and Walton–on–the–Hill in Lancashire, to Richard Parr, the bishop of Sodor and Man, lamented that 'I cannot indure to preach as formerly, whether it bee a true weaknes[s], or that spirit (w[hi]ch some say) hauntes a B[isho]pe, or other intanglinge imployments, I knowe not, but sure I am, I cannot away w[it]h preachinge'. Most tellingly, he recalled that one of his former tutors had preached that 'the principall office of a B[isho]p was not preachinge, but superintending a doctrine that goes well downe in these dayes, I wish I could defend it, as readily as I can imbrace & practise it': John Rylands Research Institute and Library, Legh of Lyme Correspondence, Box 3, Folder 9 (Richard Parr to Thomas Legh, 3 Aug. 1638).

[59] P. Lake and M. Questier, 'Introduction', in eidem (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. xv. See also D. D. Wallace, Jr., 'Via Media? A Paradigm Shift', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 72 (2003), pp. 2–21, for a convenient summary of the advocates in the historiographical debate.

[60] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 292.

[61] Laudianism potentially offered an escape route for many, though: a semi–coherent set of values which they could all showcase to their parishioners, which, if employed carefully enough, could be all things to all clergymen. For a whole selection of concerns ranging from problems with church fabric to Grindletonian Familists, Laudianism offered much more than a neo–clericalist rhetoric by which a clergyman could justify his calling and exemplify it with gusto to his parishioners.

[62] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 453: 'he [Laud] had so many dangers threat[e]ned from the *Puritan* Faction'. See also BL, Add. 35331, fo. 36v: in Jan. 1629–30: Archbishop Samuel Harsnett of York banned ('forbidden') the sale 'w[i]thin his province' of the works of William Perkins. See also Carlton, *Laud*, p. 228: 'a remarkably insecure man.'

the *esprit de corps* of the revived clerical estate. It was always in Laud's nature[63] – and his acute experience at Oxford[64] – to regard those who differed from him as personal enemies.[65] He closed his mind to compromise. Although some historians consider him 'an embarrassment', at least during the 1640s, Laud had pursued policies that were unashamedly radical and, to some extent, popular in their composition and appeal.[66] To the self–styled godly, however, the reforms comprised doctrinal error and prelatical power. The malevolent agency of Antichrist – or, in Viscount Saye and Sele's term, 'these Mysteries of iniquitie' in the world[67] – could be felt and found in the position of the ministry, whose prestige and wealth had increased enormously since the steady deprivations of the Reformation.[68] With its forceful demand for unquestioning obedience, however, Laudianism had a dimension that disassociated it from Dutch Arminianism.[69] The archbishop emphasized the comprehensive nature of the church and strongly elevated ecclesiastical authority, creating an ideal of hierarchy and order in which Puritan attempts to purify communities were suppressed. Laud valued an inner and aesthetic spirituality, one that distanced itself from the fevered activity of sermon–

---

[63] M.D. Shepherd, 'Charles I and the Distribution of Political Patronage' (Univ. of Liverpool Ph.D. thesis, 1999), p. 45: Laud was 'always uncertain of his position, was in fact very cautious of how he used his influence, avoiding intervention on the behalf of others and preferring to act alone.'

[64] C.M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983): Dent shows an incipient Protestantism taking root in a minority position within the Univ. of Oxford, but through the subtle co–operation of the Protestant agents of the regime, establishing a position of enviable strength in the larger colleges. Although his exemplary caution to use the word 'Puritan' should be welcomed (ibid., pp. 2–3), he does too willingly accept the near–literal truth of the Puritan claims of corruption (e.g. undergraduate debauchery and popish influence): ibid., ch. 3. It is arguably in this spiritual dynamism of debate that the very term 'Puritan' retains its use. Dent finally argues that Catholic survivalism in Elizabethan Oxford was an important source of developing tendencies within the seventeenth–century Church: ibid., p. 232. Laud represented 'a single man' in Oxford in the face of 'an Army': Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 53. When he became the surprise Chancellor in 1630, Laud found that 'The Statutes at Oxon., lay in a very lamentable condicion': Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8 (12 Mar. 1643–4 – 11 Oct. 1644), p. 36.

[65] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 85: 'He had with most incredible patience endured the baffles and affronts which were put upon him by the power and practises of his enemies.'

[66] J. Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (2007), p. 204. For the success of the altar policy, see K. Fincham and N. Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 5, 218–21, 272–3 and A. Walsham, 'The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti–Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England', *JEH*, 49 (1998), esp. pp. 625–30. This is not to claim that 'parish Anglicans' were, by their instant and inevitable nature, rustic Pelagians. Counter to a rather enduring trend of historiographical scepticism about the popular appeal and reach of Laudianism, Fincham and Tyacke present evidence embedded in local archives that many of the initiatives for renovation and beautification came from local parishioners themselves and enjoyed their warm and enthusiastic support.

[67] W. Saye and Sele, *Vindiciae Veritatis* (1654), p. 11. Saye and Sele was a prominent opponent of Laudianism.

[68] Saye and Sele was particularly exercised by the menaces associated with Laudianism and seized with relish the opportunity to bring forward low–key personnel of the Caroline Church in the early years of the Long Parliament.

[69] Scholars have long registered dissatisfaction with the term, 'Arminianism'. Laud and his many followers remain mercifully resistant to polemical categorisation, though.

gadding, a pastime of the godly and the Reformation itself, that '*miserable Rent* in the Church':[70]

> Never was there such a *Sermon–age* as this is … We have turned all our *Members* into *Eares* … as if in *Religion* we were to go *no higher*, then *Autium tenus, up to the eares. Preaching* is but the *Means* to bring us to *Prayer* … *Praye*r is the *End* of *preaching*: and the *means* is not to be magnified before the *end*.[71]

The revisionist impulse of historians – Davies, Sharpe, White and Cromartie,[72] to name the most prominent few – has led to an uncritical reading of Laud's invocations of unity and denials of coercive intent.[73] Indeed, he advanced policies that were sacerdotalist, protecting clerical privileges, resources and honour: clergymen and ministers of the Gospel were considered 'shining Starres … Angels.'[74] He was almost universally described as a politique, a Machiavel and a malcontent motivated by personal ambition and greed who was merely using religion as the pretext and occasion for ecclesiastical power. By enlisting and exalting the sacraments, Laud waxed lyrical on the benefits to be derived from their partaking – there was little sign of a Word–based divinity. His dominance reached its apogee in the writing of the Scottish Prayer Book, believing 'it were best to take the English Liturgy without any variation' at all.[75] Charles I was indeed authoritarian, commanding the universal use of a new Anglican–style liturgy in all parishes and imposing a selection of acts of general assemblies as canons of the church. One of the key targets of councillors was to manipulate the peculiarly pliable character of the king in their favour and to thwart the ambitions of their rivals.[76]

---

[70] W. Laud, *A Relation of the Conference Betweene William Laud ... and Mr Fisher the Jesuite* (1639), p. 133. Liturgy and ceremonies, the key bones of contention for so many writers of the English Reformation/s, were, for Laud at least, at the heart of the matter.

[71] R. Tedder, *A Sermon Preached at Wimondham in Norfolke, at the Primary Visitation of the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Matthew Wren, Lord Bishop of Norwich* (1637), p. 12.

[72] In a recent essay, published in one of the many *festschrifts* for John Morrill, Professor Alan Cromartie again put forward the interesting, albeit unfounded, notion that Laud was a moderate figure.

[73] Patrick Carter also questions Davies' ascription of all responsibility for ecclesiastical policy to Charles I, suggesting Laud played a much closer and 'major', though secretive, role in securing the 1640 clerical subsidy than he admitted at his trial in 1643–4: P. Carter, 'Parliament, Convocation and the Granting of Clerical Supply in Early Modem England', *Parliamentary History*, 19 (2000), pp. 22–23, at p. 22.

[74] W. Hardwick, *Conformity with Piety, Requisite in God's Service* (1638), p. 8. See also Russell, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Origins*, p. 23: Laud's determined belief that improved respect for the clergy would come as a result of church beautification has been deemed 'totally erroneous.'

[75] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 427: 'so the same Service-book might be established in all his Majesty's dominions'. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 323: 'the Bishops busie and intent on a publick *Liturgie*' in 1636. However, see Carlton, *Laud*, p. 161: 'it is impossible to say whether Laud was chiefly responsible for the implementation of the new prayer book.' See also ibid., p. 45, for Carlton's dismissal of Tyackean claims of 'disputes over dogma'.

[76] See Shepherd, 'Political Patronage', esp. chs 4 and 8.

The ever–widening divisions in the church, alongside the inheritance of a mostly Catholic Ireland and a predominantly Presbyterian Scotland, caused endless issues of maintenance for an over–ambitious monarch such as Charles I.[77] Anglicanism, however, did *not* exist: it was not present in the Reformation settlement, but its 'invention' or 'moment' arguably came with Richard Hooker.[78] Combined with 'acts of amnesia or censorship', however, an anachronistic tendency in scholarship – the route of Anglicanism – has ensured that the established church is 'unconsciously seen … through a Laudian prism'.[79] James I's 'great Incouragement' of the proto-Laudians, including Andrewes and Neile, 'by which … the *Anti–Calvinians* or old English Protestants took heart again, and more openly declared themselves',[80] should not be taken as wholly representative of his religion.[81] The need to protect and champion the

---

[77] C. Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), p. 211: 'He [Charles] did not create religious division, though he exploited and exacerbated it with all the strength at his command.' See idem, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Origins*, p. 1: 'a state of chronic misunderstanding, terror and distrust.' See also SRO, D661/11/1/5/d: the king's speech to Parliament, 23 Jan. 1640–1: 'there are some men whoe more malitiously then ignorantly will put noe difference betwe[e]ne reformat[i]on and alterat[i]on'. However, see Parliamentary Archives, HL/PO/JO/10/1/35: letter from Charles I to the House of Lords, 12 May 1628, touching the liberty of the subject. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 377: 'It may deservedly be a matter of no small amazement, that this poor and unprovided Nation [Scotland], should dare to put such baffles and affronts upon their Lawful King'. See also Russell, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Origins*, p. 17: Charles I had 'a deliberate intention of reversing the political and religious traditions of the Elizabethan establishment: those very traditions in which his older opponents had grown up.' See as well East Sussex Brighton and Hove Record Office, L/C/D/1, fo. 31r (the king's letter concerning the loan, 7 July 1626): the failure of a few Parliaments in the late 1620s he ascribed to 'the disordered passions of some members' which had ruptured the token harmony between king and Parliament. On Charles I's longstanding resentment at Scottish interventions in English affairs (i.e. the direct opposite of being 'in good obedience'), see Surrey History Centre, G52/2/19(8): Edward Nicholas to Charles I, 18 Aug. 1641.

[78] P. Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (1988), pp. 225–30. Lake calls this claim a few decades later 'very unwise' (idem, 'The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s', in S. Platten [ed.], *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion* [Norwich, 2003], p. 90), but still argues that the *Ecclesiastical Polity* 'constituted not a defence of a church or an ideology already in existence, but the construction out of the theological, institutional and liturgical materials made available to him by the post–Reformation English scene of an idealized version of what the English church … should be like': ibid., p. 118. See as well idem, 'Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (1987), p. 42: 'With Hooker we are close to the ideological origins of English Arminianism.' Arguably, Durham House piety was a straightforward development of existing Prayer Book spirituality, edifying worship already justified to Elizabethans by Hooker and his contemporaries. See further Foster, 'Neile', p. 213: 'Durham House in the Strand immediately became a sort of party headquarters where rooms were permanently available for people like Laud'

[79] D. MacCullo.ch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), p. 10.

[80] P. Heylyn, *Historia Quinqu-Articularis* (3 vols, 1660), iii, pp. 94 and 103. As well as praise for the '*King*[']*s craft*', Heylyn nevertheless considered James I to be 'out–witted' by others: idem, *Observations on the Historie of the Reign of King Charles* (1656), pp. 13–14. Cf. P. White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (1983), p. 40: 'Those historians who believe that Charles I's appointments signalled a doctrinal revolution must accept that James initiated it.' See G.W. Bernard, 'The Church of England, c.1529–c.1642', *History*, 75 (1990), p. 195, for the discredited rise of Arminianism 'before the accession of Charles in 1625.' See also Bodl., MS Jones 56, fo. 3r: in 1616, Laud was probably the main contributor in procuring from King James I an order encouraging the more intense study of the Fathers within the universities. See also BL, Lansdowne MS 152, fo. 38r: James I took his role as fount of honour, restoring the aristocracy, also very seriously, describing it in 1611 as 'the cheiffest calling and worthiest of their care, wherein they doe most expresse the Image of that immortall God'. James I possessed both 'a detailed grasp of abstract theory with a native political shrewdness': K. Fincham and P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), p. 206.

[81] Cf. White, 'Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', p. 39, considers James' doctrinal Calvinism to have been a 'myth'. White's argument finds fresh evidence in A. Cromartie, 'King James and the Hampton Court Conference',

royal prerogative was the main reason for their recruitment rather than the possession of similar doctrinal views and pietistic styles. In the post-Reformation era, however, 'conformity was never static, its enforcement rarely consistent, and its priorities open to different readings', but Laud's rise to power brought with it a redefined programme of ceremonial conformity in which evangelism, its ideals and objectives, were effectively proscribed.[82] To label one group of believers 'Anglican' over another would be to imply that they, all alone, represented the true pre-war Church of England. It is a term best discarded until later, after the English Civil War had splintered groups into those who aligned themselves with the Prayer Book and episcopacy, and those who chose to criticise them.[83] Julian Davies, however, maintains that Laud's sacramental emphasis originated from 'the patristic reorientation and historical reinvestment of Anglicanism',[84] taking at face value his articulation of a religious mission which sought to maintain 'orthodox truth' whilst 'reducing' the church 'into order' through 'the external worship of God in it'.[85] Neither is it any clearer where the blame should be apportioned for destabilizing the religious *status quo*. 'Having swung away from the "Puritan Revolution" of Whig tradition to the Laudian coup championed by the

---

in R. Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), esp. p. 63, which argues that the king offered 'no true concessions' to godly aspirations in 1604. James did indeed raise expectations which he may never have meant to satisfy, but where he was always guarded about his own stance – Laud 'was not so contemptible in the eyes of the King [James] as it was generally imagined' (Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 65), however – Charles was positively enthusiastic and vocal, although the origins of his religious convictions remain hidden or, at least, obscure. In the absence of clinching evidence, his trip to Madrid in 1623 seems rather decisive and would make an interesting future subject for the research student. See, however, Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 65: 'Laud seemingly failed to win the complete trust of King James.' See also Cromartie. 'James', pp. 62 and 63: 'James was in practice more hostile to puritan dissent than even the most authoritarian bishops' and 'all the changes that can be traced with confidence to James's own opinions involved a definite shift *away* from godly aspirations.'

[82] K. Fincham, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud', in Lake *et al.* (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, esp. pp. 157–8, at p. 157.

[83] In her attempt to resurrect 'Anglicanism', Judith Maltby has identified an almost forgotten subject: enthusiasm for the Prayer Book post–1642. She has identified a group of laity that are neither, *pace* Christopher Haigh, residual Catholics nor proto–Laudians: eadem, '"By this Book": Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, pp. 115–37. The search for a viable term for the middle ground – Prayer Book Protestants, e.g. – has led her to confer too stable (and restrictive) an identity on an extremely wide variety of disparate practices, protests and political expressions, however. She argues that scholars have focused too much on dissatisfaction with the Prayer Book, not simply survivalist Catholics or conforming Puritans. See also Le Bas, *Laud*, p. 7: 'he was seized with a vehement desire to bring the Church of England from this state of defection, back to her native principles.'

[84] J. Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992), p. 54. Davies argues, however, that Charles I's sense of sacramental kingship produced a vision, not finely tuned theologically but of considerable import in shaping the direction of church policy. This was a 'Caroline Captivity', for which Laud was 'the bureaucrat' and never the zealot: Carlton, *Laud*, p. 229. See also R. Shelford, *Five Pious and Learned Discourses* (Cambridge, 1635), p. 12: 'the beauty of preaching … hath preacht away the beauty of holinesse'. See as well what Laud told Viscount Saye and Sele, i.e. that he knew 'no "gifts or graces set aside, much less thrust out," but such as are neither gifts nor graces of Christ, but the bold and impudent attempts of weavers, cobblers, and felt–makers … to preach without knowledge, warrant, or calling': Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 103. In Davies' picture, Laud is not even the most enthusiastic prelate at implementing the reforms.

[85] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 42.

revisionists,' Alex Walsham writes, 'the pendulum is gradually coming to rest somewhere in the middle.'[86]

Perhaps the most striking development in recent years has been the emancipation of religious thought as, once again, a proper subject of enquiry – 'back in fashion as an explanation for the English Civil War.'[87] The twentieth century was mostly concerned with 'the gentry controversy' and the Marxist–influenced view mapped onto the Weberian–Tawneyite agenda for analysing the causes – and course – of the Civil War. There was a reductionist discounting of theological conviction as an authentic mover of action – Laudianism, as a result, was 'consigned to a scholarly No Man's Land'.[88] Casting aside the theories of R.H. Tawney, Christopher Hill and Lawrence Stone, the rise of political narrative in the 1970s coincided with – or arguably presaged – a reinvigoration of interest in the ecclesiastical establishment as a destabilizing force. The search for the causes of the Civil War – what Conrad Russell once described as the ascent of Everest[89] – precipitated a fresh take on the evidence. The 'New British History' opened up horizons of astonishing breadth with religion serving as a key factor in the decisive 'long–term causes of instability' inside the Stuart kingdoms.[90] Explanations that focused upon underlying structural changes were dismissed as deterministic, teleological and/or anachronistic, stimulating new thematic departures. The conservatism of Calvinism,[91] with all of its subversive potential toward the

---

[86] Walsham, 'Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited', p. 623.
[87] P. Lake, 'Anti–popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in R. Cust *et al.* (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642* (1989), p. 72.
[88] J. Adamson, 'Introduction: High Roads and Blind Alleys – The English Civil War and its Historiography', in idem (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (2009), esp. pp. 7–21, at p. 9. 'Since the 1980s, whole areas of the past which had hitherto been regarded almost as no-go areas – the Laudians … – have gradually been opened up as subjects for respectable historical enquiry': ibid., p. 25. The Weber–Tawneyite analysis puts the *ideas* of the Puritans in the forefront of any explanation, be it political, economic or social, which took place in England. Scholars as of late have not been so self–consciously concerned with 'the Big Questions' about modernity.
[89] Russell, *Causes*, p. 1. Ibid., p. 7: 'a civil war … not a revolution'. His arguments and central thesis have become somewhat oversimplified over time, as the subtleties and nuances of the original research are/were worn away. Russell's main purpose was to affirm the essential conservatism of Calvinists (or Puritans) out there in the tame English wild.
[90] Ibid., p. 213: 'the problem of religious division'. Contingency, nonetheless, still played a decisive role: 'the fortuitous element' of Charles' personality. Regretting the anglocentricity that swept Scotland and Ireland aside, present–day scholars have sought to broaden their parameters, preferring to call the conflict 'the British civil wars'. What Russell calls the monarch's 'inability to read the political map' prevented him from reaping the dividends from peace and prosperity of the 1630s: ibid., p. 208. M.C. Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 287: Charles I only achieved 'dismal results' and the English forces raised to defeat the Scots were marked more by 'disorder rather than discipline'.
[91] Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists*, p. 7: 'Calvinism was the *de facto* religion of the Church of England'. See as well idem, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 115 (1987), p. 202 and 207: 'Calvinism was dominant in the highest reaches of the established church' and 'Calvinist dominance of the Church of England continued during the first two decades of the seventeenth century.' The success of Arminianism post–1625 eroded away the mutual accommodation with Puritans within the much–revered 'Calvinist consensus'.

institutional structures of the church and state, was directly positioned against Arminian innovation (the reflex was deeply conservative – to protect the Church *status quo* Laud); the old antithetic picture of Puritan–activists–versus–Anglican–figures was immediately replaced.[92] Here was *the* destabilizing, even revolutionary, event in the history of the early Stuart Church. The fracturing of the religious peace, the 'Calvinist consensus' in the Jacobean era,[93] provided an alternative to secular or ideological conflict with the strict doctrine of predestination[94] – that most especially rarefied of theological concepts, the *summa totius Christianismi*[95] – becoming the fundamental topic of concern.[96] Differences in doctrine were ultimately submerged in a common and broad acceptance of the loosely defined Elizabethan system. The forbidding ideological straitjacket of Calvinist versus Arminian has gradually disappeared in scholarship – 'the positive agenda of most anti–Calvinists was dominated by issues and priorities other than predestination'[97] – and been substituted for a peculiarly distinctive 'style', one that focused on worship and the priesthood, the authority of the Church

---

[92] There is still, however, 'the need for a more stringent examination of popular anti–Laudianism': J.A. Sharpe, 'Crime and Delinquency in an Essex Parish 1600–1640', in J.S. Cockburn (ed.), *Crime in England 1550–1800* (1977), p. 105.

[93] That there was mutual agreement in the church before the rise of Arminianism is an observation most closely associated with Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists* and Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, pp. ix–x, although both historians do not use the term 'consensus'. See also Russell, *Causes*, p. 84. It seems to have been first coined by P. Lake, 'Matthew Hutton – A Puritan Bishop?', *History*, 64 (1979), p. 182 and idem, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 227 and 239, but T. Harris, 'Revisiting the Causes of the English Civil War', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), pp. 625–7, at p. 625 prefers 'a Jacobean balancing act', playing different factions off against each other in an effort to establish a mutual degree of ecclesiastical harmony in the early Stuart Church. See also Russell, *Causes*, p. 107: 'the Jacobean compromise was killed by Charles I.' One drawback of this approach is that Laudianism becomes a vague sort of *deus ex machina*, an entirely unpredictable and largely arbitrary force which emerges from out of nowhere to cripple the settled and safe ecosystem of Jacobean Protestantism. Old–time Calvinists felt aggrieved at the demise of the 'consensus' – they were deeply worried by a theological reorientation that appeared to be taking the church in the wrong direction. Kenneth Fincham is highly sceptical of Laud's protests that he promoted Calvinists *as well as* Arminians: idem, 'William Laud and the Exercise of Caroline Ecclesiastical Patronage', *JEH*, 51 (2000), pp. 87–91.

[94] For R.T. Kendall's basic distinction between 'credal' and 'experimental' predestinarianism, see idem, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 1–9.

[95] Leif Dixon has modified Kendall's infamous distinction between 'credal' and 'experimental' predestinarians. His new redefinition of 'experimental' predestinarians as 'practical' predestinarians puts forward the notion that these ministers challenged believers to find personal assurance in order that they, first of all, might please God rather than simply attain inward certainty of salvation. He argues, very convincingly, that modes of predestination are/were inextricably linked to spiritual angst by demonstrating that many believers fostered an ethos of pursuing outward expressions of good works rather than inward navel–gazing. In a rather unsure, even uncertain, culture, the doctrine of predestination provided a sound and stabilising source of comfort and assurance. See idem, *Practical Predestinarians in England,* c. 1590–1640 (Aldershot, 2014), *passim*, esp. pp. 7, 11–12 and 15.

[96] Cf. Strict predestination was 'one of the least attractive dogmas ever formulated in any religion': G.E. Aylmer, *Rebellion or Revolution? England 1640–1660* (Oxford, 1986), p. 138. See also Russell, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Origins*, p. 20: 'The Laudians' worst offence was their attack on Predestination.'

[97] P. Lake, 'Predestinarian Propositions', *JEH*, 46 (1995), p. 121. See, however, Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 287 ('A convincing case that Laud was a doctrinal Arminian has yet to be made') and Bernard, 'Church of England', p. 201: 'none of the evidence offered gives any very telling support for the proposition that Laud was an 'Arminian''. See also C.Z. Wiener, 'The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti–Catholicism', *Past and Present*, 51 (1971) esp. p. 29.

Fathers[98] and the nature of episcopacy; the institution by early 1641 seemed impregnable, a deeply entrenched belief. The origins of episcopacy lay beyond recall of living memory.[99] The ideological turf of the century was binary, between good and evil counsel, monarchy and tyranny, and true and false religion, a dualistic impression or language compounded by the dogged presence of Catholics.[100] The success of the Counter–Reformation on the continent made this nexus of fears and concerns sufficiently real, the political valence of which was increasingly widespread.

What made Laud and his acolytes somewhat different was that their combined assault on extreme Calvinist ideas was not aligned with a similar assault on Arminianism, which they ultimately regarded as manifestly less dangerous – in fact, they evinced a willingness to stop discussion of doctrines of predestination altogether: it simply ran too many risks to be worthwhile (or even relevant!). The ideological context of Laudianism may be found in the inner workings of the 'Durham House' group, a court–centred collection of divines who considered themselves (that is, their ecclesiological and doctrinal assumptions) to be in battle with a Calvinist establishment. What was novel remains a tricky interpretative question,[101] although the systematic way in which policies were enforced certainly caused alarm. It is argued in this dissertation that whereas a laissez–faire approach to diversity of worship in the parishes had largely prevailed under James I,[102] it since yielded to the attempted enforcement of conformity

---

[98] Bourne, *Anglicanism of William Laud*, p. 86: 'Laud … had perhaps an excessive reverence for the Early Fathers'. Nonetheless, a keen propensity to cite the Fathers should not been taken in and for itself as a strict badge of irenic intent.

[99] P. Lake, 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the 'Beauty of Holiness' in the 1630s', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, pp. 161–85, for the notion of 'styles' of divinity. The Arminians were promptly smeared as crypto–papists, igniting the smouldering anti-Catholicism in the vast majority of subjects. However, one should not take Laud's denial that he was an Arminian *prima facie*, since for tactical reasons he found it desirable to deflect the charge. Cf. White, 'Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', p. 41, n. 26. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 406: 'whilest the Archbishop laboured to support *Episcopacy* on the one side, some of the *Puritan* Party did as much endeavour to suppress it, by lopping off the Branches first, and afterwards by laying the Ax[e] to the root of the Tree.'

[100] Walsham, 'Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited', p. 646: 'Laud hate[d] papists with a passion'. See also C. Haigh, 'Puritan Evangelism in the Reign of Elizabeth I', *EHR*, 92 (1977), p. 51: Puritan preachers faced the dual prospect of 'the stolid conservatism of the elderly and the rude indifference of the generality'. A few scholars have detailed how other Laudians, including Richard Neile, John Cosin and William Laud himself, adopted a far more moderate approach towards Roman Catholics in the hope that this might win them to the Protestant faith. See, e.g., Walsham, 'Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited', pp. 638–9; A. Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited', in Lake *et al.* (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy,* p. 167; and Milton, *Catholic and Reformed,* pp. 80–1.

[101] Not every Arminian was a rigid or repressive supporter of Laudianism, however: e.g. A. Guibbory, 'Donne's Religion: Montagu, Arminainism and Donne's Sermons, 1624–1630', *English Literary Renaissance,* 31 (2001), esp. p. 438.

[102] LPL, MS 1372, fo. 59v: James I was not so lenient with Roman Catholics, however. James said that the Romanist divines were 'like to bawdes, whoe thoughe theye doe not sinne in their owne bodies, yet they are guiltie by inducinge others.' See also T. Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–*

and, in effect, its Caroline – or, rather, Laudian – removal destroyed the base that the church had established in national sentiment. Alongside normal accounts of the magistrate settling *adiaphora* ('things indifferent'), more radical defences of church reforms began to appear in which the altar policy, for example, was justified in terms of Eucharistic notions of the Real Presence.[103] That the relationship between the British churches – England, Scotland and Ireland – within the composite monarchy was driven by sheer 'authoritarianism', however, rather than an all–consuming desire for uniformity is still a questionable contention.[104] There was a marked tendency to conflate religion and politics in all of the countries, to attribute secular ends to spiritual means, to create false rumours and conspiracies of those desperate to destabilize the state and discredit, even destroy, the church.[105]

The evidence, not least for the pivotal decisions and turning points of Laud's career, is often scarce and open to (mis)interpretation.[106] Alan Cromartie's thesis frequently proceeds by assertion rather than argument, but, knowing how difficult the record is, he always asserts what is, in his view, 'quite possible' rather than certain.[107] Davies' acceptance of Laud's self–proclaimed lack of power, 'the insecurity of his own

1624 (Cambridge, 1989), p. 34: James I's proclamations ordering the gentry to leave London were an attempt to prevent their meeting to form a community of 'secular dissent'.

[103] Prior's Kitchen: Hunter MS 67, item 14: Bishop Neile, in a speech prepared for delivery to the House of Lords in 1629, said, 'St Paul did not boggle at the word *Altar* which I understand spoken of the lord's table.' He compared current practices to how 'tables stand in an alehouse' and protested that 'We duck not to the altar, but bow ourselves to God, into whose presence we have come when we enter his house.' See J.T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry: From the Reformation to the Civil War* (1969), *passim*, which confirms Tyacke's argument that Laudianism was something new on the ecclesiastical horizon.

[104] See J. Morrill, 'A British Patriarchy? Ecclesiastical Imperialism under the Early Stuarts', in A. Fletcher *et al.* (eds), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 209–37, at p. 236. See also P. Donald, *An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles, 1637–1641* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 175, 188–9, 230–1 and 279–81, helps to explain partly Laud's role in Scottish affairs and a better sense of the hostility with which the Covenanters regarded the archbishop between 1638–40 and his status as an 'incendiary' in the articles they submitted to the House of Lords in Dec. 1640.

[105] J.P. Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603–1640* (1999), p. 180: the fragile unity of the church was 'shattered' by Laud(ianism).

[106] Laud published very little, except when he faced mounting anti–Catholic pressure to do so. See, e.g., idem, *Relation of the Conference*, sig. A4: '*I was willing to have it passe* [the conference] *as silently as it might … because I could not hold it worthy, nor can I yet, of that Great Duty, and Service, which I owe to my Deare Mother*, the Church of England.' Untrained in caution and compromise, Laud preferred to keep controversies silent, making the authorship of reforms difficult to gauge. Ideological division, however, still rent the nation; the short-term roles of faction and parochialism should not be accorded primacy without recognising they were linked to – often dominated by – other issues of longevity. He sent copies to Thomas Wentworth, amongst others.

[107] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 86.

position',[108] should also be approached with caution, even scepticism.[109] It was in Laud's best interest to portray himself as an overburdened servant rather than a master at his trial: 'Laud's objective there was not historical veracity but to save his neck.'[110] His trial has come to be overlooked by contemporaries as well as scholars.[111] Unlike the proceedings against Wentworth and Charles I, neither did it rivet the attention of politicians nor pamphleteers.[112] Laud was 'pointedly and heartlessly abandoned' by the king[113] – it was 'a stain on its cause' and 'a travesty of justice'[114] – remaining a prisoner in the Tower of London from March 1640–1[115] until his ruthless execution when 'that grand enemy of the power of godlynes[s], that great stickler for all outward pompe in the service of god, left his head at Tower hill'.[116] This dissertation will not explore the

---

108 Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 303. See M. Kishlansky, *Charles I: An Abbreviated Life* (2014), p. 50: 'he was in fact a cautious man who rarely acted without explicit direction from the king.' Laud is presented as an honourable figure, 'an institutional man' acting on a code of courtly conduct in a time when the legitimacy of old institutions was under siege: 'his principal objective was to protect the wealth and prerogatives of the Church' (ibid., p. 49).

109 M. Todd, [Review of J. Davies' *Caroline Captivity of the Church*], *American Historical Review*, 99 (1994), p. 895: 'Those who find it hard to see Laud as powerless will have the most difficulty swallowing Davies's explanation'.

110 Fincham, 'Laud', p. 69. Laud's aim at his trial in 1643–4 was simple: 'he never had purpose or Resolution', he declared, 'to alter the Religion Established in the Church of England' (BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 42r). See also L. James, *'This Great Firebrand': William Laud and Scotland, 1617–1645* (Woodbridge, 2017), p. 168: Laud's trial in 1644–5 was 'undoubtedly one of the great show trials of the seventeenth century'.

111 Cromartie does not spend any time, not even a page, on Laud's execution. He refers only to the trial in defence of Laud's somewhat dubious claim that he rescued twenty people tempted by Catholicism: idem, 'Laud', p. 80. Sharpe is correct by saying that 'the slow pace of the [legal] proceedings against him scarcely indicate that pursuit of the archbishop and condemnation of his programmes had a high priority': idem, *Personal Rule*, p. 935. On the nineteenth day of his hearing in 1644, Laud gave examples of how 'many times "circumstantials" in religion do quite destroy the foundation [of faith]', but these were all concerned with the reflection in circumstantials of a direct rejection of the Incarnation: Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 337. Laud is not concerned here with the notion that heretical doctrines might overthrow the foundation of faith by consequent. Laud's prosecutor complained that the archbishop identified no point of popery which overthrew the foundation. In reply, Laud cited the doctrine of transubstantiation but did not try to demonstrate how this doctrine endangered the foundation but merely argued that this was an example of a question of mere circumstance (the means of Christ's presence in the sacrament) which both Catholics and Protestants had accounted a point fundamental by both inflicting death and in dying for it: ibid., iv, pp. 337–8. See also Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 422: 'It is unnecessary to deal in detail with Laud's trial'.

112 P. Heylyn, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate, the L. Archbishop of Canterbury* (1645), p. 15: 'though some rude, uncivill people reviled him as he passed along with opprobrious language'. However, Laud not only received more time to prepare his answers to the charges than Wentworth did, but he also received a stronger calibre of legal counsel with Matthew Hale and John Herne.

113 J. Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 34 (1984), p. 172. See also A. Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, p. 63; Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 204 ('in striking contrast to the king's devotion to his secular councillor [Wentworth], his abandonment of his highest–ranking prelate was heartless, cynical, and complete'); and D.L. Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments, 1603–1689* (1999), p. 125: '[he did] nothing to rescue Laud'.

114 A. Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution: 1625–1660* (Oxford, 2002), p. 295 and A. Milton, 'Laud, William (1573–1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

115 A crowd gathered once Laud was identified and reviled him along the way, threatening to kill him in his coach; the Lieutenant of the Tower had to call out the yeoman of the guard to quell the riot.

116 ERO, T/B 9/1, p. 47 (10 Jan. 1644–5). See also W.G. Palmer, 'Invitation to a Beheading: Factions in Parliament, the Scots, and the Execution of Archbishop William Laud in 1645', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 52 (1983), p. 26: execution served as a potent bargaining–chip in the problematic relationship between Parliament and the Covenanters; it was duly believed by many that it 'had been contrived by St. John and Vane for the Scots' benefit.'

drama surrounding Laud in the early 1640s[117] – during his trial he was 'economical with the truth, minimising his own responsibility and magnifying the role of others'[118] – but it is important to remember that he was proclaimed 'the *King's* and the *Churche's Martyr*' upon his death. 'The pulling downe [of] this great Pillar of our Church' was memorialised instantly, but only 'impartiall Posterity will know how to value him'.[119] He was unmoved by the occasion ('he did not so much as seeme once fearfull'): his head was 'cutt of[f] at one blow.'[120] Laud's trial was not much of a success – it satisfied his enemies, but William Prynne, the crazed provider 'of all the evidence',[121] was unable to substantiate the charges.[122] Even though there were high hopes that 'the Archbishopp … will be found very deepe in Capitall Crymes',[123] Prynne conducted the proceedings 'with the unscrupulous rascality of fanaticism'[124] and only used 'Witnesses

---

117 It has been sufficiently analysed in N.R.C. Forward, 'The Arrest and Trial of Archbishop William Laud' (Univ. of Birmingham M.Phil. thesis, 2012). See John Coke's remarks on Laud's 'asleep' trial in 1641: HMC, *Cowper MSS* (3 vols, 1888), ii, p. 284 (John Coke the Younger to John Coke the Elder, 25 May 1641).
118 Fincham, 'Laud', p. 72. See also St John's College, Oxford, MS 409, pp. 19/1–22 ('Articles exhibited in the Parliam[en]t against the Archbishopp of Canterbury 15 December 1640').
119 *Mercurius Aulicus* (5–12 Jan. 1644–5), p. 1340: 'the most groundlesse, malicious, solemne, studied Murther, that ever was committed in this wretched Island.' See also Heylyn, *Briefe Relation*, p. 15 ('the most glorious Crowne of *Martyrdome*') and BL, Add. MS 37719, fo. 204v: 'In Laud the Miter, in blest Charles the Crown.'
120 St John's College, Oxford, MS 260, fo. 2r–v: 'eyther in his countenance, voice, or gesture.' Marquis de Sabran, the French ambassador, claimed to have never seen so much blood ('tant de sang'): BL, Add. MS 5461, fo. 29v.
121 Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 47. Trevor–Roper sees the trial as insubstantial, comprised of 'a tedious series of charges' (idem, *Laud*, p. 422), a claim made by Laud himself ('this comfortless and tedious trial'): Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 50. When charged with 'incendiaries', King Charles said he had 'none such about him': BL, Stowe MS 187, fo. 15v. See also Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle, Sy: Y.I.47.: 'Hee answeare, That his Ma[jes]tie believeth that he hath none such about him' (11 Dec. 1640). Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 46, writes that 'Prynne's perversion of evidence was manifest in Laud's trial'. At Laud's trial, one of the many charges levelled against him by the Scottish Commissioners was that their sustained opposition to the much–despised 1637 Prayer Book had been 'answered with terrible Proclamations ... *Cant.*[erbury] procured us to be declared Rebels and Traitors in all parish Kirkes of England ... Canterbury kindleth warre against us': *The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners Against Canterburie and the Lieutenant of Ireland* (1641), p. 15.
122 The statement by Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 204, that 'Laud himself realized that he had been cast adrift, and resigned himself to imminent martyrdom' is not borne out by the evidence. He did indeed complain about the 'clamour and revilings, even beyond barbarity itself' that accompanied his trip to the Tower in 1640–1 (Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 436), but it did not upset him completely, turning his attention to God rather than 'the tongues of Shimei and his children': ibid., iii, p. 437. My disagreement on this specific point implies no lack of general admiration for Adamson's fine book, however. Laud also claimed 'that some lords were very well pleased with my patient and moderate carriage since my commitment; and that four earls, of great power in the House, should say, that the Lords were not now so sharp against me as they were at first': ibid., iii, p. 395. However, the Earl of Warwick called for Laud to be removed from Black Rod's house in Westminster to a cell in the Tower on 26 Feb. 1640–1 (he showed 'no Compassion to him who shewed none to others'): BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 42v. See also ibid., fo. 39v ('The ArchB[isho]p being at the Bar': 26 Feb. 1640–1) and Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 515: 'The day being come, and the Archbishop brought unto the Bar in the House of Peers'. John Adamson also relies heavily upon Laud's *History of the Troubles and Tryal* (1695), which was not published until half a century after his execution and imbued with a strict revisionism that sought to fit his own 'persecution' into 'his' version of events: idem, *Noble Revolt*, esp. pp. 100–110. It was, indeed, an apologetic written for the sake of posterity.
123 BL, Add. MS 28000, fo. 74r: Edward Swan to Henry Oxinden, 7 Feb. 1640–1: 'it is concluded of all hands he [Lord Deputy Wentworth] cannot answeare his accusations w[it]hout life.' Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 37: 'the significance of Laud and Wentworth was considerable.'
124 J.W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603–1644* (1938), p. 195. Forward, 'Arrest and Trial of Archbishop William Laud', p. 106 ('The importance of Prynne's role cannot be over-exaggerated') and Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 422: 'Of Prynne's malice there can be no doubt.' Given semi-confidential access to voluminous private papers, Prynne attempted to establish an indissoluble link between the crypto-popery of Laudianism and theories of absolute

as he durst trust'.[125] In Laud's closing address, he referenced a number of specific concerns which included 'the generality' and 'the incertainty' of the accusations, the limited time assigned to him to respond to the allegations, the acquisition of his private documents and the fact that many of his accusers were 'suspected Sectaries and Separatists from the Church'.[126] He was still held primarily responsible for the 'dyvysyons' caused by the Scottish Prayer Book,[127] but the accusation that Laud conspired to create war in Scotland was not raised in any significant manner during his trial[128] and, even though the Covenanters would certainly not be aggrieved at his demise,[129] he was never a pawn in the ongoing negotiations between Parliament and the Scots.[130] In fact, he followed the likes of Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley in their exquisite development of the *ars moriendi* tradition, performing a heavily ritualistic execution that dramatized the fall of the church.[131] Certain members of the social elite tolerated, perhaps even sanctioned, popular riots and demonstrations – unrest was widespread. Intoxicated with freedom, pamphleteers published widely. Laud's defeat in the 1640s, however, signalled the absolute victory of 'legal values' and the restoration of the medieval view of the constitution as a fully secular entity.[132] Charles did very little – almost nothing – to preserve Laud's neck,[133]

---

or arbitrary rule. Historians portray the event as a show–trial with the result already pre-determined. However, the event was heavily dependent upon 'the almost total conflation of treason with the lesser cause of praemunire', since Laud was likely to be acquitted on the first charge: A. Orr, *Treason and the State: Law, Politics, and Ideology in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 120–1.

[125] *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors*, ed. T.B. Howell (34 vols, 1809–28), iv, p. 349.

[126] Laud, *Works*, iv, pp. 370–3. Ibid., iii, p. 237: 'I am almost every day threatened with my ruin in Parliament.'

[127] BL, Add. MS 14828, fo. 5r. A number of historians have identified Scottish pressure in his execution, however: Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 305; Orr, *Treason and the State*, p. 112; James, *'This Great Firebrand',* ch. 5; and C. Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 182 and 268. It cannot be underestimated how much the Scottish wanted to see 'the great Idol of England, the Service–Book' overthrown, nonetheless: *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. D. Laing (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1841–2), ii, p. 117. Baillie himself had written in early 1640 to the Short Parliament that Archbishop Laud sought to align both the English and Scottish churches in doctrine and discipline: idem, *The Canterburian*[']*s Self–Conviction* (Glasgow, 1640).

[128] In the fourteen–point indictment, only one – the thirteenth – references Scotland: BL, Harl. MS 476, fo. 7r–v.

[129] NRS, GD406/1/569: Hamilton to Laud, 22 Oct. 1638: 'My Lords of the clergie … are of the opinion … that the [Glasgow] assemblie be rather prorogued'.

[130] In February 1643–4, there was no comment in Laud's vociferous critic, Robert Baillie's letters, apart from to comment that 'Canterbury every week is before the Lords for his tryall [preliminary]; but we have so much to doe, and he is a person now so contemptible, that we take no notice of his process': *Robert Baillie*, ed. Laing, ii, p. 139.

[131] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 539: 'Thus *Laud* fell, and the Church fell with him'. See also St John's College, MS 260, fo. 2v: 'He [Laid] spake nothing at all … concerning the Scots'.

[132] A. Cromartie, *The Constitutionalist Revolution: An Essay on the History of England, 1450–1642* (Cambridge, 2006), ch. 8, in which narrowly theological explanations of conflict are forcefully rebutted. He argues that the resurgent clericalism of the Laudians amounted to anti–Erastianism. See idem, 'The Constitutionalist Revolution: The Transformation of Political Culture in Early Stuart England', *Past and Present*, 163 (1999), pp. 90–1: 'Laud's downfall owed much to the fact that he was operating in a world where common law had come to dominate.'

[133] Charles had always been a monarch to be wary of. See, e.g., WWM, Str P 12/271: Lord Wilmot to Wentworth, 10 Jan. 1631–2: 'beware howe youe doe dysarme him [the King] at his first Comings … By a smale force perhaps,

whereas he ventured every feasible option and was 'prepared to run the greatest risks to preserve' Wentworth's 'life.'[134]

Although his biographer, Hugh Trevor–Roper, gained 'more sympathy' for him over time,[135] there remains a distinct and longstanding prejudice in much of the historical writing. While the discerning scholar of Charles I can now choose from more than a hundred biographies, several articles and cinematic adaptations[136] – the literature is rich, sophisticated and methodologically diverse, drawing not just on history but on cultural theory and cognitive psychology[137] – the ecclesiastical historian, despite an abiding consensus that 'Laud wielded the most influence',[138] must pursue the archbishop through correspondence and notes. Such neglect has led Kevin Sharpe to suggest that 'Laud's power and control … may … have been exaggerated',[139] but the mutually exclusive terms in which the king and archbishop have been addressed in older scholarship have recently been sidelined for rich new avenues of interpretation. Charles I could occasionally lambast Laud, as he did at Woodstock in the summer of 1631,[140] but they worked together more often in a dynamic and striking relationship, 'a partnership of prince and prelate unparalleled since the Reformation.'[141]

He maye gett some smale thynges … But by a force of Some shew, youe maye not doubt, but to doe what youe please w[i]th them'.

[134] *CSPV, 1640–2*, p. 125. This may have served to save the elderly archbishop in the short-term. As Russell argues, the king's defence/s never did them 'much good' ('the more Charles defended his servants, the more at risk they were'): idem, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 178–9. Treated 'as an individual and as an episcopal scapegoat. This made it harder for the king to take steps to save his archbishop's neck': James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 12.

[135] Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. viii.

[136] Warwickshire County Record Office, CR2017/C1/104: Marquess of Hamilton to Lord Feilding, 4 Nov. 1641. When Hamilton reported the Incident of Oct. 1641 to Feilding, his brother–in–law, he said it was 'a poynt of respect to his Ma[jest]ie not to wrytt to anie of particulares, which I have observed.'

[137] See Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots*, p. 205: 'The king clearly liked his [Laud's] divinity'. See also Fincham, 'Laud', p. 87: 'The king's trust in Laud's judgement evidently gave the archbishop unmatched opportunities to mould royal thinking as well as influence patronage.'

[138] R. Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (2005), p. 173: 'Of Charles's other ministers'. See, however, P. White, 'The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 230: 'Laud's political influence was limited.' Cf. Donald, *Uncounselled King*, p. 75, n. 141: Laud's influence has been 'exaggerated'.

[139] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 143. Sharpe makes it clear in his preface that he differs 'substantially' with Russell and Tyacke over religion: ibid., p. xxiii. He views Laudianism as an uncontroversial ideology of order.

[140] Bodl., MS Jones 17, fo. 303r: 'there was much dilligence used in questioninge & suppressinge those who preached on the one or part contrary to my Declaration [of 1628], but nothinge done to those who preached on the other w[hi]ch was not his [Charles'] meaninge, hee haveing ever desired that those points should bee forborne on both sides indifferently. Hereupon my L[or]d of London [Laud] made a solemne p[ro]testation before God'.

[141] Fincham, 'Laud', p. 93. See also James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 37: 'His closeness to the monarch, therefore, was unequalled for a member of the episcopacy and was on a par with the most senior councillors at court.' Charles considered it his duty as supreme governor to silence debates and preserve 'that circle of Order' against 'unquiet and restlesse spirits': *Stuart Royal Proclamations, 1625–46*, ed. J.F. Larkin (Oxford, 1983), p. 93. In 1632, for instance, Thomas Aylesbury moved the monarch for a dispensation for Thomas Anian while the king was 'sitting att dinner in the Presence chamber att Greenw[i]ch; and that tyme was taken in regard my Lo[rd] of London [Laud] was there attending his ma[jes]tie and delivered his opinion (being asked) that it might very fitlie be done, and according to the Canons. Whereupon his ma[jes]tie gave p[r]esent order, both for the dispensac[i]on, and for the

While Laud has been overtly praised for being ‘cautious, tactful’ and ‘politically pragmatic’,[142] Charles I failed to understand – or even acknowledge – the limits on his royal authority.[143] ‘The scope and intensity of the key projects of the Personal Rule’, including Ship Money and the Book of Orders, ‘were unprecedented.’[144] The influence of Archbishop Laud should not be underestimated here; he was, following the deaths of Buckingham[145] and Weston in 1628 and 1634–5 respectively, the principal advisor to Charles I.[146] His determined pursuit of a new Scottish Prayer Book has been explored in depth elsewhere,[147] but his role as a strategic politician, a restless figure unaccustomed to the arts of compromise, remains undiscovered.[148] The shared outlook between king and archbishop enabled both of them to produce the annual archiepiscopal accounts for England without much, if any, disagreement at all.[149] While some historians describe the connection between them as purely formal – ‘the two were not close personally’[150] – all the evidence seems to point in the opposite direction towards a working marriage of great proportions.[151] The facets of personal ideology and strategic appointments cemented his position in the king’s favour – much influence, too, could be wielded from outside formal institutions. In a personal monarchy, counsel

clause of permutation, w[hi]ch my Lo[rd] of London named to be 23 miles’: Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service, 705:73/14450/403/230: Thomas Aylesbury, 7 June 1632.

142 Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 232 and 302.

143 He was a monarch with a ‘fatal’ propensity ‘to shut down public debate rather than engage with it.’ See further T. Harris, ‘Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain’ in *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, eds A. Houston *et al.* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 145. See also R. Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626–1628* (Oxford, 1987), ch. 1, esp. pp. 16–90, for Charles’s high expectations of others – to follow his own wishes and steamroll particular lines of counsel.

144 H. Langelüddecke, ‘Policy Enforcement during the Personal Rule of Charles I: The Perfect Militia, Book of Orders, and Ship Money’, in G. Southcombe *et al.* (eds), *Revolutionary England, c.1630–c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes* (Oxford, 2017), p. 9.

145 Tyacke, ‘Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter–Revolution’, p. 131: ‘their [the English Arminians’] best hope lay in trying to capture the mind of the King or at least that of the royal favourite.’

146 See Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 49–50, for the argument that Buckingham’s death initiated the Personal Rule. ‘No Man’, the king wrote in mid–1627 when Buckingham was still in France, ‘ever longed so much for anie thing, as I doe, to heere some good newes from you’: BL, Harl. MS 6988, fo. 27r: Charles I to Buckingham, 22 July 1627. See also Kishlansky, *Charles I*, p. 41: ‘After Buckingham’s death, Charles never again elevated a favourite’, though he then goes on to concede that ‘the most important royal minister during the 1630s was the Lord Treasurer, Sir Richard Weston’: ibid. See also Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 131.

147 James, *‘This Great Firebrand’*, ch. 3. See also Donald, *Uncounselled King*, p. 27: Laud was, indeed, ‘most notoriously and fully involved with the affairs of Scotland’.

148 K. Fincham, ‘Introduction’, in Laud, *Corresp.*, p. l: ‘We await a modern biography that does justice to Laud as a politician.’

149 Laud, *Works*, v, pp. 307–70. However, six weeks after his triumph in Oxford, Laud dreamt ‘that the King was offended with me, and would cast me off, and tell me no cause why. *Avertat Deus*. For cause I have given none’: ibid., iii, p. 227. See also C. Carlton, ‘The Dream Life of Archbishop Laud’, *History Today*, 36 (Dec., 1986), p. 13.

150 Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 284. See, however, Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 202: ‘The personal bond between Charles and Laud … was a critical feature in the landscape of court’.

151 In the areas of policy and patronage, Charles’ role is often occluded or even rendered invisible, leading historians either to overestimate or to marginalize his influence. The sources lend themselves to differing interpretations of the religious proclivities and political judgement of the monarch, rendering all effort to find the ‘culprit’ null and void.

was everything. Laud had few, if any, jurisdictional powers beyond England, but he had acquired one special asset: the king's permission, which allowed him to extend his remit beyond the country's borders. Laud's regular gifts to Charles I suggest that their relationship transcended official boundaries: 'a spurr Royall' that Laud offered to the king in 1635 is indicative of an association which surpassed ordinary spheres of influence.[152] Indeed, Laud assumed a position of trust and confidence, enjoying easy access to the monarch to further his own agenda. He even used his close relationship with the crown to advance reform in the dioceses, criticizing George Coke, bishop of Hereford since 1636, for mismanagement of issues such as patronage: 'I am not only unsatisfyed in the Busines[s], but ashamed of itt.'[153]

Where Laud stood on the issue of clerical advancement is not too difficult to measure, but William Juxon, the Lord Treasurer from 1636, had many hopes riding on his back. Whether he agreed with the prediction that 'he will find the office the easier, because it was smooth[e]d & made to his hand by the Commissioners', notably William Laud, is open to some doubt.[154] His reputation for uprightness, however, preceded him – he secured the appointment on 6 March 1635–6 with 'the yo[u]ng frye of the Clergye' overjoyed at the prospect of 'the Joyning of the whyte Sleaves and the whyte Staffe'[155] – but a couple of years later Wentworth received Laud's concern that Juxon possessed neither the strength of character nor the determination of will for the post:

> As for the King[']s Coffers, the lock of them is too much at Command, and there be too many keyes. The Lord Treasorour[,] to my Knowledge[,] would use providence enough, were he let alone; but were I in his Case they should command the Staffe when they would, but not a penny of money, till those difficultyes [in Scotland] were over.[156]

[152] O. Millar (ed.), *Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I* (Glasgow, 1960), p. 130. Charles followed Laud's vision closely and intently, so much so that the archbishop believed that 'he should need no other assistance': Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 163. Charles was more than willing to lend his authority to Laud's ecclesiastical designs, possessing a shared hatred of irreverence and sacrilege. The Earl of Dorset, hardly a signed–up Laudian sympathiser, praised Laud's undying faith towards the king, 'so upright in his place that never any that sate in his place before him had cleaner hands than he': Bodl., MS Tanner 67, fo. 91r. Charles equated ceremony with a stable secular order through his single-minded promotion of divines and decoration, which severely tested the apparent loyalty of his subjects. Both 'acted in close collaboration': Russell, *Causes*, p. 112. Laud acted as the *de facto* head of the commission during the winter of 1635.

[153] BL, Add. MS 64917, fo. 41v: Laud to George Coke, 27 Oct. 1638: 'I shall forbeare to acquaynt the King w[i]th it; Unlesse farther Complaint, or Other Necessity urge me to it.' Laud claimed to be 'sorry' to write about it: ibid.

[154] WWM, Str P 15/365: James Howell to Wentworth, 15 Mar. 1635–6. Laud coveted the office.

[155] WWM, Str P 16/3: George Garrard to Wentworth, 5 Apr. 1636: 'The Clergye are soe high here'.

[156] WWM, Str P 7/156v: Laud to Wentworth, 29 Dec. 1638. This folder is one of the very few, alongside no. 1, that is foliated rather than paginated or item numbered. It is strictly foliated on the reverse side from 7/36 onwards. Many letters testify, however, to Juxon's proficiency as Lord Treasurer: Bodl., MS Douce 393, fos 54r–65r.

Many years later in his marginalia to Prynne's *Breviate of the Life of William Laud*, he confided, 'I hope it was no Crime to pray for him in that slippery place & that the Church might have no hurt by it.'[157] Wentworth, not Laud, was the disappointed one, however – few letters to Juxon survive;[158] he communicated 'once a yeare at least'.[159] Brian Quintrell's contention that 'the bland and amenable Juxon' assumed the role due to 'the king's tight grip on patronage', wishing to pass over Laud, lacks evidential weight.[160] Gerald Aylmer has even argued that 'if Charles had really had the "root of the matter" in him, known an able man when he saw one, and felt that he could manage men of ability, he should have brought Strafford back from Ireland … and made him Lord Treasurer',[161] but William Juxon, 'his understudy',[162] appears not as inconspicuous a choice as originally thought.[163] Alongside his religious career were his financial connections – he had been educated, much like Laud, at the Merchant Taylors' School and was related to Nicholas Crispe, leasing land from successive bishops of London.[164] Juxon and the archbishop experienced a somewhat troubled relationship – he wished he would be as 'brave' with 'the Revenew' as the Lord Deputy was.[165] Laud, nevertheless, strongly believed that the 'grave and experienced men' of clerical stature were 'far fitter' to exercise power 'than many young youths which are in either House [of Commons or Lords].'[166] While Juxon never assumed the role of Laud's minion,[167]

---

[157] Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 21v. Cf. Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 175: 'the known architect'.

[158] He did not wish to 'trouble' Juxon (WWM, Str P 3/295: Wentworth to Juxon and Cottington, 26 Aug. 1637), giving him 'the paynes of reading my Empty lines' (WWM, Str P 3/296: same to same, 20 Sept. 1637). It has been argued that Wentworth did not possess 'enough self-belief' for the position; however, the sheer forcefulness – and strength – of his personality, in fact, dissuaded Charles from choosing him for the position: Cust, *Charles I*, p. 172.

[159] WWM, Str P 3/296: same to same, 20 Sept. 1637. See also L. James, 'Introduction' in *The Household Accounts of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1635–1642*, ed. eadem (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. xxxvi–xxxvii: 'Juxon did not feel the need regularly to ingratiate himself with his ecclesiastical superior [Laud].'

[160] B. Quintrell, 'The Church Triumphant? The Emergence of a Spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635–1636', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 108.

[161] G.E. Aylmer, 'Charles I', in W. Lamont (ed.), *The Tudors and Stuarts* (1976), p. 125. Mark C. Fissel agrees, dismissing Juxon as 'a bad choice for Lord Treasurer anyway': idem, *Bishops' Wars*, p. 295.

[162] Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 39.

[163] A. Foster, 'The Clerical Estate Revitalised', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 141: 'as William Laud proudly recorded in his diary.' See also *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, ed. Questier, p. 198: John Southcot to Peter Biddulph, 16 Aug. 1633: '[Juxon] being a creature of Laud[']s and promoted by him.'

[164] T.A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582–1663: Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury* (1985), pp. 19–20 and 91–2. He had many attributes and associations. Crispe was described by Laud in 1639 as 'a man that I have been long acquainted with, and is a forward servant of the King's to his utmost power': Laud, *Works*, vii, p. 567.

[165] WWM, Str P 7/117v: Laud to Wentworth, 22 June 1638: 'my hopes growe extreamly faint.'

[166] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 194. See also Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, pp. 173–5. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fos 69v–70r: 'A Libell sett up by the People at the Entrance to the Parliam[en]t House. The voice of God is the Cry of the People' (18 May 1641).

[167] WWM, Str P 15/206: Garrard to Wentworth, 1 Sept. 1635: 'he [Juxon] hath the Good Opinion of every man.' Without ever acquiring even in the eyes of hardcore polemicists such as William Prynne the odium that normally went with such an association, William Juxon succeeded in this secular–minded role.

he did follow the archbishop's footsteps strictly and sharply, adopting the role of President of St John's College, Oxford upon Laud's departure before becoming the bishop of London in October 1633. It is difficult to imagine a clergyman more loyal to the Laudian agenda, subscribing to all those tenets intrinsic to the 'beauty of holiness' and belatedly moving up the career ladder after Laud, after a long–expected elevation, being delivered the *congé d'élire* and thus becoming archbishop of Canterbury in September 1660.[168]

At the time of the appointment, Laud was highly satisfied – it has rightly been called a 'triumph'.[169] His scope for patronage was not as 'circumscribed' as first thought;[170] his diary entry was not 'the reluctant admission of a disappointed man' but a vastly understated declaration of success.[171] *Contra* Quintrell, his words were ***not*** those of a timid figure depressed at watching a governmental office slip out of his fingers. The Reformation had indelibly associated the clergy with affairs of state, but not 'since Henry 7.['s] time' had there been a churchman associated so deeply with the engine of state[172] – the first in holy orders for over one hundred and fifty years; it was a sign of 'the church triumphant'.[173] However unforeseen it may have been, Laud was 'infinitely pleased' and delighted meanwhile the burning flames of anticlericalism were fanned even further.[174]

---

[168] The modest ideals of the 'beauty of holiness', with which Laud fervently championed in the 1630s, had not merely survived but triumphantly surmounted the rage of iconoclasm to inform and shape liturgical usage of the Restoration church.

[169] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 540. Archbishop Laud enjoyed 'the satisfaction of seeing his own client Juxon installed in Portland's place': C.M. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (North Carolina, 1983), p. 20. The appointment was 'engineered' and 'secured' by Laud: J. Adamson, 'England Without Cromwell: What If Charles I Had Avoided the Civil War?', in N. Ferguson (ed.), *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (1997), p. 114 and Worden, *English Civil Wars*, p. 23. See Hallam, *Constitutional History*, i, p. 495: 'an astonishing proof of his influence'. Juxon was, at best, a conservative reformer: R. Ashton, *The City and the Court, 1603–1643* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 142 and 148.

[170] Cf. Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 92. Laud, *Works*, iii, pp. 215–16: 'Doctor Juxon, the Dean of Worcester, *at my suit* sworn Clerk of his Majesty's Closet. That I might have one that I might trust near his Majesty, if I grow weak' (my italics). See Fincham, 'Laud', p. 83: 'the most significant patron in church preferment in the 1630s.'

[171] Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 108. Quintrell quietly endorses Julian Davies' argument: ibid., p. 91, n. 31. Few, if any, lamented Weston's death: WWM, Str P 14/336: Viscount Conway to Wentworth, 17 Mar. 1634–5.

[172] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 226. See also *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages Informed to the Parliament* (11–18 Apr. 1644), p. 5 ('if the Church held not up its head now, hee had done what hee could, and could doe no more') and Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 164: 'I can see no treason in this, nor crime neither.'

[173] WWM, Str P 15/365: Howell to Wentworth, 15 Mar. 1635–6. In March 1635–6, the Venetian ambassador heard several '*complain freely that the most conspicuous offices … are falling by degrees into the hands of ecclesiastics, to the prejudice of the nobility*': *CSPV, 1632–6*, p. 531.

[174] Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 175: 'believed he had provided a stronger support for the church'. The argument that Laud was left 'isolated at court' does not match the reality: Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 88. Juxon and Laud had been rather close since their days at Oxford; the junior astutely fulfilled the senior's 'desires' – 'I thought it might stand w[i]th your L[ordshi]pp[']s liking': TNA, SP 16/87, fo. 68r: William Juxon to Laud, 26 Dec. 1627. One would not argue that he was ever 'Laud's man' (cf. Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 92), though

Within a matter of days in November 1640, the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, one of the two Secretaryships of State, and the Lord Treasurership (currently occupied by Juxon, who 'faced a fundamental conflict of interest in his dual roles'[175] as bishop as well as lord treasurer) had all been emptied. Laud, above all else, was firmly committed to preserving the majesty of the Personal Rule – a '*Coagmentatio duplex,* a double buckling' of the temple and the throne together which would resist all manner of lay intrusion – given that his prevailing influence in strategic negotiations with the king was based upon his conviction that God was owed 'the highest roome at the *Councell-Table*'.[176] His delayed execution may even have encouraged the king to persevere in his determination not to accept any swift deals.[177] While Wentworth might have been considered a 'Turnecote' by many individuals after the Forced Loan controversy in 1626–7,[178] such opinions and attitudes could not be ascribed to the archbishop who

Laud was not a defeated rival for the post; his power, in fact, rose in finance and foreign policy upon the passing of Weston. Rumours that Wentworth wanted the job continued to circulate upon his return to England in mid–1639 ('the likelyest & fittest man'), however: Bodl., MS Tanner 67, fo. 126r: Robert Hobart to [?], 18 Aug. 1639. Cf. Somewhat misguidedly following Quintrell's analysis, Richard Cust writes that Laud, indeed, 'made a serious bid to become lord treasurer himself': idem, *Charles I*, p. 173. See also C. St John–Smith, 'The Judiciary and the Political Use and Abuse of the Law by the Caroline Regime 1625–1640' (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2016), p. 178: 'The impetus to do this [appoint Juxon] came almost entirely from Charles I rather than Laud'. Wentworth had consistently – and quite strenuously – denied that he had ambitions for the post. See, e.g., WWM, Str P 8/208: Wentworth to George Wentworth, 25 Mar. 1635 ('intreat all my freinds that speake of it, to Silence it as much as may be, as a thing not to be intertained by me … it was the Place, in the whole world, the most unfitt for mee. And that I desire it should be soe understood by all that love me') and WWM, Str P 8/235: Wentworth to Earl of Dorset, 19 May 1635: 'I must implore out [of] love of you w[hi]ch suggests this thought in you, alltogether to Silence it, and suffer it never to depart forth of your lipps … I know too well the Treasorour[']s place and the Strength of my owne shoulders to undergoe the weight of itt'. This did not stop many other people believing the role should go to Wentworth (WWM, Str P 9/69, Necolalde, the Spanish ambassador, to Wentworth, 31 Mar. 1635: 'how necessary your presence is here'), although Cottington believed Laud would acquire it: WWM, Str P 15/253: Cottington to Wentworth, 30 Oct. 1635. By mid–autumn, in his last letter to Wentworth on the subject before Juxon's appointment, he was arguing that Laud would get the Treasurer's place, 'who w[i]thout all doubt wyll be most unfitt, yet better he then none': ibid.

[175] Mason, *Juxon*, p. 91. See also TNA, SP 16/397, fo. 39v: information spoken by Captain Napier, 8 Aug. 1638: in the summer of 1638, Napier was overhead saying at a lodging house about the impending Scottish invasion that 'there is the Lord ~~of~~ Treasurer … who is Bishop of London, but no man can serve God & Mammon'.

[176] W. Laud, *A Sermon Preached on Munday, the Sixt of February, at Westminster at the Opening of Parliament. By the Bishop of S. Davids* (1626), pp. 12 and 21–22. However, it cannot be held that Laud was a mere 'statesman' – as noted in intro n. 8 and White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 245, n. 35 – since he acquired the maturity of a theologian at the Univ. of Oxford, spending three decades there – almost half of his entire life. Peter Heylyn regarded William Juxon's appointment as Lord Treasurer in 1635–6 as an attempt by Laud to further the tithe cause: idem, *Cyprianus*, p. 304.

[177] M.J. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008), p. 360: 'Laud's death, three weeks before the Uxbridge negotiations opened, can have done little to make Charles interested in peace.' See also P. King, 'The Episcopate During the Civil Wars, 1642–1649', *EHR*, 83 (1968), esp. p. 529. Archbishop Laud was duly declared 'our … great martyr'd Patriarch … of ever blessed memory': *The Remains of Denis Granville*, ed. G. Ornsby (Surtees Soc., vol. 47, 1865), p. 94. See also BL, Harl. MS 166, fo. 269v: less than a year after the English and Scots had laboured to reach a negotiated settlement with Charles I at Uxbridge in the early months of 1644–5, relations between the two kingdoms had deteriorated to such an incomprehensible extent that it was widely believed that a new war against 'the Scott[']s Army' was not only inevitable but imminent.

[178] BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 11v. See also R. Cust, 'Wentworth's "Change of Sides" in the 1620s', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, pp. 63–80, esp. pp. 74–7. See as well LPL, MS 1253, fos 99v–101r: in 1627, when Thomas Perkins, a groom to the Earl of Lincoln, was censured by the Star Chamber for circulating an anti–'Loane' tract, bishops Laud and Neile had called his offense treasonous and gradually extended its definition.

remained staunchly averse to the Renaissance pursuit of self–fashioning. From his elevation to the Privy Council in April 1627, however, Laud enjoyed the unequivocal support of the reigning monarch, Charles I.[179] Rather than seeking to get one off the hook whilst simultaneously impaling the other, the formidable deeds of their 'working relationship' ought to be reassessed in much closer detail. Its 'character' should be revised in the light of many 'areas of harmony and points of friction',[180] since the Irish and Scottish policies of conformity, at least, were not royal initiatives of 'Caesaro–sacramentalism',[181] but the determined pursuits of an archbishop desperate for success. While Charles I and Wentworth have been studied in exhaustive detail,[182] often with the latter seeking his Majesty's 'allowance of what I have done',[183] Laud remains cast

---

[179] R. Lockyer, *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1485–1714* (2005), p. 308: 'Laud worked so closely with the King that it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between their respective contributions to decision-making.' Laud still enjoyed complete control at the start of the 1640s, as reflected in the king's refusal to admit the earl of Leicester as Secretary of State. By mid–Jan. 1640, the Treasurer of the Household, Henry Vane, was being rumoured as the next Secretary of State 'in his [Coke's] room' (see TNA, SP 16/442, fo. 95v: Thomas Smith to John Pennington, 17 Jan. 1639–40). At the Treaty of Newport in late 1648, Brian Duppa was instructing the king to make concessions at precisely the same climactic moment that he was assisting in emboldening his royal image as staunchly committed to the decrees of the Church: S. Kelsey, 'The Kings' Book: *Eikon Basilike* and the English Revolution of 1649', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution, c.1590–1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 150–68, esp. pp. 155–6. Charles I failed to adequately supply a preaching ministry unlike one of his predecessors, Elizabeth I, who 'used to *tune the Pulpits*': Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 161. Laud was also associated with – indeed he may even have actively encouraged – prosecutions for 'any Simony' which, if proven, meant the patronage for that turn fell to the crown: Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service, 705:73/14450/406/454: Laud to Lord Keeper Coventry, 14 Aug. 1633.

[180] Fincham, 'Laud', p. 93. Idem, 'Restoration of Altars', p. 940: 'A reassessment of Charles I's rule as supreme governor, assisted by a powerful Laudian interest, is long overdue.'

[181] Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, esp. pp. 18–24. Davies speaks of 'Charles I's attachment to Laud' (ibid., p. 60), but earlier dismisses their partnership by referencing the times in which 'Charles gave only lukewarm endorsement to Laud's policies': ibid., p. 44. For the best all-round character sketches of Charles I, see Cust, *Charles I*, chs 3–6 and Russell, *Causes*, ch. 8 ('The Man Charles Stuart'), although there are several interpretational differences between these accounts, the former adopting a post–revisionist point–of–view, the latter embracing revisionism. See also J.S. Hart, 'Rhetoric and Reality: Images of Parliament as Great Council', in Braddick *et al.* (eds), *Experience of Revolution*, p. 75: 'Charles I's near–pathological reliance on private counsel.' See also K. Forkan, 'Strafford's Irish Army 1640–41' (National Univ. of Ireland, Galway M.A. thesis, 1999), p. 70: 'If, after Strafford's removal, the king continued with the unpopular policies advocated by Strafford and Laud, it would become clear that he was a man with whom any parliament would find it impossible to do business.'

[182] Charles I, according to Laud, 'knew not how to be, or be made great': Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 443. See also Durston, *Charles I*, p. 68: 'This rueful observation remains the perfect epitaph for Charles I and his ill–starred reign.'

[183] WWM, Str P 6/131: Wentworth to Laud, 16 Dec. 1634. See also WWM, Str P 6/23: same to same, 31 Jan. 1633–4: 'your Lo[rdshi]p should do me a mighty favour to transmitt hither unto me what opinion is made ther[e]of on that side, especially how his Ma[jes]ty rests satisfyed w[i]th my poore indeavours ther[e]in.' Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, ch. 7, sees Charles' commitment to Wentworth rather than Laud as a blend of regal stubbornness. Charles I observed that his ecclesiastical reforms were in line with his father's: [Charles I], *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland* (1639), pp. 15–18. James I, after all, had died while a public form of liturgy was being created: ibid., p. 17. Wentworth was far more successful in his attempt/s to control the most senior secular posts. By 1640–1, he had removed a number of men who he regarded as opponents of 'Thorough', although it had been necessary to use a financial gift – which Laud, indeed, regarded as a bribe – in his attempt to oust Lord Mountnorris from the Vice–Treasurer's post. The ousting of Mountnorris and Loftus as well as his actions against the Earl of Cork and Piers Crosby earned him numerous powerful enemies at court and a reputation for rough dealing. See also F. Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', *JEH*, 33 (1982), p. 559: 'Laud is the first archbishop of the post–Reformation era to have left behind him no reputation for generous hospitality.' Laudian hagiography was, in any case, muted. The oft–promised rehabilitation of Laud has never materialized, despite the best efforts of Peter Heylyn.

aside as a point of reference and reduced to a mere footnote in many of the leading textbooks. Some scholars have contended rather that Laud was far too inflexible and stubborn, too obsessed with his own convictions and resolve to be an effective leader.

During the turbulent decade of the 1640s, however, the king had few individuals to whom to turn at moments of personal and ecclesiastical crisis. John Williams and James Ussher may have assumed a far greater role in the first half of the decade,[184] but neither attained nor achieved the all-embracing influence of Archbishop Laud.[185] He had indeed possessed 'the king's *full* concurrence' in his doctrinal and liturgical reforms,[186] but Charles I was obliged to relinquish support as storm clouds gathered.[187] The king felt a certain degree of pitiful sorrow at the fate of the Earl of Strafford, protesting that it was a grave error, but Laud's death is never mentioned in *Eikon Basilike*.[188] Upon the implementation of new statutes at the University of Oxford in mid–1636,[189] Secretary Coke effusively praised the archbishop, 'this worthy prelate', who as chancellor had made it 'his chief work to recover to the Church … what may be now restored',[190] but

---

[184] Williams and Ussher, however, were effectively marginalized by 1644 – Williams taking retirement to Wales, Ussher facing the prospect of alienation due to the king and court's recourse to Irish Catholics for military support.
[185] A. Milton, 'Sacrilege and Compromise: Court Divines and the King's Conscience, 1642–1649', in M.J. Braddick *et al.* (eds), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 135: 'Charles in the 1640s had no clerical adviser remotely equivalent to William Laud in the 1630s'.
[186] Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 163 (my italics).
[187] NRS, GD406/1/167: Charles I to Hamilton, 2 Dec. 1642: 'I have sett up my rest upon the justice of my Cause, being resolved that no extreamitie or misfortune shall make me yeald, for I will eather bee a glori[o]us King or a patient Martir'.
[188] Laud reacted to his sentence of death with studied composure. Peter Heylyn reported that 'he neither entertained the news with a *Stoical Apathy*, nor wailed his fate with weak and womanish Lamentations (to which Extremes most men are carried in this case)': Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 529.
[189] See Dent, *Protestant Reformers*, p. 221: 'Throughout the 1590s, the Calvinist message rang loudly and clearly from the Oxford pulpits, with few to challenge it.'
[190] Laud, *Works*, v, p. 128. Sharpe argues that Laud's reforms at Oxford were not religiously inspired, pursuing 'not doctrinal controversy, but a learned ministry': idem, 'Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford', in H. Lloyd–Jones *et al.* (eds), *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor–Roper* (1981), p. 157. See, however, Univ. of Nottingham, Manuscripts and Special Collections, MS Cl C 73: Francis Cheynell to Gervase Clifton, n.d. July 1636, for a discussion of 'a man [Laud] whose worth was [in] every way equall to his Honour', a figure whose 'power at the court' was ever–growing and would 'promote the glory of our university': 'wee did all esteeme him … for our studyes and Patron for our preferments.' He is referenced as 'greate' on both sides of the first folio (r and v), though there is a telling exchange – 'a long debate' – which involved Charles I when 'the Arc[h]B[isho]p[']s power of ~~visitation~~ visitinge the universityes was tryed'. Laud insisted upon visiting 'by a power inherent in his See', a power which derives 'immediately from God', but gave way to the king's complaints that it would justify Wolsey's '*Ego et Rex meus*' and thereafter 'fell lowe, upon his knees': ibid. The wrong date – June 1636 – is given in Fincham and Lake's essay in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 255, n. 52; in fact, the letter is dated a month later. It is an *ex post facto* report of a detailed hearing at Hampton Court on 21 June 1636, in which 'the last weeke' of that month saw counsel from the Univ. of Cambridge rebutting Laud's metropolitical claims of '*Jure divino*' authority. See further Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 73. See also CUL, MS Add. 22(c), fo. 7r: Charles proclaimed 'that both universities may receave the same rule, goe on the same way, and soe bee the happye mother of all pietye and union through the church'. See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 37: 'I say B[isho]ps are jure divino Apostolico'. These are the words of Laud. Coke also had, much earlier even, portrayed James I's personal horror at the Overbury scandal: 'the heynousnes[s] of it hath made the king[']s eyes shedd teares, and his bowells to yearne.' Bodl., MS Willis 58, fo. 225r.

scarcely half a decade later Laud was left alone in the Tower with few, if any, documents and/or persons for company.[191] He was also '*scandalously and without reason blamed*' as the king's chief ecclesiastical advisor with regard to Scotland in 1638,[192] but Laud complained that it was 'not the Scottish Businesse alone that I looke upon, but the whole frame of things at home and abroad … and my misgiving soule is deepely Apprehensive of noe small evills comeing on.'[193] Scholars portray the archbishop as a much spent force by the end of the decade, accumulating offices and powers at precisely the same moment as the Scottish crisis (1637–8), in which he had 'bitten off more than he could chew'.[194] Although Laud was never held in too much esteem in his own day – he was considered as tactless and troublesome by many – he proved highly influential in crafting policy, recognising that Charles I 'loves extreamly to have such things [policies], especially once moved, to come frome himself' but arguably shaping the very questions which were asked.[195] It still remains the case, however, that 'a substantial study of Laud' is 'necessary',[196] for his role in government and the church has yet to be sufficiently explored. Indeed, Peter Heylyn's adverse picture of the English Church overrun with zealous Calvinists has led many to endorse, near–impulsively and implicitly, his much wider narrative,[197] a vision which remains in stark contrast to Peter White's cosy and warm interpretation of advanced 'Anglicanism', however.[198] *Cyprianus Anglicus* thus lacks the merits of critical assessments. Laud, indeed, produced a full–scale conformist clericalism, which looked

---

[191] Laud's chancellorship tried to foster a 'perfect model for the commonweal, an academy from which those nurtured through discipline to virtue might emerge as governors of a well–ordered nation'; this model was showcased to Charles I during his magnificent visitation in 1636: Sharpe, 'Laud and the University of Oxford', pp. 146–164, at p. 150.
[192] *CSPV, 1636–9*, p. 395. See also New College, Oxford, MS 9502 (unfoliated): 27 Apr. 1638: 'The businesse of Scotland is much talked on [i.e. the Covenanter revolution of 1638–9] … what the issue of it will be none know'.
[193] WWM, Str P 7/119v: Laud to Wentworth, 22 June 1638.
[194] Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 296. See also Carlton, *Laud*, pp. 166–7.
[195] WWM, Str P 6/362: same to same, 26 Sept. 1636.
[196] A. Milton, [Review of C. Carlton's *Archbishop William Laud*], *JEH*, 41 (1990), p. 504: 'a difficult task'.
[197] Cf. Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 54: 'Confidence in Heylyn's grasp of the overall pattern of English religious developments … does not, of course, obviate the need for further research into the career of Laud'. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, esp. p. 51, for 'the disposition of those times [pre–Caroline] … that there was little to be seen in it of the Church of *England*, according to the Principles and Positions upon which it was at first Reformed ... the *Calvinian* Rigors in matters of *Predestination* … *Episcopacy* maintained by halves, not as a distinct *Order* … [and] the Church of *Rome* inveighed against as the *Whore of Babylon*'.
[198] White, '*Via Media*', p. 229: 'It was not so much the novelty of policy but its vigour that distinguishes the 1630s.' In his much broader monograph, White dismisses Heylyn's – as well as Prynne's – opinions as 'the language of polemic' (idem, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic,* p. 11), distinguishing it from 'the resolution of the great antinomies', e.g. faith and works, grace and nature, assurance and doubt, which is defined as 'the essence of theology': ibid., p. 5. See also the claim in a libel of c.1635 that a Laudian bishop, ardently committed to his own ceremonialism, was actively encouraging the 'hig~~he~~ aulter' to be erected in some parish churches: SRO, Q/SR/217, no. 29.

back to the pre–Reformation church for its view of the church's role and importance in the commonwealth, and which certainly sought to break in important ways from the sort of reformed tradition inside which even Archbishop Whitgift had operated.[199] In periods of polarisation and confrontation between precisian and conformist, Laud often presented himself and his advocates as the underdogs.

Historians have unquestionably expanded the parameters of their concerns, examining political culture and *mentalités* – the interface between politics and ideas – as new and much welcome topics of investigation. However, the role played by Archbishop Laud in the ecclesiastical reforms of the 1630s has remained partially undiscovered.[200] This dissertation re–examines his surviving correspondence with members and antagonists of the court[201] in an attempt to go some way towards shedding light on the complex nature of alliances and divisions forged by this *éminence grise*, those who were *in* and *out*side the charmed circle of Laudian respectability. He was not a consummate politician,[202] knowing the right people and backing the right protégés, but his behind–the–scenes manoeuvrings were so successful that they have remained covertly hidden. No work has yet tried in any detail to assess his relationship/s with the major figures of the Caroline era. Laudianism, in part, emerges in this dissertation not as a neutral concern with unity but as a theologically potent force, a divinely inspired insult to the Reformation and a positive, though disruptive, drive towards the 'beauty of holiness'. There has, indeed, been an exasperating – and often quite puzzling – course of development in the historiography of Laudianism which is insufficiently recognised and which provokes this dissertation. It is no longer necessary to adopt at face value his

---

[199] Archbishop Whitgift explained that 'he could not a low [*sic*] of it [the printing of John Rainold's manuscript], because of summe glauncinge matters in this tyme': Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 318, fo. 139r: 4 Dec. 1584. See also R.A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560–1642* (1960), chs 4–6 and 10. The provocative nature of Laudianism is somewhat played down. See, e.g., p. 56, for 'the success achieved by Neile's administration.'
[200] This has not stopped historians from concluding that Laud's role in policy-making was minimal: J-L. Kim, 'The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the Character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637', in Braddick *et al.* (eds), *Experience of Revolution*, p. 20 and *passim*. Based upon an uneven interpretation of Caroline liturgical policies, this essay downplays the archbishop's agency and overvalues that of Charles I ('dominated by the king'): ibid.
[201] Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 210: Charles I's court was 'exclusive, distant and innovatory in its ways.' See also Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists*, p. 192: 'the growing power of Archbishop Laud at court.'
[202] 'You would be directed & ruled by no body … nor make yourself noo p[ar]tie at court but stood uppon yourself': TNA, SP 16/484, fo. 137r: John Lambe to Laud, 4 Oct. 1641. While he has proven to be an elusive historical actor, Laud categorically failed to escape the accusation of high treason at his trial in 1643–4. James admits in her conclusion, however, that 'the archbishop did *not* have to face prosecution for *any* of his Scottish activities': eadem, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 170 (my italics). See also Worcester College, Oxford, Clarke MS 71 (unfoliated: it should be noted that, although the pages are bound together, the MS is unfoliated. This makes it almost impossible to refer to specific folios in the documents other than the dates): 16 Apr. 1644: though, Ireland was mentioned partly with regard to 'my Lord of Strafford[']s Case'.

artful protestations of innocence,[203] deflecting criticism and discouraging complaints by often invoking the king's will.[204] His pre–eminence in ecclesiastical matters was unrivalled; he proved a powerful force in the three British churches, both in terms of doctrine and discipline, protecting his close interests whilst pushing forward his own policies. The archbishop was a figure of immense strength whose personal 'manner could be abrupt and his tone aggressive' – someone to admire, if not emulate[205] – but whose deft command of the details, despite relying upon an astute team of secretaries to write the majority of his letters,[206] led him into a peerless and supreme position of unqualified courage and conviction. Viscount Saye and Sele wasted no time in the opening session of the Long Parliament in denouncing Laud as 'mean … troublesome and busy', a man whose 'waspishness and proud Carriage' had allowed him to overcome the low level of 'his Breeding'.[207] Laud's impeachment and execution were not simply – or only – 'a sacrificial offering that would gratify the Scots',[208] although he ceased to be of much wider symbolic significance in Parliament's immediate redress of grievances in the winter of 1640–1. It would be another three years before there were serious steps taken to prosecute him – a dark and dismal time in the Tower of London

---

203 Neither is it necessary to adopt Sharpe's perspective in which Laud is 'the executor rather than deviser of royal policy', an ingenuous bureaucrat whose own writings and sermons eschewed matters of religious controversy: idem, *Personal Rule*, p. 285. Virtually every detail of Sharpe's portrait is intended to counter images of a vindictive and censorious archbishop – images that built on, deepened and developed those caricatures found in satirical pamphlets designed to ridicule his fears and to anathematize his doctrines: H. Pierce, 'Anti–Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645', *HJ*, 47 (2004), pp. 809–48, esp. pp. 812–13.

204 See, however, Charles I's personal intervention in Oxford in mid–1631 when Laud's power as chancellor had been challenged: Laud, *Works*, v, pp. 49–74. For much looser citations of the king's wishes and/or will, see Laud, *Corresp.*, pp. 32, 67 and 164. Laud tendered his formal resignation in June 1641: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 242.

205 Fincham, 'Introduction', p. l: 'but on other occasions he could be diplomatic, prudent and foresighted'.

206 To manage the archbishop's burdensome level of work, the team was spear–headed by the official secretary, William Dell, who sometimes wrote under his own name on Laud's behalf. See, e.g., Laud, *Corresp.*, pp. 168–9. See also St John's College, MS 260, fo. 2v: 'There was a Servant of the Archb[isho]p[']s (whose name I thinke was Mr [William] Dell)' at Laud's execution on Tower Hill in London on 10 Jan. 1644–5.

207 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 44r–v, at fo. 44r (6 Mar. 1640–1): 'L[ord] Say[e] touched upon the Birth of the L[ord] of Cant[erbury]'. Bishop Williams defended Saye against Laud's charge that he was a 'Separatist'; 'His Grace [Laud] w[oul]d not have called the L[ord] Say[e], [a] Separatist, had he known him so well as he': ibid., fo. 45r. See also ibid, fo. 13v: 'At 2 of the Clock [3 Feb. 1640–1] in the Banqueting House, the Two Houses wait upon the King, where the King first gives them thanks for the Care they had of the Maintenance of [the] Religion Established, from w[hi]ch he would never swerve'. Williams once said Laud 'abounds in passion and rashness': ibid., fo. 45r. Saye and Sele protested about the king's – and Strafford's erstwhile ally's – presence at Strafford's trial ('it was not a House while the King was there'): ibid., fo. 52v.

208 Cf. Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 203. See also ibid., pp. 610–11, n. 93 and James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 159: 'Anglo-Scottish interests merged with the anti-episcopal movement to orchestrate Laud's downfall'. Royalists had been debating the legitimacy of seeking the assistance of the Scots since, at least, the death of Laud in early 1644–5: D. Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–9' in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, p. 52. Laud knew that his process of impeachment was following hard behind the condemnation of the canons and several other bishops feared that too vigorous a defence of the canons would lead to their own impeachment. David Scott's account of the fluidity of divisions within royalism is superlative: idem, 'Counsel and Cabal in the King's Party, 1642–1646', in J. McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 112–35.

lay in wait for 'a marked man',[209] subject to delays and deferrals as Parliament grappled with much larger issues,[210] amongst which was the dismantling of the prerogative courts of Star Chamber and High Commission in mid–1641, and dealt with many 'divers[e] weighty Reasons'.[211] Laud had long established himself as Charles' confidant, '*seeing the king privately*'[212] less than twelve months into his archbishopric and promoting, in turn, Richard Neile to York in 1632,[213] William Piers to Bath and Wells in late 1632 and Matthew Wren to Hereford in 1634, all of whose appointments he *never* denied at his trial in 1643–4.[214] 'Hearty & playne', [215] Laud acquired a much enhanced status as a patronage broker,[216] both spiritual and secular, during the decade

---

209 James, '*This Great Firebrand'*, p. 152. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 42v: 'presently sent to prison [rather than under house arrest in Charing Cross, in custody of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, James Maxwell], and to be sequest[e]red from all Eccl[esiast]icall Power … That Mr Maxwell undertaking for him, he should continue with him till Monday [1 Mar. 1640–1], and then go to the Tower.' Laud had remained under house arrest for a 'full ten weeks' at Maxwell's house: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 240. Laud noted Maxwell's 'love and care' towards him during his house arrest: ibid., p. 437. Prynne claimed that it was at Maxwell's house 'where he then burned most of his privy Letters and papers', but there is an annotated denial in Laud's hand: 'Mr Maxwell was by command of the Hon[oura]ble House to be by me all the while, And he was not one minute from me & know's [*sic*] I did not burn any [of] the paper': Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 23v. Wentworth had previously been committed to Maxwell's care, but for a much shorter period: a fortnight from 11 to 25 Nov. 1640 upon the instigation of John Pym *et al.*: BL, Stowe MS 361, fo. 79r–v (Pym's speech to the Lords, 11 Nov. 1640). See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 465 and Bodl., MS Rawl. Poet 26, fo. 122v: 'The Primate [Laud] is now brought under the rod, / And is to bee disciplined, [']till hee serves God, / His King & his Country, in other wayes, / Then ever hee practiced in his old dayes.' ('A Song or Ballad in Parliament–tyme. 1640.')

210 Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle, Sy: Y.I.47.: 'Since his Ma[jes]tie hath been graciously pleased to declare that all matters civill shall there be determined by Parliam[en]t' (15 Mar. 1640–1).

211 The trial was postponed endlessly and, indeed, tiresomely – see Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 16 Jan. 1643–4 ('hee should have further time granted him') – but eventually lasted from 12 Mar. 1643–4 to 29 July 1644. According to John Wilde, the 'distractions of the time' were the principal reason for the delay along with many 'other impediments', which Laud chose to mean that there were few individuals other than William Prynne malicious enough 'to search into such a forsaken business': Laud, *Works*, iv, pp. 54—5.

212 *CSPV, 1632–6*, p. 226: 2 June 1634. See Cust, *Charles I*, p. 135: 'the administrative and managerial skills that the archbishop possessed in abundance.'

213 SRO, D1287/9/8 (A/92): 'A Relation of what was observed & done in the Lord Archb[isho]p of York[']s visitation of the Dioces[e] of Chester [Richard Neile's] Anno Domini 1633, concerning the state of the Churches, Clergie, & Church Service': Neile's officials had been instructed to report back names of those 'of whom it were well some notice were taken.'

214 See, e.g., Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 5 July 1644: 'there were divers[e] others'. See also A. Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, p. 135, n. 4: 'Laud does not at any stage seem to have told deliberate untruths at his trial, even if he often withheld incriminating evidence.' On 18 Dec. 1640, Lord Paget stood up in the Painted Chamber in Westminster Palace to read the charges against Laud made by the Scottish Commissioners before a joint committee of both houses. This was before the archbishop was given over to the custody of James Maxwell, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod. Wishing 'to avoid the gazing of the people', Laud did not travel there until it was nighttime: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 239. At a conference with the Commons in December 1640, two Petitioner Lords – Viscount Mandeville and Lord Paget– presented Pym with the Scots' treason charges against Strafford and Laud. For both as Petitioner Lords, see their signature on a copy of the petition, see BL, Harl. MS 4931, fo. 67r–v.

215 BL, Add. MS 69868, fo. 128r: George Coke, the then nominated bishop of Bristol, to John Coke, 25 Nov. 1632: 'I was this day w[i]th my Lord of London [Laud] to give him thankes [for the appointment]'. This was much before their rift six years later. See n. 141 above. For the 'great affection' that Laud had for his brother, John, however, see BL, Add. MS 69868, at fo. 128r and ch. 1, n. 47 below.

216 Laud became a conduit between court and king. See, e.g., *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, ed. Questier, p. 253: Smith to Laud, 15/25 Apr. 1635: in a letter to Laud in mid–1635, Smith claimed that despite those who accused him of being 'hatefull to my king and country at home', he implored Laud to persuade the king of his loyalties to the king and the church. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 40r: 'He abused the Power that was intrusted

of the 1630s, selecting, *inter alios*, bishops, deans and prebendaries for the royal stamp of approval.[217] Combined with his close and intimate relationship to the throne, 'all ecclesiastical preferments hung' on the archbishop's shoulders.[218] 'Socially and psychologically uncertain,'[219] Laud was a key figure of enormous power whose contribution *and* importance to clerical politics during the reign of Charles I,[220] diminishing the pervasive control of the laity over the privileges and jurisdiction of the episcopate and the ministry, has only lately begun to be examined and understood. Unlike the work of Kevin Sharpe, this thesis sees factional intrigue disturbing the alleged peace of the Caroline court far more intensely, though somewhat haphazardly, than has been hitherto suggested.[221] It aims to shed some light on the complex nature of Laud's alliances with influential members of the Caroline court. Laud, for instance, often lamented the existence of bitter rivalries.[222] His prosecution by the Long Parliament was slow and laborious,[223] but Laud remained committed to his glorious

---

unto him by promoting Prelates, Priests, [and] Chaplains, which were either Popish or unsound in Religion, or manners.'

[217] Quintrell's claim that Laud felt 'perturbed' and 'despondent' at the selection of William Juxon as Lord Treasurer in 1635–6 has already been sufficiently dismissed: idem, 'Church Triumphant', p. 105. Laud, in fact, appointed Juxon, alongside Matthew Wren, Walter Curle and Brian Duppa ('my worthy friends'), as 'overseers' of his will on 13 Jan. 1643–4, exactly a year before his execution: Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 450. Laud signified Juxon's promotion to the diocese of Hereford in 1633 before the latter's speedy advancement to London. See Fincham, 'Laud', p. 79, n. 43. Quintrell relies almost entirely upon the interpretation of Charles I once advanced by Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, esp. pp. 24–45, claiming that 'the prominence accorded to Laud's supposed role in the choice of Juxon has served to obscure that of the king': idem, 'Church Triumphant', p. 99. Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 299: 'the role of the king has been seriously underestimated'. See as well Shepherd, 'Political Patronage', p. 143: 'Laud was therefore unlikely to have played any great role in advancing Juxon's career'.

[218] J. Oglander, *A Royalist's Notebook* (New York, 1971), p. 59: 'he then being an eminent man'. Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 39: 'the issue of preferment provides further evidence that Laud's influence has been exaggerated and that of the king underestimated.' See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 263: 'It has been *Laud*[']s great care, as he grew into credit with his Majesty, to give a stop to such corruptions as had been used too frequently in the Court, about Church Preferments'.

[219] Carlton, *Laud*, p. 228.

[220] Durston, *Charles I* (1998), p. 49: 'Charles was undeniably the principal author of his own considerable misfortune'. As early as 1626, Charles had promised Laud the deanery of the Chapel, the clerkship of the Closet and even the see of Canterbury: Laud, *Works*, iii, pp. 161 and 196. See also Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists*, p. 114: it was on the trip to Spain in 1623 when Charles made up his mind about which brand of Protestantism he would subscribe to: he became a convinced anti–Calvinist (his views 'may, therefore, date approximately from this point.')

[221] Sharpe, *Personal Rul*e, pp. 177–9 and idem, 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625–1642', in D. Starkey (ed.), *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987), pp. 252–7.

[222] See, e.g., WWM, Str P 7/152v: Laud to Wentworth, 29 Dec. 1638. The idea, however, that there were no factional rivalries at the Caroline court (e.g. Kevin Sharpe and others) does not square with the reaction of contemporaries who complained of the existence of long–term competition at court.

[223] After months of delay, the initiative produced suddenly 'a long reporte' on the archbishop's treasons within two days 'to bee read by the clarke of the howse' (BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 256r: 24 Feb. 1640–1) – at the exact same moment the Scottish Commissioners were publishing their declaration calling for justice against 'these two Incendiaries [Laud and Wentworth]': *From the Commissioners of Scotland, 24 February, 1640* (1641). The Pro–Scottish faction in the English Parliament, led by John Pym in the Commons, was concerned with a thorough reformation not only in Church but also in the state; as early as 11 May 1641, the Covenanting leadership had designated them 'the Commonwealth[']s men': Univ. of Edinburgh Library, MS Dc.4.16. (Instructions of the Committee of Estates of Scotland, 1640–41), pp. 101 and 105.

self–pursuit of rebuilding St Paul's Cathedral.[224] Laud was determined to ensure greater efficiency, probity and uniformity throughout all of the British isles: the promotion of *Thorough* – seen as unnecessary and unwarranted Anglicizing by many – in regulating government, landed title and, most importantly, religious policy. In many ways, he has left behind a vast and multifaceted series of documents including a diary,[225] a set of sermons, his speeches, publications and much else besides, though it remains difficult to ascertain his opinions without first consulting the extensive reams of correspondence.[226] Indeed, Chapter One examines his alliance with the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Thomas Wentworth, through their voluminous letters.[227] Explicit in their heavy–handed profusions of loyalty to *Thorough* – a strident notion as much as a straightforward policy of zealous support for the crown which became paramount in both of their minds – it is argued that this close partnership developed in the winter of 1629–30 upon Wentworth's admission onto the Privy Council and blossomed into an intimate friendship sustained by shared objectives and enemies.[228] The second chapter, meanwhile, addresses the conflict between Wentworth and the Earl of Cork in 1634–5 through Laud's fairly distant gaze. Wentworth's assault upon Cork's family tomb in St Patrick's Cathedral, for example, provides a snapshot of a power struggle as the Lord Deputy attempted to establish his unequivocal authority in ecclesiastical matters.

---

[224] CUL, MS Add. 7339/137: Laud to Arthur Ingram, 19 June 1638: 'this Magnificent Worke, the Re–edifying of St Paule[']s Church'. See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 15: Edward Bond, it was alleged by Laud, had contributed to the repair of St Paul's 'willingly', i.e. without any threats or oppression and SRO, Q/SR/214, no. 4 (15 Apr. 1634): the rates for contributions to 'the repaire of St Paule[']s Church' were based on the subsidy in Staffordshire and Bodl., MS Tanner 142, fo. 61r: in a 7 Apr. 1636 letter to Laud, the Laudian minister George Cottington asked Laud to probe the king as to whether they could make 'better use' of some funds for 'the reparac[i]on of St. Paul[']s Church'. Laud 'justly' defended donations to St Paul's at his trial. See, e.g., Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 31. St '*Paul's*' Cathedral served as Laud's 'perpetuall *monument*': Dering, *Collection of Speeches*, p. 5. See also Hull History Centre, C BRI/23 and C BRI/24 for the commission to collect contributions for St Paul's repair. See also Prior's Kitchen: Hunter MS 67, item 14, for Bishop Neile's remark that 'I have preached often times at Pauls'.

[225] Shepherd, 'Political Patronage', p. 133: 'Even though Laud may have written his diary merely for the benefit of his own reputation to posterity, it is extremely unlikely that he would have intentionally lied in something which was at the time of writing intended solely for private use.'

[226] Cromartie attempts to analyse Laud's textual remains devoid of context. Such a pursuit allows him to claim that few, if any, scholars have 'attempted the unpretentious task of using *all* the volumes of his nineteenth–century *Works* to sketch his theological opinions': idem, 'Laud', p. 76. Laud wrote 771 letters to various authorities: Fincham, 'Introduction', p. xxi.

[227] The earliest extant letter from Wentworth to Laud is 3 Oct. 1630 (TNA, SP 16/174, fo. 11r), which discussed the 'willfull folly' of Peter Smart in 'the Highe Commission'. Addressed from 'Yorke', i.e. much before his appointment as the Lord Deputy of Ireland: ibid. The next available letter from Wentworth was written on 4 June 1633 (WWM, Str P 8/2–5), that is, over thirty months afterwards when Laud was only still the Bishop of London. As aforementioned, the vast majority of letters are contained within WWM, Str Ps 6 (15 Nov. 1633 – 15 Nov. 1636) and 7 (20 Nov. 1636 – 25 May 1639), but a few bits of correspondence are contained in other folders, such as Str Ps 12, 13 and 20.

[228] Cf. Carlton, *Laud*, p. 134: 'Laud's enemies – who were never as numerous as he believed'.

Laud's assistance in Cork's relentless prosecution proved very complex. Chapter three also looks much closer at Laud's complex associations with the crypto–papists – Weston, Cottington and Windebanke – an understudied group at the Caroline court surveyed through a subtle examination of their collective manoeuvres against the archbishop and his resultant distrust of them. It is suggested that while they often found agreement amongst themselves in terms of policy direction the many incompatibilities and suspicions arose out of a mutual fear of unchecked ambition. Accusations of inspired motives and secret malice abounded – it was not so much an issue of principle as it was a clash of personalities.[229] Their correspondence, indeed, operated within 'a siege mentality and kind of exclusiveness'.[230] Laud became a very capable administrator in the reconstruction of the Church of England, albeit one who succumbed to a conspiratorial obsession. Chapter four studies finally – and extensively the Star Chamber trial of William Prynne for *Histrio-mastix* in 1633–4, using a wide plethora of manuscript material to reconstruct Laud's aims and intentions. It has been the case – all too regularly amongst legal historians, it seems – to assume that William Prynne faced little, if no, opportunity to defend his book. It is hoped to prove a corrective to views of Puritanism as an entirely oppositionist force centred on the *classis* movement and teetering on the edge of open separation.

As Peter White claims, however, the model of a Calvinist majority versus an Arminian minority is 'simply inadequate'.[231] However, as will become evident throughout this thesis, Tyacke's central argument – that Laud was 'a leading architect of religious change during the 1630s'[232] – is taken as accepted.[233] In so far as it attempts to

---

[229] This chapter adds weight to Malcolm Smuts' contention that political disagreement between privy councillors was not so much to do with constitutional principles ('intellectual dimensions') than 'more practical' statecraft. See, e.g., M. Smuts, 'Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain', in B. Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (2003), pp. 284–8, at. p. 288.
[230] Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 188.
[231] White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic,* p. 11. However, White's 'Anglicanism' is far too uncontroversial an ideology of order. It presupposes a continuous existence of a broadly 'Anglican' identity which ignores continental influences in favour of homegrown talent such as John Jewel and Richard Hooker: ibid., esp. pp. 69–74 and ch. 7. He continues to argue that the 'oppositionist' categories of 'Puritan' and 'Arminian' obscure matters more.
[232] Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 70. See Tyacke's point that Laud's ideal was firmly predicated upon an unquestioning faith in the soteriological power of the sacraments, a position saliently out of alignment with the predestinarian doctrines of the Fathers of the English Reformation: idem, *Anti–Calvinists*, ch. 8.
[233] Though do see the contrasting – and much welcome – opinions of: *Times Literary Supplement* (1987): 21 Aug., p. 899 (4403: Conrad Russell); 4 Sept., p. 955 (4405: Ian Green); and 18 Sept., (4407: Thomas Cogswell), p. 1017. In his review of *Anti–Calvinists,* Christopher Haigh suggested that Tyacke's central thesis mistakenly offered 'a desperately–needed explanation for the English Civil War': C. Haigh, [Review of N. Tyacke's *Anti–Calvinists*], *EHR*, 103 (1988), p. 425. However, Tyacke remains absolutely correct in saying that 'the 1620s, taken as a whole, saw a dramatic shift in official Church of England teachings': idem, *Anti–Calvinists*, p. 106. See also CUL, MS

understand 'Laud's own odyssey',[234] this account is intended, however, as a formal balance to the biographies of Trevor–Roper and Carlton.[235] Unfortunately, no personal archive of Laud's papers is known to be in existence. In the absence of a personal archive such as Lord Deputy Wentworth's, the private man remains largely irrecoverable, so that perforce the biography, indeed, centres on a very public career. We lack a sound study. Letters written by him are piecemeal and spread amongst many archives and depositories, namely – but not restricted to – Lambeth Palace and the British Library.[236] It is, therefore, imperative to contextualise his episcopal career by considering the social and political circles in which he moved, especially those occasioned by his elevation to the bishopric of St David's in November 1621. Laud also shared a much wider religious agenda that drew him into a nexus of leading English clergymen which included such luminaries as Richard Neile, Archbishop of York[237] and Matthew Wren, Bishop of Norwich and Ely. There is perhaps no more enduring representation of an English clerical leader than Laud's portrait by Anthony van Dyck.[238] This thesis contends that where Laud's papers are not extant, the political path he traversed in association with these important allies give strong indications as to his own ideology or, for want of a better term, *mentalité*. The untimely destruction of the Elizabethan settlement of religion,[239] the ecclesiastical *status quo*, welcomed a new crisis of religious opinion. Focusing on Laudianism has to a considerable extent subsumed Laud himself within a wider movement at the expense of any real examination of his own ideas. Born out of a conviction that almost too much has already

---

Dd.12.22, fo. 52r: during that decade Fanshaw said, 'our Religion is att stake, & I am glad to heare that the Arminians shall be by proclamation cried downe.'

[234] N. Tyacke, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001), p. 21.

[235] Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, *passim* and Carlton, *Laud*, *passim*.

[236] However, congratulations must go to Professor Fincham, whose Laud, *Corresp.* superbly compiles over two hundred hitherto unknown letters from many archives, depositories and libraries.

[237] Richard Neile was one of Laud's closest and most intimate allies. See SRO, D1287/18/2: Laud to Neile, 15 Oct. 1639 (P/399/195): 'The state of the Scottish Affayres, as now they stand, cannot bee unknowne to you. Nor the violence w[hi]ch hath been used in Church Businesses'. It was Richard Neile as well who much earlier, in September 1609, selected his protégé Laud to preach a 'Sermon' *coram rege* for the first time: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 134. See as well V.E. Raymer, 'Durham House and the Emergence of Laudian Piety' (Harvard Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1981), p. 13: Like Laud, Neile never spent much, if any, of his time writing programmatic religious treatises but 'His great achievement was the systematic patronage and protection of a nascent ecclesiastical faction.'

[238] R.J. Willie, 'Sensing the Visual (Mis)representation of William Laud', *Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature*, 34 (2017), pp. 183–210, at p. 187: 'Laud's posture in the van Dyck portrait paradoxically exudes a sense of unease and discomfort as well as nonchalance, which, arguably, makes the instability of the visual image particularly apparent.'

[239] Trevor–Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, p. 42: 'Like all compromises, it [the Elizabethan settlement] depended for its success on a certain lack of definition'.

been said about *that* other side of the question – the Puritans[240] – this thesis follows Laud's development as Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 to his death in early 1644–5. In the four succeeding chapters, it is hoped to show some of the reasons why the archbishop became such a uniquely hated figure. The point of reinterpreting Laud is not to vindicate this much–maligned man, but rather to render his behaviour historically intelligible. In the history of political thought, in particular, Archbishop Laud has figured very little, although his obsession with the twin themes of order and hierarchy should have proven fruitful territory for historians. The present analysis of Laud is an exercise undertaken in precisely this spirit. There is most definitely 'a need for a [more] detailed study of the political thought of William Laud.'[241]

[240] P. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 294, 329 and 388–90: Collinson's intervention expertly demonstrated that the majority of Puritans were vitally integrated into the established Church; that is, they were seeking to reform it from within. He also argued that Puritans represented merely the leading edge of a broad body of Protestant and reformed opinion. They were able to exist – and even thrive – *within* the established church.
[241] G. Burgess, 'The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered', *EHR*, 107 (1992), p. 857, n. 1 See also Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 235: 'There is no modern full–length study of Archbishop Laud.'

Chapter 1: 'I doe not see any Reformation possible, w[i]thout some Severity'[242]: Laud, Wentworth and the Church of Ireland, 1633–41

In May 1639, Laud made a bitter speech in the Court of Star Chamber where Piers Crosby, 'in Estate very lowe, and a h[e]art wholly Irishe; full of vanitye, ambitious to be held a man on whom the Irishrye forsoothe depende', was on trial for libelling Thomas Wentworth, the later Earl of Strafford.[243] 'The State', he declared,

> doth not owe a little to my Lord Deputy that the kingdom of Ireland is kept in that great peace and security; for at this day (God be thanked) that kingdom is at peace, notwithstanding the multitude of Scots in that kingdom, and those rebels that are within an hour and a half's passage of Ireland. No part of England is in more security than they are at this time; and, under God and the King, I can attribute it to nothing but the wisdom, courage, and care of my Lord Deputy; and therefore God forbid offenders against his reputation should go away without exemplary punishment.[244]

George Goring's early admonition, that Crosby was 'like to have a shrewd tug in the Star Chamber', had finally materialised.[245] The court, which divided seven to three against Crosby, implicitly accepted the motive ascribed to him by the Yorkshire MP, Francis Wortley: 'my Lord Deputy bore a hard hand in *Ireland*, and wished my Lord Deputy displaced, and My Lord *Falkland* in it again.' Although he confessed to having 'heard heretofore well of Sir *Piers Crosby*', Laud bore him the least affection: 'if such

---

[242] WWM, Str P 6/40: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4. What follows is a considerably expanded version of the seminar paper one gave to 'British History in the 17th Century' at the Institute of Historical Research, London in the early winter of 2018, which was occasioned by an invitation to speak by Professor Fincham.

[243] WWM, Str P 5/162: Wentworth to John Coke, 16 Dec. 1634. He complained about 'all such Libertines as himselfe [Crosby]': ibid. See WWM, Str P 3(ii)/66: Wentworth to John Wintour, 16 Apr. 1639: 'of very meane Judgment, held for very vaine and slight by as many as truly and inwardly know him'. Crosby, knight and baronet, was deemed a renegade privy councillor, a corrupt figure of little talent who desired nothing but his own material advantage. He would triumphantly return not many months later as a key witness at Wentworth's trial, however. See also WWM, Str P 10(b)/24: Wentworth to Cottington, 8 Dec. 1638, asked for Cottington's support in the Crosby case: 'written to my lords of the Privy Councell ... he [Crosby] may be Examined'.

[244] Laud, *Works*, vii, pp. 649–50.

[245] *CSPD, 1635–6*, p. 554. It is not surprising that Conway could not 'finde any man that is his fr[i]end, for his owne sake' (WWM, Str P 14/275: Conway to Wentworth, 20 Jan. 1634–5), with Crosby leading a successful attack on an innocuous crown bill in that year. In response to an agent's suggestion that he show to Laud papers concerning Crosby's prosecution, Wentworth wrote, 'the more of my freinds that are acquainted w[i]th it the better', a remark that underscores the importance of maintaining more than one political association: WWM, Str P 21/157: Wentworth to William Raylton, 18 Sept. 1636. William Raylton, this man–of–business, was in a position to observe courtly manoeuvres: '410 [Crosby] was in the Privy Chamber very bould and briske, and was kindly saluted by the eldest Sonne of 175 [Earl of Arundel], but noe conference at all': WWM, Str P 16/58: Raylton to Wentworth, 14 Sept. 1636. For much more on the Crosby case, see B. Kane, 'Scandal, Wentworth's deputyship and the breakdown of Stuart honour politics', in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Reshaping Ireland, 1550–1700: Colonization and Its Consequences* (Dublin, 2011), pp. 147–62.

a thing shall go unpunished, or with a light punishment, no Man in his Place can live in safety of his Life, Honour, and Fortune.' He bypassed 'the goodly Report' he had heard of him and proceeded straight to the crime. Such an unbridled speech, in which he 'spoke so fast, as at that Time the Pen could not hold pace with him',[246] confirmed the existing relationship between the earl and the archbishop, one that was characterised by fierce loyalty, mutual trust, passionate designs and good will.[247] George Radcliffe, member of the Privy Council of Ireland, might have been crucial to Crosby's earlier prosecution,[248] but Laud was always willing to broker on Wentworth's behalf with the king in contravention of Charles' rule that ministers approach him directly.[249] Their close relationship has been neglected in much recent scholarship, focusing more upon

---

[246] J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, 1618–48* (8 vols, 1659–1701), iii, pp. 893, 899, 897, 899 and 898.

[247] Wentworth was not an earl at this stage. He was elevated scarcely half a year later. He had hoped for an earldom as 'soe great a Marke of your favour' as early as 1634: WWM, Str P 3/133: Wentworth to Charles I, 20 Sept. 1634. In another letter to Charles I, he requested 'any marke of your Ma[jes]tie[']s favour' since he was regarded more as 'a Bashaw of Bud[dh]a then the minister of a Pious & Christian King' by Crosby *et al.*: WWM, Str P 3/259–60: same to same, 23 Aug. 1636. The king assured him that 'noble myndes ar[e] alwais accompanied with lawfull Ambitions' (WWM, Str P 40/7: Charles I to Wentworth, 23 Oct. 1634), but two years later showed signs of frustration and issued a rebuke: 'the cause of this desyer of yours, if it bee knowen, will rather hasten then discourage your Ennemies … the markes of my favo[u]rs that stopes maliti[o]us Tongues ar ne[i]ther Places nor Tytles, but the littell welcome I give to accusers, & the willing Eare I give to my Servants' (WWM, Str P 40/15: same to same, 3 Sep. 1636). Wentworth had hoped that an earldom would elevate him above his opponents, but Laud insisted that the king would only deal with requests person-to-person: WWM, Str P 6/352: Laud to Wentworth, 31 Aug. 1636. The earldom itself was not important; it was a test of the king's favour ('for such is the slo[w]nes[s] of Weston that Wentworth utterly dispaires of goeing thorow w[i]th the great worke before him, unlesse hee may have his immediate dependance upon 100 [the king]'): WWM, Str P 6/97: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Sept. 1634. See also Chatsworth House, Derbyshire, Cork MSS Box 17/92: William H. Lake to Earl of Cork, 6 Dec. 1631: 'Lo[rd] Wentworth … will be sent Deputy into Ireland.'

[248] WWM, Str P 5/159: Wentworth to Coke, 16 Dec. 1634. Radcliffe, Wentworth's legal advisor, close confidant and trusted man–of–affairs, was the only person allowed to visit Wentworth during his trial from 22 Mar. 1640–1. See also CUL, MS Add. 90, fo. 73r: on the 29 Dec. 1640, Radcliffe was accused 'of H[igh] Treason'. He was a key part of Wentworth's administration, acting as his legal counsel since the late 1610s, had married his cousin and shared his imprisonment for refusing the Forced Loan in 1627. Radcliffe became an important intermediary. See, e.g., WYAS, WYL100/PO/7/II/20: Radcliffe to Arthur Ingram, 4 Nov. 1635, for Radcliffe acknowledged that Ingram's letter of 20 Aug. 1635 concerning the demands of one Mr Brand had 'troubled me very much. My Lord Deputy thinkes his hono[u]r is ingaged, & that if Brand be not pay[e]d at his dayes, he must see him payde'. Ingram had already warned Radcliffe that he was not to pay Brand without his consent. Radcliffe felt that he was torn between them both and pleaded, 'What shall I doe? I am trusted by y[o]u by a letter of atturney, w[hi]ch trust I may not breake.' Radcliffe felt unable to deal with this issue any further: 'quit my handes of that account, & leave the money accordinge to the agreement w[i]th my Lord Deputy, for to me it belonges not.' He protested that 'money matters I will ~~quit myne handes~~ not med[d]le betwixt y[o]u: it beinge a matter above my pitch & reach. Other way then thus, to secure myselfe: I know not.' See also WWM, Str P 12/282: Charles Wilmot to Wentworth, 9 Mar. 1631–2: the 'Generall of the Armye', Charles Wilmot, informed him of the factious nature of the council. Wilmot cautioned him: 'you may fynde yourr assistants in Counsell keen to followe youe with united hartes, which I feare, youe will fynde some tro[u]ble.'

[249] Charles liked to have an immediate and personal relationship with his ministers of state. If they did not direct their questions through intermediaries, Charles I assured them of his continued 'favo[u]r': WWM, Str P 40/15: Charles I to Wentworth, 3 Sept. 1636. See also B. Quintrell, *Charles I, 1625–1640* (1993), p. 50. See as well National Archives of Ireland, MS 2445, fo. 331r (Viscount Falkland to Charles Coote, 18 Aug. 1633): Wentworth proved immune to external pressure from various ministers, a great 'freeness from faction – for that Tyranny shall have noe more dominion over hym – w[hi]ch he wyll sooner fynd them then I can discerne heare, and w[hi]ch I desire w[i]th the first to heare what he fynds'.

Wentworth's other ecclesiastical plenipotentiary, John Bramhall,[250] whose moves to restore ecclesiastical lands and negotiate favourable leases were liked by Laud. It did not help matters, though, that Piers Crosby had 'the Power of the Queene[']s Court', an institution that Wentworth reviled, on his side and the support, however discreet, of the Earl of Cork.[251] It was always Wentworth's strategy, on the other hand, to colour 'his courtly opponents as raw and lawless chieftains' and Crosby was no different.[252] Although he was 'alltogether unknowen' to him, 'by injury or benefitt', Lord Deputy Wentworth regarded him as 'Malevolent and Spightfull':

> There is not any thing in the Man but Formality, and that ever sett the Mutinouse way, ariseing from an overweaning in himself, that hee meritts more then a state can doe for him.[253]

It has been argued that 'Wentworth and Laud did *not* enjoy a close, personal relationship',[254] but their correspondence points to something much more complex.[255] Laud echoed the points about Crosby, confirming Wentworth's worst impressions.[256] It came as little surprise that 'a malitiouse Practise alleadged to be committed by S[i]r Piers Crosby', 'that Trifle of a fellow', was 'to Scandalise the Lord Deputy'.[257] Even though the dark business consumed plenty of 'tyme',[258] by mid-1639 'the Cause … is

---

[250] J. McCafferty, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633–1641* (Cambridge, 2007). Wentworth's rule is analysed in H. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland: A Study in Absolutism* (Manchester, 1959), but his profound alliance with Laud receives only a cursory glance: ibid., pp. 31 and 112–13. See also Parliamentary Archives, HL/PO/JO/5/1/7: Crosby witnessed Wentworth allegedly say that any 'Act of State' would be binding (26 Mar. 1641). See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 268: Bramhall once said of Wentworth, '*That it was not possible for the Intentions of a mortal Man, to be more serious and sincere in those things that concerned the good of the* Irish *Church, that his Lordships were*.'

[251] WWM, Str P 16/19: John Temple, the earl of Leicester's *homme d'affaires* at court, to Wentworth, 18 Apr. 1636 and T.O. Ranger, 'The Career of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork in Ireland, 1588–1643' (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1959), pp. 370–1. For more on Cork, see ch. 2.

[252] J.F. Merritt, 'Power and Communication: Thomas Wentworth and Government at a Distance during the Personal Rule, 1629–1635', in eadem (ed.), *Political World of ... Wentworth*, p. 129. He was singled out for criticism, however, as 'the silly man': WWM, Str P 3/260: Wentworth to Charles I, 23 Aug. 1636.

[253] WWM, Str P 5/162: Wentworth to Coke, 16 Dec. 1634.

[254] F. Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40' (Univ. of Liverpool Ph.D. thesis, 1995), p. 84 (my italics). See p. 91: 'the absence of a close friendship' and 'Laud and Wentworth managed to disagree over personalities and politics.' Merritt also argues that 'Wentworth deliberately sought to create an impression of intimacy, the better to convince his correspondent of the closeness of their political alliance': eadem, 'Power and Communication', p. 120.

[255] CALS, DLT/B43, p. 7: 'His [Wentworth's] morall qualityes are hard ~~to be~~ described.' Ibid., p. 3: 'Thomas [Wentworth] of whom I ~~speake~~ now come to speake had his Education as other gentlemen of his condition at Schoole & university, Innes of Court, and France.'

[256] WWM, Str P 7/185v: Laud to Wentworth, 1 May 1639: 'Cause against S[i]r Piers Crosby is now comeing on.'

[257] WWM, Str P 10(a)/23: George Radcliffe *et al.* to Commissioners of Star Chamber, 13 June 1637. 'That Trifle of a fellow' is from WWM, Str P 7/189v: Wentworth to Laud, 25 May 1639. Originally in the summer of 1635, both men had gone their separate ways – the conspiracy case took time to develop, being taken into custody in 1636.

[258] WWM, Str P 7/184v: Laud to Wentworth, 1 May 1639.

now at last to fall in judgment before your Lo[rdshi]ps in the Starr Chamber'.[259] Wentworth was confident in his 'owne Innocency & Crosby[']s villa[i]ny'.[260] Crosby was at this stage financially drained and Wentworth found himself much bound to the court for their justice in the case – he strongly believed that if he was not recompensed, 'let none ever be confident in a good Cause.'[261] Laud played an understated, though decisive, role in the judicial proceedings, ensuring that 'Wentworth's systematic defamation … [and] studied derision' of Crosby went ahead uninterrupted in court. He was also 'Wentworth's most prominent correspondent.'[262]

Despite the fact that Wentworth's relationship with Lord Treasurer Weston had fallen on stony ground[263] – he was formerly described as being 'a heavie blocke in your waye'[264] – few, if any, at court managed to out-manoeuvre him.[265] It was Laud, however, who first nurtured their association in the hope that Wentworth's appointment

---

[259] WWM, Str P 10(a)/298: Wentworth to Francis Willoughby, 12 Apr. 1639: 'and there I trust by God[']s Grace to be quitt from one of the most impudent and false Conspiracyes that, as I thinke, was ever hatched against soe great a Minister as the Deputy of Ireland is'.

[260] WWM, Str P 7/190: Wentworth to Laud, 25 May 1639: 'the most apparant things in the world.'

[261] WWM, Str P 10(a)/319: Wentworth to Countess of Carlisle, 25 May 1639. Wentworth's accounts also detail payments made to the Countess of Carlisle, for which George Radcliffe insists was only a 'Platonick' relationship: CALS, DLT/B43, p. 8. Piers Crosby was fined 'five thousand pounds dammage': WWM, Str P 10(a)/323: Wentworth to Earl of Barrymore, 29 May 1639.

[262] A. Clarke, 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590–1646: Wentworth's "Tawney Ribbon"', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26 (1988), p. 158 and Merritt, 'Power and Communication', p. 118. The Earl of Dorset was said 'not [to] beleeve one word' which uttered from Wentworth's mouth in this case: WWM, Str P 10(a)/339: Wentworth to Earl of Dorset, 24 July 1639.

[263] Wentworth described Weston as 'the heavyest Adversary I ever had' (WWM, Str P 8/221: Wentworth to Earl of Newcastle, 9 Apr. 1635) while Laud was equally scathing of a man of 'such Delay and uncertainty': WWM, Str P 6/109: Laud to Wentworth, 20 Oct. 1634. His death in March 1634–5 caused Wentworth to be delivered from a 'mighty and determined malice': WWM Str P 6/163: Wentworth to Laud, 13 Apr. 1635. The assumption that Wentworth 'enjoyed from the beginning the full confidence' of Lord Treasurer Weston is mistaken: C. Brady, 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroys, 1541–1641', in B. Bradshaw *et al.* (eds), *The British Problem, c.1534–1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (Basingstoke, 1996), p. 115. Weston had supported Wentworth's appointment to Ireland to remove him from the English political scene: WWM Str P 21/76: Wentworth to Edward Stanhope, 25 Oct. 1631. Wentworth 'described Weston as the 'very principal' of his friends' (Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 148), but the quote is taken from a letter written by him to deny allegations that he was seeking to replace Weston as Lord Treasurer – 'sum sham[e]lesse person or other hath insinuated' – of which there had been rumours in circulation since 1629: WWM, Str P 21/98: Wentworth to Weston, 21 Oct. 1632 and BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 31r ('it is reported that … Weston … will resigne': June 1629).

[264] WWM, Str P 6/187: Laud to Wentworth, 12 May 1635. Shortly after Weston's death, Laud wrote that England and Ireland would benefit by 'this writt of Remove' since he was 'soe farr short of being soe good a servant as the King tooke him for': ibid. and Str P 6/194: same to same, 12 June 1635. Upon hearing of his ill health, Wentworth claimed that he was praying for 'his happy Recovery' – he had been dead for almost a fortnight by then: WWM, Str P 3/185: Wentworth to Cottington, 26 Mar. 1635. After finding out about his death, the Lord Deputy attacked the way in which Weston had treated him ('his displeasure'): WWM, Str P 3/212: same to same, 13 July 1635. For more on this, see ch. 3. Wentworth himself fell in 1640. See, e.g., Bodl., MS Carte 1, fo. 197r (Wandesford to Ormond, 26 May 1640): 'I am not satisfyed, that these great distempers of his bodye came without some strong and violent operations of his mynde … these great disturbances w[hi]ch are now fallen out, upon this unhappy dissolution of [the Short] Parl[i]ament'.

[265] 'My Lo[rd] Treasurer is *Dominus factotum*, unto whom the residue, they say, are but cyphers': BL, Harl. MS 390, fo. 448r: Joseph Mead to Martin Stuteville, 1 Nov. 1628. Charles ordered Wentworth as President to 'certefie our Thre[a]surer of England for the tyme beinge the true Accounts of all sumes of money': Bodl., MS Rawl. C.197, fo. 25v. Weston was still 'potent in Court': WWM, Str P 6/138: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Jan. 1634–5.

would offer him a chance to reform the Church of Ireland.[266] It is assumed that they both formed a recognisable faction at court,[267] but this developed, if at all, because they were isolated – to speak of a united association would be to exaggerate the depth of their relationship. Their surviving correspondence dates from 1630, comprising over two hundred and thirty letters;[268] the two characters feature in the historiography very closely as budding architects and promoters of *Thorough*, the authoritarian policy of reform that opposed self-interest and lax administration[269] – both wrote in cipher, much to Laud's distaste.[270] Their correspondence predates a meeting of 21 January 1630–1, as recorded in Laud's diary,[271] and it probably developed in the summer of 1630 following Alexander Leighton's trial. C.V. Wedgwood stressed the significance of the 21 Jan. meeting, but was seemingly unaware of correspondence between the two as early as Oct. 1630.[272] Who contacted whom remains a disputed – and unanswerable – question,[273] but it seems that Leighton's views would have provoked mutual disgust

[266] 'The state and condition' of the Irish Church was 'deplorable': WWM, Str P 8/16: same to same, 16 Aug. 1633. Wentworth wasn't entirely sure about taking the position. Warwickshire County Record Office, CR2017/C48/9: Nicholas to Lord Feilding, 13 Dec. 1631: 'never was there as yet such an officer [Lord Deputy], that lost not ground att Court throughe his absence, & the envy of maligne p[er]sons.'
[267] See George Wentworth's comments on the Irish court in particular: WWM, Str P 8/84–90 ('Journall of the businesse commanded me by your Lo[rdship] to the Court of Engl[and]').
[268] Letters dating from before Laud's promotion as archbishop (1630–3) can be found in WWM, Str Ps 8, 12 and 20, but the vast majority of correspondence is included in WWM, Str Ps 6 and 7 dated from 15 Nov. 1633.
[269] See, e.g., Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 132–45. Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 100: 'two names alone stand out like giants, Wentworth and Laud, determined to resist disruptive activities in every form'. Kearney regards *Thorough* as a delusion of grandeur, 'in its essentials a policy of force, in which political concession and negotiation were regarded as signs of weakness' (idem, *Strafford*, pp. 6–7, at p. 7), whilst Charles Carlton sees it as 'more the expression of the impatience of Laud and Wentworth': idem, *Laud*, p. 117. Laud even used the term, '*thorough*', in a letter to John Bramhall, later bishop of Derry, as early as the summer of 1633: HMC, *Hastings*, ed. F. Bickley (4 vols, 1928–47), iv, p. 55: Laud to Bramhall, 16 Aug. 1633.
[270] WWM, Str P 6/26: Laud to Wentworth, 13 Jan. 1633–4: 'God in heaven knowes what I shall make of it.' By Laud's third surviving letter, he was commenting on the length of Wentworth's 'lardge' letters (WWM, Str P 12/184: same to same, 28 Dec. 1630), but was 'most Confident, if either of us faile our letters will be finger[e]d': WWM, Str P 6/289: same to same, 30 Nov. 1635. See also WWM, Str P 6/279: same to same, 16 Nov. 1635: with 'the multitude of pressing occasions I have yet had noe leisure at all soe much as to read them [the letters]'. WWM, Str P 6/292: Wentworth to Laud, 3 Jan. 1635–6: 'never trouble you w[i]th Cipher more then needs must'.
[271] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 213. A few months after Alexander Leighton's case, Laud mentions that he was closeted in his 'little chamber at London–house' with Wentworth. Laud wrote of the dangers inherent in the position: WWM, Str P 20/110: Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1632 (misdated to 1631 – indeed, he refers to 'Secretarye Windebank').
[272] C.V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford, 1593–1641: A Revaluation* (1961), p. 91. Laud's diary contains little reference to Wentworth – the next entry relates to his impeachment on 11 Nov. 1640: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 238. Leighton claimed that his appearance in Star Chamber in 1630 'did occasion their combination' (idem, *An Epitome or Briefe Discoverie* [1646], p. 68, recte, p. 76), this being confirmed by Laud: WWM Str P 12/184: same to same, 28 Dec. 1630. It was also alleged that Wentworth began supporting episcopacy at this time, perceiving 'that the support and defence of the *Hierarchy* would make *him Great'*: ibid. In June 1630, they were both present together at four council meetings: *Acts of the Privy Council, Charles I* (11 vols, 1929–64), vi, pp. 5, 12, 16 and 24. Heylyn does not allude to Leighton's punishment, but states that 'such inviolable Friendship' developed after Wentworth was sworn a Privy Councillor as early as Nov. 1629: idem, *Cyprianus*, p. 194. See also F. Pogson, 'Making and Maintaining Political Alliances during the Personal Rule of Charles I: Wentworth's Associations with Laud and Cottington', *History*, 84 (1999) p. 56: Laud was 'Wentworth's most valuable supporter at court.'
[273] Cf. 'The two men must, in the long interview – sought, *one imagines*, by Wentworth in the first place – have laid the foundations of their mutual understanding': Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 91 (my italics). She forgets to mention that Wentworth attended Laud's admission as Chancellor of Oxford in mid–1630: Laud, *Work*s, v, p. 7.

from them both: Laud was impressed by Wentworth's 'many violent and virulent expressions' at the trial.[274] Laud maintained a self-righteous opposition to the pursuit of 'private ends' rather than 'public service';[275] Wentworth recognised the importance of engaging allies at the Caroline court. His energetic administration of the Council of the North from 1628, the presidency of which he had his eyes set on for two years, also held out promise for Ireland.[276] It was promoted as an efficient body with respect to a multitude of administrative business, 'even towards that great worke of Reformation in Religion'.[277] In December 1628, Wentworth outlined the relationship between the monarch and his subjects, but stated

> my House hono[u]r'd, myself entrusted w[i]th the rich Dispensac[i]on of a Soverai[g]n Goodness, nay assured of all these before I ask'd, before I thought of any. Can you shew me so sudden, so strange variety in a private Fortune? Tell me, was there ever such over-measure? The like Credit given to so weak a Debtor? Baulked indeed before I begin, owing more both to King, & People than I shall ever be able to repay to either.[278]

By the autumn of 1632, Charles I was made aware of their 'good correspondencye'.[279]

While Wentworth seemed to enjoy a talent for making bitter enemies, Laud's caution and hesitancy often served to restrain the Lord Deputy's actions, though neither were quick to overlook opposition to their reforms. The affairs of state and politics of the court were much more alien to the Yorkshire landowner.[280] He was also lacklustre in his aim to pull the church into doctrinal conformity with England, though he acquiesced

---

[274] Leighton, *Epitome*, p. 68, recte, p. 76. Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 131: 'it was the beginning of a long intimacy.'
[275] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 221. Wentworth specifically identified the need for able men and requested that 'sufficient and credible persons be chosen to supplie such Bishopricks as shall fall voide': WWM, Str P 21/86: 'Propositions to be considered of by his Ma[jes]tie concerning the Government of Irelande', 17 Feb. 1631–2.
[276] F. Pogson, 'Wentworth as President of the Council of the North, 1628–41', in J.C. Appleby *et al.* (eds), *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England, 1000–1700* (1997), pp. 185–98. 'Wee earnestly require the saide Lord President & whole Counsell … from henceforth to use severitie against notable offenders and to punish them w[i]thout longe delaie not onely by paine of boddy and imprisonm[e]nt butt also by good fyynes': Bodl., MS Rawl. C.197, fo. 26v. It was rumoured that Wentworth was to be replaced by the Earl of Newcastle upon his appointment, but this never materialized due to Wentworth's insistence that he retained the presidency, for fear that 'the tyme hath raysed a noyse of my going into Irelande': WWM, Str P 21/80: Wentworth to Stanhope, 11 Dec. 1631. Both of these manuscript sources are unknown and/or unused by Dr Fiona Pogson.
[277] WWM, Str P 6/238: Wentworth to Laud, 12 Sept. 1635 (misdated to 1634).
[278] Bodl., MS Tanner 72, fo. 300r: 'Wentworth's Speech, when he first sate as President of the North.'
[279] WWM, Str P 20/112: Laud to Wentworth, 1 Oct. 1632: 'both honest men & mye servants'.
[280] WWM, Str P 6/1: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1633: 'how I served you at Yorke, And your Churchworke there.' Wentworth from mid–1629 performed his apt management of the northern commission, keeping in close contact with key court supporters between Yorkshire and London: F. Pogson, 'Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission', *Recusant History*, 24 (1999), pp. 271–87, esp. pp. 274–78. See also WWM, Str P 13/209: Philip Darrell's estimate of the recusancy commission's income in late 1633. (Wentworth's claim to have raised the annual yield from £2,000 to £9,500 was *not* a gross exaggeration).

in Laud's strong insistence on passing the Thirty-Nine Articles by Convocation.[281] Their characters complemented each other both in terms of policy and personality: Wentworth's keen strength of will could often inspire the more grounded and pessimistic archbishop. 'He was a man who not only saw his role in heroic terms', Terence Ranger once argued, 'but who actually tried to effect the impossible.'[282]

Laud experienced few, if any, problems with the limits of his formal jurisdiction, despite being the first archbishop to adopt an active interest in the Church of Ireland.[283] Neither was Wentworth slow in pursuing his aims and exercising his newfound capacity for direct action. Laud hoped to recover the material wealth of the church – a position only achievable, according to Wentworth, after the debts of the crown had been cleared and the army established on a firm footing.[284] It was held 'to be of Absolute Necessity' that the kingdom had sufficient martial forces[285] – Wentworth believed his orders for the government of the army, 'the principall Nerve of his Ma[jes]tie[']s Power', would 'prove a worke of much labour, And procure me many enemyes',[286] though Cork and Loftus had advised as much.[287] It would be a slow and arduous process, 'so vast a

---

281 Laud made plain his impatience with – and mistrust of – parliamentary procedure. See J. McCafferty, '"God Bless Your Free Church of Ireland": Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation of 1634', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, pp. 187–208, esp. pp. 192–3. Wentworth had written to him, nonetheless, about the viability of passing the canons, holding it 'most needfull your Lo[rdshi]p would take a Course that all the Cannons now in force in England should be imposed upon this Clergy': WWM, Str P 6/20: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Jan. 1633–4. Laud later admitted to Wentworth that some of the English canons 'will not p[re]sently fitt that Churche', but still argued that their introduction would remove 'such a Confusion … as hath hitherto been among them': WWM, Str P 6/143: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Jan. 1634–5. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 215: '*Laud*[']s care as great for preserving the King[']s Authority and the Churches['] peace as it was in *England*.' See also BL, Add. MS 35838, fo. 109r: Wentworth to the Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, 10 Dec. 1634. Wentworth wrote to the prolocutor demanding a straight vote without debate and 'a particular account [of] how each man gives his vote.'

282 T. Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation', *Past and Present*, 19 (1961), p. 44.

283 Morrill, 'A British Patriarchy?', p. 213. Whitgift, Bancroft and Abbot all intervened in Ireland, as and when required by their royal master, but circumstances radically changed post–1633. Laud viewed the Church of Ireland as a sister church, albeit one with inferior determinative qualities.

284 'I will by the help of God set this Crowne out of Debt, and settle the Constant Payment of the Army, w[i]thout any future Chardg[e] to the Crowne of England': WWM, Str P 6/81: Wentworth to Laud, 19 July 1634.

285 WWM, Str P 3/160: Wentworth's speech to both Houses of Parliament in Ireland, 15 July 1634. A month earlier Wentworth made similar remarks to the king for 'the tranquility and safety of this your dominion & People': WWM, Str P 3/96–7, at 97: Wentworth to Charles I, 17 June 1634. See also WWM, Str P 5/22: Wentworth to Coke, 26 Oct. 1633: 'There hath such a Strange Neglect attended this Army'. According to Malcolm Smuts, 'Ireland in the 1630s provides a classic example of an attempt to erect a civil polity through autocratic government backed by an army': idem, 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture', in I. Atherton *et al.* (eds), *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006), p. 31. See also WWM, Str P 12/271: Lord Wilmot to Wentworth, 10 Jan. 1631–2: 'beware howe youe doe dysarme him [the king] at his first Comings … By a smale force perhaps, He maye gett some smale thynges … But by a force of Some shew, youe maye not doubt, but to doe what youe please'.

286 WWM, Str P 5/27: same to same, 7 Dec. 1633. It would take four and a half years for the army to be in 'such … good Order': WWM, Str P 7/126v: Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1638.

287 WWM, Str P 1/33: Lords Justice, Cork and Loftus to Wentworth, 27 Feb. 1631–2: 'wee may not advise the lessening of them [the army] to a fewer number then as now they stand.'

worke' that was only attainable 'in good tyme'.[288] Wentworth had been informed by Windebanke that many captains and officers were 'absent from their Charge', lacking the requisite vigour,[289] and can be found complaining that the army was 'extreamly out of frame[,] an army rather in name then deed; whether you consider the[i]r numbers, their weapons, or their discipline',[290] but on the very same day he hinted to John Coke that if he raised the prospect of a Parliament they would 'instantly' give their consent to improvement 'w[i]th all the Chearfullnes[s] possible'.[291] What was 'formerly cried downe as an impossible worke' was celebrated as a 'Maisterpeece',[292] but Wentworth was also keen to emphasise the support that they offered to the crown and church – 'Ther[e] is no greater truth, then that in this Kingdome, the King were not to be obeyed, the Bish[o]ps not to exercise their functions w[i]thout the Countenance and Support of an army'[293] – and he insisted that its 'reformation … shall be pursued w[i]thout delay.'[294] His forceful management of the Irish economy also made the country self-sufficient, even prosperous, ceasing to be a burden on the Exchequer. Any diminution of this, and the power of the church, would preclude all possibility of the Irish people escaping their state of 'prophanenesse and Barbarisme'.[295] Neither Laud nor Wentworth had the faintest idea about the impending disaster in 1641, a *coup d'état*,[296]

---

[288] WWM, Str P 8/17: Wentworth to Laud, 9 Sept. 1633.
[289] WWM, Str P 4/25: Francis Windebanke, signet on behalf of Charles I, to Wentworth, n.d. but mid–late 1633. See also WWM, Str P 5/48: Wentworth to Coke, 3 Mar. 1633–4 and Str P 5/60: Wentworth to Windebanke, 6 Mar. 1633–4. At the start of March 1634, Wentworth sent a letter to each of the king's principal secretaries of state, John Coke and Francis Windebanke, giving his forthright opinion on the responsibilities of viceroy. In this brief account, he began with a blistering attack on all of those who advised the king 'to put Jealouse Restraints, and Qualifications upon his Deputye', accusing them of having 'narrow and Circumscribed harts'. Such counsel was not just corrosive to the king's interest but was also recommended by those 'not acquainted w[i]th that Sincerity and candour w[hi]ch can only Qualifye a man to serve the Kingdom & Crown worthyly'. He continued his discourse by outlining the importance of having a deputy whom the king could put some trust: 'The Place is a Place of highest hono[u]r, wher[e]in the soveraignty itselfe is imbarqued in some measure w[i]th him', Wentworth maintained, 'and if he bee lessened in either, he growes either Scandalouse for want, w[i]thin his owne doores, or contemned abro[a]de.' To constrain the authority of the lord deputy, so it was said, was to constrain the king's sovereign power itself: if the viceroy lost the support of the monarch then his position was simply untenable. Wentworth subsequently emphasized the absolute necessity of possessing authority and countenance. Should the lord deputy not have the 'means to gratifye some, as well as to punish others', he asserted, 'Men will rather run from him then come a neare him [and] abandon him'. He concludes with a short discussion on the appropriate penalty for breaching the monarch's trust or corrupting justice in respect of the king's subjects: 'Appoint Justices, send for him presently over, Give him his Chardge, make him answere it strickly at the perill of his head. And for my owne part I shall desire no spareing.'
[290] WWM, Str P 3/8: Wentworth to Richard Weston, 3 Aug. 1633. 'I finde it, as [in] all things els[e], in that disorder w[hi]ch cannot be well beleeved': WWM, Str P 5/22: Wentworth to Coke, 26 Oct. 1633.
[291] WWM, Str P 5/9: same to same, 3 Aug. 1633. Laud would mention during the summer of 1634, just a year later, that Secretary Coke was 'exceeding[ly] diligent' in business: WWM, Str P 6/95: Laud to Wentworth, 3 July 1634.
[292] WWM, Str P 5/202: Coke to Wentworth, 20 Sept. 1633.
[293] WWM, Str P 8/17: Wentworth to Laud, 9 Sept. 1633.
[294] WWM, Str P 5/76: Wentworth to Coke, 13 May 1634.
[295] WWM, Str P 6/13: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4.
[296] TCD, MS 836, fo. 82v: 'for the preservation of his Ma[jes]ty['s] prerogative [and] theire owne Religion & liberties against the Puritane faction in England[,] Scotland & Ireland who intended … to enact such Lawes whereby

but the moves toward absolutism worried contemporaries who thought the church was becoming a strategic monopoly in the process of state-building. 'The triangular working group' of Charles, Laud and Wentworth was in strict operation – its effectiveness was close and detailed correspondence.[297]

Due to the vast distance from London, however, Wentworth never felt comfortably secure in the king's service.[298] His naturally abrasive methods may have delighted the archbishop, but he was always unsure as to how effectively he stood with Charles I. In the autumn of 1633, Wentworth informed the courtier the Earl of Carlisle that, despite obstructions, 'I am yet in gathering w[i]th all possible Circumspection my observations' about where and 'when to advise a Reformation'.[299] The following year after Wentworth's appointment in 1634, George Downham of Derry, the bishop of Limerick, Francis Gough and Thomas Ram, bishop of Ferns and Leighlin, all passed away. Downham, in particular, was a rigid Calvinist who led his peers against the 'superstition, idolatory, errors, heresies, and apostacy of the Roman church' in 1627.[300] Wentworth told Archbishop Laud in the very same month in 1633 that he would do 'the Businesse of the Churche, in despight of the Devill.'[301] A few months later Wentworth had 'not begun to stirr in the recovery of the Patrimony of the Churche', aiming 'neither to looke thorow my fingers, Nor to accept any man[']s Person … and thorow & thorow keep myselfe in the same Tenour, till I have brought my labours to their full fruite and effect.'[302] The king promised that he would refrain from using Irish revenues to make gifts to courtiers, employing them instead to pay off his debts and fund the army,[303] but

---

the Inhabitants of Ireland should conforme in Religion to the Church of England, or otherwise to bee deprived of life[,] libertie & Estates.'

297 S. Poynting, '"From His Matie to Me with His Awin Hand": The King's Correspondence during the Period of Personal Rule', in Atherton *et al.* (eds), *1630s*, p. 85. Poynting draws links to the Charles, Hamilton and Laud relationship in Scotland in the late 1630s. Laud also used a loyal episcopal agent, John Bramhall, rather than James Ussher in the same way that he operated through John Maxwell instead of John Spottiswoode in Scotland. None of Charles I and Wentworth's surviving correspondence is dated any later than 25 May 1639, although the king reports that he has seen 'divers[e] letters' from between them scarcely eleven months later: WWM, Str P 3(ii)/108: Charles I to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1640. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 274: 'the Bishop of *Derry* [Bramhall], who under him had the chief managing of the affairs of that Church'. Charles I set a strongly worded letter warning the Lord President not to go against the Irish Commission, after hearing that 'p[ro]ceedings before our said Councell growe much more p[er]plexed and our Subjects often disappointed of the just fruit of their suits, there then in the happie raignes of Queene Eliz[abeth] and our blessed ffather': WYAS, WYL100/PO/1/51 (22 June 1629).

298 Kevin Sharpe cites his absence as an *exemplum* of why personal access to the sovereign was so fundamental: idem, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (1989), p. 166.

299 WWM, Str P 8/31: Wentworth to Earl of Carlisle, 7 Oct. 1633.

300 Univ. Of Nottingham, Portland Welbeck Collection, Pw V 73: 'The Religion of the papists is superstitious and Idolatrous' and their 'doctrine [is] Erroneous, & Hereticall'.

301 WWM Str P 8/44: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Oct. 1633: 'Naturally I work against the streame'.

302 WWM, Str P 6/28: same to same, 7 Mar. 1633–4.

303 WWM, Str P 6/81–2: same to same, 19 July 1634.

he was caught a year later giving £10,000 out of the subsidies to the Earl of Nithsdale.[304] Weston had been relaxed about these debts, but Laud and Wentworth were concerned with the stability of the kingdom's finances: Charles I would not gain respect, let alone the obedience, of his people unless his payments were 'certaine, both for the Army and all other Necessaryes.'[305] By the summer of 1638, Laud was congratulating the Lord Deputy on the 'good Order' of the army: 'it cannot but give a great Assurance to all the Affaires of that Kingdome'.[306]

The prevailing tone of their letters is neither one of diligent nor intimate friendship,[307] sharing personal secrets and news, considering Wentworth's warmer relationships with George Radcliffe, Christopher Wandesford and even Francis Cottington,[308] but they possessed a repertoire of familiar habits. Laud had indeed expressed some trust in the Lord Deputy's choices for bishoprics, but insisted that the king will 'send' over 'his owne Chaplaines',[309] the same as in England. The archbishop has been deemed a friend in much of the historiography, a companion with especial power to assist the Lord

---

[304] WWM, Str P 6/277–8: Laud to Wentworth, 21 Oct. 1635: 'Great Guift … contrary to his Resolution'. Nithsdale enjoyed preferential treatment at court from the very beginning of Charles' reign, despite being an overt Catholic. There could, however, be some good and mutual relations with Catholics: Bodl., MS Add. C. 286, fo. 21r: Wandesford to Radcliffe, 26 March 1637: Wandesford mentioned that 'FFather Roach and I drinke your health hartily. he is a good Preist I am certayne a Good fellowe.' See C.V. Wedgwood, *The King's Peace, 1637–1641* (1971), p. 363: Wandesford was 'his [Wentworth's] close friend and right–hand man'. Although his father advised Wentworth that Roman Catholics 'hold the same fundamentall points that we doe', it was alleged to be 'onelie Ambitio[n,] pryde and Covetousnes[s] and want of charitie … [that] cause this hatefull Contention': WWM, Str P 40/1: 'William Wentworth … his advice and councell to Thomas Wentworth, his sone and heire', 1604.

[305] WWM, Str P 6/26: Laud to Wentworth, 13 Jan. 1633–4. Wentworth added, 'the debts of the Crowne taken of[f], you may governe as you please': WWM, Str P 6/7: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633. Durston, *Charles I*, p. 49: 'Charles was a king with whom it was almost impossible to do business.'

[306] WWM, Str P 7/126v: Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1638.

[307] Cf. Carlton, *Laud*, p. 146: Wentworth was 'Laud's closest friend'.

[308] 'I do not thanke you that I must be the last man that receives notice from yourselfe of your marriage' (WWM, Str P 8/16: same to same, 16 Aug. 1633), though there is too much emphasis placed upon this fact in Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', ch. 3, esp. p. 90: 'their correspondence is not one of deep friendship'. See WWM, Str P 2/106: Wentworth to Christopher Wandesford, 30 July 1623, for his reference to himself as an 'absent freind'. See also WWM, Str P 5/10: Wentworth to Coke, 3 Aug. 1633: Wentworth wanted to 'seriously thinke upon it and debate it' [Irish Parliament] with Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe, 'whom I only trust on this side.' Although detailed evidence of their day–to–day activities are naturally limited, Wandesford and Radcliffe appear in various capacities in official documentation of Wentworth's regime and correspondence. Radcliffe was, for example, once called by Lord Kilmallock 'his [Wentworth's] ec[c]ho': UCL, Special Collections, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 28r. In the standard political histories of the 1630s and 1640s, Radcliffe and Wandesford have received little attention. No details were too small to escape their attention, not a single central event could unfold in the Irish government without their orchestration. See also CALS, DLT/B43, p. 3: 'where my lo[rd] of Strafford procured him to be made Maister of the Roules … He [Christopher Wandesford] was one of my lord[']s confidents' ('A Short Schetch of L[or]d Strafford['s] life').

[309] WWM, Str P 8/16: Laud to Wentworth, 16 Aug. 1633. Wentworth pursued his own course with Bramhall, however. Brownhill overemphasizes the relationship between Wentworth, Radcliffe and Wandesford by claiming that Bramhall 'did not achieve the semblance of close friendship which in the case of the triumvirate, had developed over many years': eadem, 'The Personal and Professional Relationships between Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and his Closest Advisors' (Univ. of Sheffield Ph.D. thesis, 2004), p. 215. By June 1634, John Bramhall had impressed Wentworth so much that the latter petitioned for his promotion to the Irish Council: WWM, Str P 6/75: Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634.

Deputy in that part which aids the church government.[310] Wentworth considered the kingdom to be 'in an excellent way', reporting that England would receive 'considerable Supply from hence w[hi]ch hitherto hath beene of Infinite Expence unto us'.[311] Although their bishops were 'very learned[,] able and zealous', he was informed that he would 'find many thinges fitt to bee reformed in the estate Ecclesiasticall of this Kingdome',[312] but the Lord Deputy was confident that 'the nearer wee come [to the Church of England], it will be much the better'[313] – at the moment the Church of Ireland boasted

> an unlea[r]ned Clergy, w[hi]ch have not so much, as the outward forme of Churchmen to cover them-selves w[i]th … The Churches unbuilt, The Parsonadg[e] and Vicaradg[e] Howses utterly ruined; The people untaught thorow the Nonresidency of the Clergy … The ~~rights~~ Rites and Ceremonyes of the Church runn over w[i]thout all decency of Habitt, Order, or Gravity, in the Course of their Service; The Possessions of the Church, to a great Proportion, in lay handes.[314]

These bitter descriptions of ecclesiastical neglect were designed to elicit a reaction from Laud. His unflinching prose seems to have convinced the archbishop – as well as many historians – of the merits of his planned actions.

Wentworth and Laud both held the common law courts in low regard, not so much from their exploitation of the people as their trespassing on the rights of the crown.[315] He was informed that he should find them 'very able and sufficient in learninge and other abilities, all good Protestants, and carefull of the king[']s service',[316] but Wentworth

---

[310] E. Cooper, *Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland* (2 vols, 1874), i, p. 329.
[311] WWM, Str P 3/104: Wentworth to Weston, 19 July 1634.
[312] WWM, Str P 1/43: Francis Angier to Wentworth, 28 June 1632: 'the number of good and painfull preachers doth dayly encrease in this Kingdome'. He advised sending over bishops from England to advance 'the propagation of true Religion': ibid.
[313] WWM, Str P 7/2: Wentworth to Laud, 3 Dec. 1636: 'I will publikly procure a Conformity in all'. See also Cust, *Charles I*, p. 243: 'Whatever he might proclaim in his court masques and paintings, Charles's perspective was decidedly Anglocentric.'
[314] WWM, Str P 6/19: same to same, 31 Jan. 1633–4.
[315] Lawyers and judges 'hange their Noses over the flowers of the Crowne, blowe and snuffle upon them till they take both s[c]ent and beauty off them': WWM, Str P 3/28: Wentworth to Cottington, 22 Oct. 1633. There is an overestimation of the 'common law mind' in much recent historiography, one which ignores a popular tradition of hostility towards the legal profession: C.W. Brooks, *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth: the 'Lower Branch' of the Legal Profession in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), ch. 7. As early as the autumn of 1633, Wentworth had boasted that he would set his 'Maister[']s Power and Greatnesse' above the common law: WWM, Str P 8/34: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Oct. 1633, i.e. same day as he corresponded with Cottington about the legal profession (see above). 'I know no reason then, but you may as well rule the Common Lawyers in England, as I, poore beagle, doe here … I am confident that the King … is able, by his wisdome and Ministers, to carry any just and hon[oura]ble Action through all imaginary opposition': WWM, Str P 6/7: same to same, n.d. Dec. 1633.
[316] WWM, Str P 1/43: Angier to Wentworth, 28 June 1632: 'and (if I bee not deceaved) comparable to the king[']s servants of that kind in England.'

transferred final appeal in matters such as disputed impropriations from the common law courts, 'where your Lo[rdshi]p may judge what good measure the poore man may expect from a Jury against the Earle' of Cork, to the Court of Castle Chamber – a concentration of power in the hands of the prerogative court over which he directly presided.[317] John Coke agreed – 'the heareinge and determininge [of] sundrie enormeous faults and offences' was to be conducted by the court, the powers of which were remarkably similar to 'our highe Courte of Starr Chamber'.[318] In contrast, 'all the Judges here bend themselves to pronounce that for law, w[hi]ch makes for the secureing of the subjects['] estate where they themselves have soe full an interest'.[319] Wentworth thus despised the 'great sway' the common lawyers enjoyed in the administration of justice – 'the Expositions of S[i]r Edward Cooke and his Yeare books' should be devalued in favour of the royal will[320] – but their position of power could not be curtailed 'till the Parliament be well passed'.[321] Laud expressed his fervent desire to rid the court of these distractions – 'scorne, and goe on … [it] Can loose you nothing that is worth the Gaining. For now lett men[']s Spittle beare as foule a froth as it will, you doe your Duty … quiet w[i]thin'[322] – but the archbishop was frustrated at the limits of what could be attempted for church temporalities, 'so bound up in the Formes of the Common Law'.[323] Laud's speech at his trial waxed lyrical about the condition of the church in former times, when the legal profession was 'as low as ours now is'.[324] His reaction to the Lord Deputy's bruising of a few bishops in High Commission serves as a salient reminder of his most cherished hopes – 'O[h]. That great disservers here might

---

317 WWM, Str P 6/149: Wentworth to Laud, 10 Mar. 1634–5. Wentworth enjoyed full and effective control of the court when Lord Mountnorris' membership ceased in 1636 (Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 72), whilst Laud sought to empower and boost the court/s to override common law, placing the king above the established laws of the land. Wentworth had said that 'MountNorris … loves his owne Profitt, something better then his freinds': WWM, Str P 8/286: Wentworth to Earl of Nithsdale, 5 Oct. 1635.

318 WWM, Str P 4/115: Coke, signet on behalf of Charles I, to Wentworth, 8 Oct. 1634.

319 WWM, Str P 5/29: Wentworth to Coke, 7 Dec. 1633. See also WWM, Str P 6/26: Laud to Wentworth, 13 Jan. 1633–4: 'The Common Lawyers are an other manner of Body here [in England] for strength and fr[i]ends, then they are w[i]th you'.

320 WWM, Str P 8/33–4: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Oct. 1633.

321 WWM, Str P 5/46: Wentworth to Coke, 31 Jan. 1633–4: 'the Jealousy I have to be abated in Power'.

322 WWM, Str P 6/317: Laud to Wentworth, 23 Jan. 1635–6. Despite the obvious credentials and prolific character, Laud was not a courtier in any sense. Cf. Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 87: 'Laud was, then, a successful courtier'. He may have enjoyed the flimsy support of a favourite, the Duke of Buckingham, but that constituted little in social terms.

323 WWM, Str P 8/32: same to same, 9 Sept. 1633. The Church of England was so tied up by the common law that it was virtually impossible 'for any man to do that good w[hi]ch he would, or is bound to do': ibid. Moreover, Wentworth believed that the real root of power was a revenue independent of Parliament, triggering, in effect, a royal resurgence undeterred by modern bargaining and compromise.

324 Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 169. Laud was posthumously vindicated when Charles I during the English Civil War/s made a vow 'to give the impropriations, yet remaining in the Crown within the realm of Ireland[,] to that poor church': Bodl., MS Carte 103, fo. 396r.

meet w[i]th such resolutions'[325] – but Wentworth still held it 'very fitt there were a high Commission set[t]led here in Dublin, concearning the use of it might be very great, to Countenance the despised state ~~State~~ of the Clergy'.[326] Laud replied with news that the king and the Lords approved of the idea but it should 'be not sett on foote till your Lo[rdshi]p sees what will become of the parliament'.[327] At a Privy Council meeting in 1632, Wentworth had accumulated new powers for his forthcoming appointment, including the right to dispense justice without fear of circumvention from London. In September of the next year, a Spanish envoy wrote to the Lord Deputy, remarking that he had heard that 'you are become allready like a Spanish Viceroy … your Predecessors it seemes have not so well attended, to sett it in the esteeme it deserves'[328] – the Earl of Essex, of course, had used it 'as a rise or step to ascend to his desired greatnesse in *England*',[329] but there were rumours that Wentworth would instantly lose credit with the king upon taking the position. The Lord Deputy 'lived there like a King',[330] but Laud and himself were not accomplished courtiers – they were too prone to dismiss the extravagance as vain luxury, an expensive and mindless pursuit which would provide nothing of lasting significance.

Wentworth's policies in Ireland, however, have been much criticised by historians,[331]

---

[325] WWM, Str P 6/27: same to same, 13 Jan. 1633–4. 'The King and the Lords here thinke it very fitt there be a high Commission established at Dublin … send me over the names of such as you would wish should be Commissioners': WWM, Str P 6/51: same to same, 12 Apr. 1634.

[326] WWM, Str P 6/20: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Jan. 1633–4. Dublin City Library and Archive, Gilbert MS 169, p. 216: the first sitting of 'the High Commission' was not until 27 Feb. 1635–6 'to sitt in St Patrick[']s Church', a full two years after Wentworth outlined his intentions to set it up. See Hull Univ. Archives, U DDEV/79/H10: A. Guthrie to Earl of Nithsdale, 7 Feb. 1635–6: The Earl of Nithsdale was alerted in advance of the first sitting that 'the Catholickes are much afrayd of it [i.e. the High Commission], but as I am inform[e]d from England it is Rather intended against the puritans, it will not be long befor[e] wee hear more certantie of it'.

[327] WWM, Str P 6/51: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634. See also WWM, Str P 6/56: Wentworth to Laud, 15 May 1634: 'I am gladd a High Commission here is agreed on'.

[328] WWM, Str P 9/17: Miguel Nicholaldie to Wentworth, 10 Sept. 1633: 'the Hono[u]r of soe eminent a dignity'.

[329] F. Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises & Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert late Earle of Essex and his Complices, Against her Maiestie and her Kingdoms* (1601), sig. B1v.

[330] WWM, Str P 13/220: George Wentworth to Wentworth, n.d. Mar. 1633–4. See also WWM, Str P 7/101v: Laud to Wentworth, 17 May 1638: 'I knowe a Lord Deputye (especially one of your Abilityes) can more easyly lead the [Dublin] Councell, then they him.' 'This is a side paper & you must burne it': ibid.

[331] Trevor-Roper singled out Wentworth for much criticism, presenting him as 'a born tyrant, inspiring both fear and love'. While Laud managed to 'worm himself into a position of influence by intrigue,' Wentworth effectively arrived in Ireland to overthrow the existing system, installing his own men – Wandesford, Radcliffe and Mainwaring – into prominent political positions: idem, *Laud*, p. 240. While Wedgwood found his policy 'fundamentally incoherent' (eadem, *Wentworth*, p. 174), Kearney wrote that it was 'almost completely misconceived' and 'destined to arouse grave discontent': idem, *Strafford*, p. 218. As events worsened, Wentworth believed that using cipher and endpapers, which contained no greeting or signature, would 'prevent the Casualtye of letters falling into other[']s hands'; they wrote two letters, the one 'what the King appoints to be done', the other 'Private Considerations, w[hi]ch may be burnt': WWM, Str P 6/295: Wentworth to Laud, 3 Jan. 1635–6. CUL, MS Add. 90, fo. 56r: 13 Nov. 1640 – 'Ordered that S[i]r Geo[rge] Ratcliff[e] be sent for to answer an Information'.

but Laud informed the king 'in private' about the improving state of the kingdom.[332] Charles I 'acknowledged' that Wentworth was performing 'excellent Service; And added w[i]th all that besides your other abilityes, you were a marvaylous industriouse man, to Carry soe many things together in such a way.'[333] He was seen to have stepped – almost unaware – into Buckingham's shoes.[334] When in England in 1636, Wentworth was determined to acknowledge that, although his proceedings against certain men had been misconstrued by his inveterate enemies as an example of 'a seveare and an austeare hardconditioned man', it was only 'the necessity of his Ma[jes]tie['s] service w[hi]ch inforced me into a seeming stricknesse outwardly.' He 'knew noe other rule to governe by but by rewarde, and punishment'.[335] So manifest were his hatreds Wentworth 'appears to have achieved the distinction of being perhaps the only Englishman to have obliterated the religious divide in Irish politics',[336] but there was a temperamental similarity between the Lord Deputy and the archbishop, 'the impatient desire for action, the need to be for ever up and doing … Laud had found in Wentworth the man whose zeal and energy would match in secular politics his own zeal and energy in the care of the Church.'[337] The Lord Deputy played to Laud's hopes – 'beleeve me I will never faile to serve you faithfully'[338] – but the king ordered him to return to

---

[332] See, e.g., WWM, Str P 6/136: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Jan. 1634–5.
[333] Ibid. 'His support for Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford was unremitting': M. Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603–1714* (1997), p. 117. See also BL, Add. MS 15567, fo. 31v, for Charles I's reception of Wentworth in early autumn of 1639 'with great expressions of favour, and renewed assurances of protection.' See Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 374: 'enthusiastic reception'. See also *A Briefe and Perfect Relation* (1647), p. 2, which states that Charles could not be viewed at all at the trial. However, see NLW, MS 467E/1683: Maurice Wynn to Owen Wynn, c. Apr. 1641, where it is stated that he could be seen laughing 'within the view' in his royal box on 10 Apr. 1641.
[334] There has been much speculation as to the inheritance of the Duke of Buckingham's legacy. He was 'the nearest thing to Buckingham's authentic successor' (V. Treadwell, *Buckingham and Ireland, 1616–1628: A Study in Anglo-Irish Politics* [Dublin, 1998], p. 20), while Kearney argues even more so that 'he was another Buckingham, going even further than his predecessor in ignoring the need for concession and compromise': idem, *Strafford,* pp. 219–20. 'Wentworth was to show a passion for the King's service (as well as for his own enrichment) that was at least equal to Buckingham's,' Roger Lockyer writes, 'and in consequence he inspired much the same hatred that the Duke had formally endured': idem, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (1981), p. 269.
[335] WWM, Str P 34/10: Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636. For an account of Wentworth's actions 'concerning the state of the Church in Ireland' at Hampton Court, see Bodl., MS Tanner 114, fo. 110r (21 June 1636). See also WWM, Str P 6/283: Wentworth to Laud, 14 Dec. 1635, since the end of 1635 Wentworth informed Laud that he had requested permission from Charles I to come to England to countenance 'many mouthes'.
[336] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies,* pp. 382–3. Wentworth managed 'with impartiality' to alienate every interest in Ireland: A. Clarke, 'The Policies of the "Old English" in Parliament, 1640–1', *Historical Studies,* 5 (1965), p. 88.
[337] Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 91. As Julia Merritt writes, 'one of the attractions of a man such as Laud was the ease with which his preoccupations could be identified and appealed to': eadem, 'Power and Communication', p. 118. See also WWM, Str P 7/7: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Dec. 1636: 'I have wond[e]red many tymes to observe how universally you and I agree in our Judgment of p[er]sons'.
[338] WWM, Str P 6/264: same to same, 2 Nov. 1635.

England in the summer of 1639, on Laud's advice,[339] saying that his instructions would be needed 'for some tyme' on Scottish affairs.[340] He was shortly made an earl upon his arrival – a decision not too early for Wentworth.[341] His arrival in England was much feared, although within a few weeks he was the man with whom to reckon, the man who had arguably the most influence with the king.

George Radcliffe waxed lyrical about his former boss, commenting that he 'never did any Thing of any Moment, concerning either political or domestical Business, without taking Advice; not so much as a Letter written by him to any great Man, of any Business, but he shewed it to his Confidents, if they were near him',[342] but, in 1634, Wentworth declared to Weston that 'ther[e] is not a minister *on this side*, that knows any thing I either write or intend'.[343] His relationship with Laud was occasionally upset by dubious rumours 'that the kindnesse betweene you and mee [Wentworth] was not yet quite broken of[f], but that it was of late very much impayred',[344] but it remained strong due to a shared commonality of purpose, a desire to reform the Church of Ireland to exacting standards.

It is ironic, however, that where Wentworth considered the crown to be most secure –

---

339 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 392. A year before Laud had written, 'I am h[e]artily Gladd you are there. For were there a weake Governor now in Ireland, that wee might have that Kingdome in disorder too': WWM, Str P 7/127v: Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1638. He wrote in the margin, 'This I have sayd to the King': ibid. He appears to have changed his mind in the next twelve months.

340 WWM, Str P 40/38: Charles I to Wentworth, 23 July 1639: 'your Councell & attendance'.

341 *Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe*, ed. T.D. Whitaker (1810), p. 187: 'My Lord of Canterbury hath moved itt tow or three times, but itt sticks' (Wentworth to Radcliffe, 10 Dec. 1639).

342 G. Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde', in *Earl of Strafforde's Letters*, ii, p. 433. This comment is found among a litany of praise for Wentworth, who 'died like a Gentleman and a Christian; a martyr for the Church and King': ibid. George Carr acknowledged that Laud might be disappointed to learn that someone else had deciphered his letters. He had copied the correspondence to Wentworth as he found it, ensuring that 'if your lo[rdshi]p should have any occasi[o]n to shew his Grace any passages ther[e]in, it may truly appeare to him as your lo[rdshi]p hath formerly mentioned that the Cipher is only in your lo[rdshi]p[']s owne keeping': WWM, Str P 16/31: George Carr to Wentworth, 6 July 1636. Wentworth, indeed, had many close associates (e.g. George Carr, Edward Stanhope, Gervase Clifton and John Melton), but they were never entrusted with any major political functions; never did they operate at the same level as Radcliffe and/or Wandesford. Wentworth's correspondence does *not* reveal a supercilious viewpoint or attitude towards these apparently subservient men. The Earl of Cork's agent, John Walley, recognised Wandesford as a benevolent force held over Wentworth's 'intemperate hand': Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 21/75: John Walley to Cork, 12 Dec. 1640. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 67, fo. 122r (3 Aug. 1639), for Wentworth's thanks to the king for making him an earl.

343 WWM, Str P 3/46: Wentworth to Weston, 31 Jan. 1633–4 (my italics): 'That too many be not taken inn to Counsell on that side, And that your Resolutions, whatever they be, be kept very Secrett, For beleeve me there can be nothing more prejudiciall to the good successe of those Affaires, then their being understood aforehand by them here, so prejudiciall I hold it indeed'. Wandesford, his distant cousin, and Radcliffe were never ministers, however.

344 'I am very much bound to you for the Constancy of your Love towards me': WWM, Str P 7/50v: Laud to Wentworth, 18 Sept. 1637. The rumour was allegedly originated by 'the old Earle of Clare', 'the Author of itt': WWM, Str P 7/60v: same to same, 11 Nov. 1637. Wentworth found the rumour 'very strange' (WWM, Str P 7/63: Wentworth to Laud, 27 Nov. 1637), but Laud insisted that although 'My Lord of Clare is gone … this I can assure you that false Report came from him': WWM, Str P 7/79: Laud to Wentworth, 19 Dec. 1637.

'the King is as Absolute here, as any Prince in the whole world can be'[345] – proved the first intimation of crisis, the result of 'a Laudian overhaul of the establishment without waiver or demur.'[346] Although the archbishop seldom hesitated to warn Wentworth against policies he found unpleasant,[347] their relationship was securely maintained through similar hatreds and fears.[348] Laud occasionally wrote about rumours they had 'fallen out',[349] but Wentworth was quick to dampen them: 'Hee that told your Grace … understood as little of my nature as of my faith and affections towards your Lo[rdshi]p.' He regarded the news as 'a kind of vermin'.[350] Prynne was under no illusions as to the real culprit who exercised 'a kind of Patriarchall Jurisdiction' over all religious printing in Ireland,[351] but the partnership was beneficial to both figures. Charles I possessed an 'unshakeable confidence in his favo[u]rite',[352] one that was only to be strengthened rather than squeezed by the events of 1640–1. However, it was Laud who was believed to have brought the earl 'to all his great places, and imployments, a fit Instrument, and Spirit, to act and execute all his wicked and bloudy Designes in these Kingdomes'.[353] The archbishop, in a rare moment of criticism, thought the king had even 'hastened the

---

345 WWM, Str P 6/131: Wentworth to Laud, 16 Dec. 1634. Whether this makes Charles I an 'angliciser', 'anglicaniser' or a supporter of 'congruity' is a moot point, but he was certainly – and irredeemably – 'authoritarian': cf. Morrill, 'A British Patriarchy?', p. 223. The Church of Ireland was in law and theory an independent church, but the practical control exerted by trusted allies of Charles made sure they rode similar paths.

346 McCafferty, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, p. 227. With regard to ardent clericalism, 'Laud loved it and John Bramhall loved delivering it': ibid., p. 228. Bramhall was a proactive reformer in his own right, however.

347 WWM, Str P 7/120: Laud to Wentworth, 27 June 1638: 'if I were w[i]th you[,] I could & would chide you for your passionate letter'. Laud often recoiled at Wentworth's dubious and overheated methods of operation, though he confessed that 'I wish wee had here more Thorow than ever I shall live to see': ibid.

348 Wentworth 'added formidable weight' to Laud's party in 1639–40 and appeared to be 'the obstacle to her bid [the queen's] for power': Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 841. Laud had seen the queen and Cottington grow so close that 'such smiles of dearnesse passe' between them: WWM, Str P 6/231: same to same, 31 July 1635. Wentworth hinted that 'a dessigne' might be afoot to make the queen oppose Laud: WWM, Str P 6/125: Wentworth to Laud, 9 Dec. 1634.

349 WWM, Str P 7/9: Laud to Wentworth, 26 Dec. 1636.

350 WWM, Str P 7/10: Wentworth to Laud, 20 Jan. 1636–7. See WWM, Str P 7/54v: same to same, 18 Oct. 1637: 'There is nothing here belowe more true then that I will in All things of the Church sincerely and chearfully doe, as your Lo[rdshi]p shall appoint me.' Cf. WWM, Str P 5/89: Wentworth to Windebanke, 5 June 1634: 'For to confesse a truth he [Laud] is allready since he came to be his Grace of Canterbury gotten forth of our Reach.'

351 W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (1646), p. 172. He regarded Wentworth as 'being but the Archbishop[']s instrument herein': ibid., p. 177. Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 525: 'Such were the Crimes or Treasons rather, which paint him [Laud] out with such an ugly countenance in the Book called *Canterburies Doom*[e], as if he were the *Greatest Traytor,* and the most *Execrable Person*, that ever had been bred in *England*'.

352 M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant Faction, the Impeachment of Strafford and the Origins of the Irish Civil War', *Canadian Journal of History*, 17 (1982), p. 236. The archbishop was also 'most Confident [that] they Cannot wrong you w[i]th the King our Maister who lookes upon the Services w[hi]ch are done him, w[i]th his owne eyes, and not thorow other men[']s reports': WWM, Str P 6/280: Laud to Wentworth, 16 Nov. 1635. N. Canny, *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, 1566–1643* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 76, also writes that Wentworth's 'attachment to the monarchy was unshakeable.'

353 H. Grimston, *Mr Grymston*[']*s Speech in Parliament upon the Accusation and Impeachment of William Laud, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, upon High Treason* (1641), p. 2. Grimston also lists Windebanke ('the very *Broker* and *Pander* to the Whore of *Babylon*') Mainwaring (one of the 'Popish Bishops') and Wren ('the most uncleane one') as among 'the Authors and Causers of all the Ruines[,] Miseries, and Calamities, we now groane under', but insists that the archbishop was 'the onely man that hath [them] raised and advanced': ibid., pp. 2–3.

Earl's death.'[354] In comparison to Wentworth's fate, 'poor Canterburie … is so contemptible that all casts him by out of their thoughts, as a pendicle at the Lieutenant's eare',[355] but they were seen as the twin architects of the disaster engulfing the kingdoms: 'Our Counsells were together knit / So close, so even, they did goe / To worke the Common weale its woe.'[356] Their unique partnership occupied the presses for a considerable time, but while Wentworth's social status could justify a beheading as a means of retribution,[357] Laud would not 'grace the Block' – he would be hung, drawn and quartered, or so it seemed.[358] Comparisons between Laud and Cardinal Wolsey were commonplace,[359] but there was also a pretend missive from the pope to the archbishop, expressing the desire that 'in *Ireland* wee hope our deare children will perpetrate all the good they can devise' but crucially leaving the question of means to one side.[360] John Clotworthy assumed a strongly anti–Straffordian position, arguing forcefully that the end result would be 'a Tyrannicall Governm[en]t' with the earl enjoying a regal state of 'boundless power'.[361] Pym agreed and urged the Lords to try Wentworth immediately as 'the head also of the Popish partie in England.'[362] Laud

---

[354] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 441.
[355] *Robert Baillie*, ed. Laing, i, p. 309.
[356] *A Reasonable Motion in the Behalfe of Such of the Clergie* (1641), sig. A3v. 'There is nothing that can make me alltogether despaire of the Publike good, or my owne private being, saveing if wee should be soe unhappy as to have you taken from us, or myselfe w[i]thout you': WWM, Str P 6/264: Wentworth to Laud, 2 Nov. 1635. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 43v: 'L[or]d of Cant[erbury] desires most of the same Councell w[hi]ch L[ord] Strafford had, which is refused' (4 Mar. 1640–1).
[357] *A Reasonable Motion*, sig. A4.
[358] *Mercuries Message, Or the Coppy of a Letter sent to William Laud* (1641), sig. A3: 'Others suppose that a Clothworker[']s son, / Shall never have such honour to him don[e]'. The Commons were prepared to pursue this 'ordinary forme of Execution', much to Laud's distress: BL, Add. MS 31116, fo. 184r–v. Laud submitted 'a most humble Petition' against this barbarous form of execution: Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 8 Jan. 1644–5.
[359] G. Cavendish, *The Negotiations of Thomas Woolsey, The Great Cardinall of England* (1641), pp. 19–23.
[360] *A Copie of a Letter Written from his Holinesse Court at Rome, to his Grace of Canterburies*['] *Palace* (1642), p. 3. He adds in parentheses, '*It yet holds well*': ibid. Wentworth was later accused of 'labour[ing] to reconcile England unto Rome' and persecuting 'Godly Preachers': BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 40r–v.
[361] BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 19v (13 Feb. 1640–1). He would return to say a few remarks at Laud's own execution in Jan. 1644–5; his conduct before the scaffold was directly compared by Heylyn to 'the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*' proposing questions to Jesus, 'our Lord and Saviour': Heylyn, *Briefe Relation*, p. 24. Bishop Warner mistakenly refers to him as 'Tho[mas]' rather than John: BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 19v. For Clotworthy's experience of Wentworth's government in Ireland in the 1630s, see J. Ohlmeyer, 'Strafford, the "Londonderry Business" and the "New British History"', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of ... Wentworth*, esp. pp. 216–18. Clotworthy was proposed for the West Country constituency of Bossiney and Maldon in Essex on the recommendation (i.e. nomination) of Lord Robartes of Truro, Warwick's son–in–law: BL, Add. MS 34253, fo. 2v: Elizabeth Cholwell to Lord Robartes, 4 Feb. 1640–1 ('att Warwick hows[e]'). Robartes was living at Warwick House in 1641 (arguably, ever since Parliament had been called). For more on Clotworthy's career, see A. Robinson, ''Not Otherwise Worthy to be Named, but as a Firebrand Brought From Ireland to Inflame this Kingdom': The Political and Cultural Milieu of Sir John Clotworthy During the Stuart Civil Wars' (Univ. of Ulster Ph.D. thesis, 2013), *passim*. Le Bas, *Archbishop Laud*, p. 324, noted that John Clotworthy, 'who had already distinguished himself by his outrageous violence against the Earl of Strafford', was a 'coarse fanatic' who harassed Laud on the scaffold in 1644–5 with 'impertinent and insidious questions.' Clotworthy was already well–known for making 'intemperat[e] speech[es]' of 'foule language' many years before: Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 660: Earl of Kingston to Clifton, 23 Jan. 1635–6.
[362] BL, Harl. MS 164, fo. 119r: 'Desired to hasten the deputies['] Triall' (16 Feb. 1640–1). Pym 'came to the Barr of the Lords[']s house' sometime between 4pm and 5pm on the 11 Nov. 1640 with the committee returning to the

continued to sit in council until 6 December and attended the Lords until his impeachment almost a fortnight later – indeed, he could have chosen to escape – but the king drew a lesson from Wentworth's death: it was not attributed to his refusal to engineer concessions, but his pliancy in making any at all.[363]

Correspondence between the two figures may have occurred while in prison. As a *causa sanguinis*, the bishops did not attend the trial,[364] though it elicited such a profound reaction among the populace that it was shifted to Westminster Hall. Although the English Parliament could neither resist the attraction of the trial, they shortly returned – or, at least, hoped – to their usual position of studied indifference.[365] The extension of jurisdiction, however, 'raised a genie they could not control.'[366] Charles I sat on the throne during the trial, gesturing towards Strafford and averring that 'He had done him no wrong'.[367] The Lord Deputy played his part, dressing in a 'mo[u]rning suite and long cloke', but whose 'posture of person' and 'proud carriage' nonetheless proclaimed his 'tyrannies'.[368] As a well–staged piece of theatrical drama, the trial was

---

Commons with a general charge against Strafford: BL, Add. MS 15567, fo. 31v. There are some questions as to the precise accuracy of D'Ewes' account of Wentworth's trial, however. He was a decidedly hostile observer of Wentworth's trial.

363 Charles I 'holds him [Wentworth] not fit to be so much as an High Constable, but cannot in his Conscience condemn him to Death as a Traytor': BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 57v (30 Apr. 1641).

364 Ibid., fo. 13r: 'the B[isho]ps sate still, but silent, for that the B[isho]p of Lincoln [John Williams] had professed in the open house, that he would not speak in this Cause, nor any of his Brethren of the Bench'. There was mass near–hysteria in London as mobs screamed for Wentworth's blood. However, see CUL, MS Kk.6.38, fo. 37r: 'That Ferebie' claimed that Wentworth 'would shortlie subdue the citie [of London].' See also BL, Harl. 6424, fo. 59r, for Bishop Williams' desire that the bishops might be 'excused from Voting in the Case'.

365 SRO, D(W)1778/I/i/12: Will Davenant to William Legge, 19 Jan. 1640–1: 'My Lord Lieutenant[']s arraignment is expected this weeke'. See also the general reactions to the Long Parliament's opening in Bodl., MS Tanner 65, fo. 129r (Thomas Jermyn, 1 Oct. 1640).

366 Russell, *Causes*, p. 126. For the shift in venue on the 11 Mar. 1640–1, see BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 48r. On 3 Feb. 1640-1, to the chagrin of the Scots, many of the Junto lords – from Saye to Brooke – stood upon the bar to argue that Strafford should be given more time ('15 days') to prepare his answer to the accusations: ibid., fo. 13r.

367 Ibid., fo. 39r. When the earl first appeared, the king took 'off his hat graciously': ibid., fo. 26r. See also NLW, MS 9062E/1678: Maurice to Owen Wynn, 22 [23] Mar. 1640–1: 'this Tuesday, as I thinke [the] 22nd March 1640[–1]'. Actually Tuesday was the 23 Mar. and Charles was originally debarred from appearing 'publicklie' at the trial by the Lords just the night before the trial, but that date would have been Sunday: ibid. See as well BL, Harl. MS 476, fo. 107r–v: Wentworth's plea to resign, repeated at the very start of the trial, was probably addressed to the king more so than his prosecutors, for the central problem to which the trial was addressed was the king's refusal to let Wentworth go. So much of what Wentworth had done constituted either an accumulation of minor misdemeanours and acts of high–handedness or else the faithful execution of his master's own wishes.

368 *A Declaration Shewing the Necessity of the Earle of Strafford*[']*s Suffering* (1641), sig. A3v: the anonymous author focused on Strafford's unfriendly appearance: 'his palled colour sheweth revenge; his sower face, cruelty; his stooping and looking to the earth, avarice; his gate, pride; and his demeanour, insolency'. He bore a resemblance to Roman villains, 'for hee is as … libidinous as *Tiberius*, cruell as *Nero*, covetous as rich *Cressus*, as terrible as *Phalaris*, and mischievous as *Sejanus*': ibid., sig. A4. A mere month before Wentworth's execution, Henry Anderson moved that the earl should be defined as *hostis Reipublicae*, an enemy of the commonwealth, in a similar way to the proceedings against Buckingham ('although hee was farre lesse criminall then this man'): BL, Harl. MS 163, fo. 54r (16 Apr. 1641). His motion failed to find a seconder, however.

unprecedented[369] and it was hoped that the 'over-punctuall, paedantique, [and] literall interpretations' of the law would be cast aside at the court of popular opinion.[370] However, his mastery of response – 'a natural Quickness of Wit and Fancy, with great Clearness of Judgment'[371] – elicited a profound and clear reaction. He took full and effective control of the judicial proceedings – an impressive task that was above and beyond the remit of the archbishop but not the Lord Deputy.[372] Pym compared the two men, 'how they both endeavoured to subvert religion … that both weere ambitious[,] proud & insolent',[373] but the Lords ruled in the earl's favour. Such a verdict left the Commons in discontent and upon the departure of the peers they immediately arose in great confusion. Strafford was positively ecstatic and Charles himself was caught laughing. Robert Baillie's recommendation – that 'Parliament [should] hold off to meddle with these two men till we be readie till joyn' – was being proved true by the day,[374] but it was only a momentary victory.

Such pressures relegated the trial of Laud to a secondary issue, but Wentworth unsuccessfully requested his presence in the Tower the night before his execution.[375] Instead, as he passed under the window of the archbishop the following morning, Laud hoped that, upon his own death, 'the world should perceive hee had beene more sencible of the Lord *Strafford*[']*s* losse, then of his own', a reasonable prospect given that the earl had been 'more serviceable to the Church … then either himselfe or any of all the

---

[369] It was the Warwick peers in the Lords who supported Clotworthy's demands for a speedy trial: see SRO, D(W)1778/I/i/14: Daniel O'Neille to Legge, 23 Feb. 1640–1. Essex and Mandeville having spoke 'most vehemently' against the deferral of Strafford's trial and then refers rather obliquely to Warwick and Holland having 'lost themselves' and incurring the king's wrath: ibid. Warwick had sworn Strafford as his prime enemy as early as his resistance to Bedford's efforts to postpone the trial in Feb. 1640–1. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 20r: on the 13th Feb. 1640-1, Strafford requested a postponement of his trial ('further time') in order to obtain some documents from Ireland, 'Papers for his Defence'. See as well Forkan, 'Strafford's Irish Army', p. 70: 'the attempt to eliminate Strafford as a political force formed a crystallisation of all the issues surrounding the events which had occurred since 1637–8. Here was a man who could become a scapegoat for all of the ills suffered by the three kingdoms over the previous few years.'

[370] C. Downing, *A Discoursive Conjecture upon the Reasons that Produce a Desired Event of the Present Troubles in Great Britaine* (1641), p. 34.

[371] Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde', in *Earl of Strafforde's Letters*, ii, p. 435. 'He fought on day by day with … an unfaltering voice': Wedgwood, *King's Peace*, p. 367.

[372] 'Laud was indeed an insignificant figure, and the Parliament, its hands already full, showed no anxiety to waste time on the difficult task of proving the charges against him': Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 410.

[373] BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 256r (24 Feb. 1640–1).

[374] *Robert Baillie*, ed. Laing, i, p. 280.

[375] *Briefe and Perfect Relation*, p. 98. Robert Pye informed the Commons that 'accesse' to the earl had been too liberal and that Strafford might 'escape' with the aid of his supporters: BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 116r (4 Jan. 1640–1). 'Thus fell the greatest subject in power … that was at that time in any of the three kingdoms', wrote Clarendon: idem, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 455.

Church-men had ever beene.'[376] Wentworth was, above all, 'the wisest, the stoutest, and every way the ablest subject that this nation hath bred'.[377] Only four years earlier, Wentworth had said much the same about Archbishop Laud[378] and, although he suffered from 'a total incapacity either to understand or to acknowledge the legitimacy of an opposing point of view',[379] it would be wrong to blame him for the uprising of 1641:[380] he accepted discontentment and grumblings as the price of radical colonization. After all, the rights of both the church and the crown which 'seldome suffer alone'[381] could not 'be recovered, unlesse a little violence and extraordinary meanes be used'.[382] The archbishop pressed for uniformity, since the king desired to 'see the Jurisdic[i]on of the Church … to be maintayned ag[ain]st both Recusants and other Factionists whatsoever.'[383] Wentworth claimed that he was perfectly equipped for the job – 'the hottest will not sett his foot faster, or farther on, then I shall doe'[384] – but their clear partnership rested on the rapport between them.

One account of his death observed how Wentworth spoke with 'such a grace … that he did even mollifie the most stony hearts there present, and many that before rejoyced at the newes of his sentence, did now testifie their compassion by their teares'.[385] Indeed, Wentworth was 'a servant violently zealous in his master's ends and not negligent in

---

[376] *Briefe and Perfect Relation*, p. 99. Laud had also written that 'I am very much bound to you for your good opinion of me and the Course I hold in the Churche': WWM, Str P 6/16: Laud to Wentworth, 2 Dec. 1633. 'Black Tom Tyrant' became Wentworth's nickname due to his forceful assertion of the prerogatives of the crown. See further WWM, Str P 21/210: Wentworth's own speech notes – he desired neither to clip the royal prerogative nor impede the government.
[377] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 443.
[378] WWM, Str P 7/10: Wentworth to Laud, 20 Jan. 1636–7: 'Hee [Coke] that told your Grace I was fallen out w[i]th you, & soe as never to forgive, understood as little of my nature as of my faith and affections towards your Lo[rdshi]p.' Laud returned the compliment, writing that 'I can neither honoure nor Serve you enough. And I care not who bites the lipp at itt': WWM, Str P 7/16: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Feb. 1636–7. His policies were entwined with the king's priorities as the ruler of a multiple monarchy, but Laud stated that in Scotland he had nowhere 'neare such help as your Lo[rdshi]p affords me [in Ireland]': WWM, Str P 6/314: same to same, 23 Jan. 1635–6.
[379] A. Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth, 1632–40', in T.W. Moody *et al.* (eds), *A New History of Ireland* (9 vols, Oxford, 1991), iii, p. 243.
[380] B. Bradshaw, 'The Invention of the Irish: Was the Ulster Rising Really a Bolt from the Blue?', *Times Literary Supplement* (Oct. 1994), pp. 8–10, at p. 10: 'it would form no part of a post–revisionist agenda to demythologize that gruesome episode [the Irish uprising of 1641].' The Ulster Rising in 1641 was a well–planned attack on Protestant settlers who occupied the estates of ancient Catholic families.
[381] WWM, Str P 6/13: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4: 'mutually prosper and decrease together'.
[382] WWM, Str P 6/149: same to same, 10 Mar. 1634–5.
[383] WWM, Str P 20/113: Laud to Wentworth, 30 Apr. 1633. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 268: Bishop of Winchester, Walter Curle, reported to Archbishop Laud in 1636 that there were 'diverse Recusants in severall partes of the Country, and that some of them have been seduced away from the Church of England within these two or three years.' (Report for the year of 1636, n.d.).
[384] WWM, Str P 6/6: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633. See also WWM, Str P 6/89: same to same, 23 Aug. 1634: 'there is not any other Servant the King hath lives a more laboriouse life, then his Deputye of Irelande.'
[385] *A True Relation of the Manner of the Execution of Thomas Earle of Strafford* (1641), p. 8, recte, p. 6. 'His losse would be irreparable to the King, and to all his fr[i]endes': LPL, MS 943, p. 712: Conway to Laud, 13 June 1640.

his own; one that will have what he will',[386] but it seemed as if his father's warning – 'for NOBLE MEN in generall itt is dangerouse to be familier with them, or to depend upon them, or to deale with or trust them too muche' –had perilously become fact.[387] Wentworth's image of himself as a poor sailor at sea in a raucous storm was accurate; he was to 'be founde deade w[i]th the Rudder in my handes.'[388] His testament that he was 'one of the oddest Deputyes that ever came here' still rings true,[389] but his acknowledgement that 'till wee be brought all under one forme of divine service, the Crowne is never safe on this side' speaks louder.[390] Laud offered him an early manifesto to which the Lord Deputy stridently adhered:

> first, if the Common Lawyers may be conteyned w[i]thin their ancient & sober boundes; if the word *Thorough* be not left out … if we growe not faint; if we ourselves be not in fault … if others will doe their partes as thoroughly as you promise for yourselfe, and justly conceave of me … I pray, w[i]th soe many and such ifs as these, what may not be done, and in a brave & noble way?[391]

The Church of Ireland had offered the archbishop 'a revealing opportunity to implement his dearest ideological concerns',[392] but it was in Scotland that Wentworth would determinedly face 'the rest of that Generation of odd Names & Natures'[393] – 'the Scotts have publickly declared me the[i]r enemye, a publicke incendiary'[394] – where much more than his personal honour would be at stake. In a scathing review of Kevin Sharpe's *Personal Rule*, Derek Hirst wrote that 'a thorough discussion of Ireland and Scotland

---

[386] *CSPD, 1634–5*, p. 350.
[387] *Wentworth Papers, 1597–1628*, ed. J.P. Cooper (Camden 4th ser., vol. 12, 1973), p. 11: 'For their thoughts are bestowed upon their owne waightie causes and their estates and actions are governed by pollicy.'
[388] NAL, V&A Museum, Forster MS 48 G 23, Item 4, fo. 2v: Wentworth to Earl of Carlisle, 24 Sept. 1632.
[389] WWM, Str P 8/35: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Oct. 1633. However, Wentworth claimed to have 'layd you [Laud] neerer my h[e]art, then any other fr[i]end I have': WWM, Str P 6/97: same to same, 22 Sept. 1634.
[390] WWM, Str P 9/188: Wentworth to Coke, 28 Nov. 1636. BL, Add. MS 34253, fo. 3r: Ussher once said that Wentworth upon his appointment to Ireland remarked 'that the Crown of England could not be well secured of that kingdome without reducing them to conformity in Religion w[i]th the Church of England.'
[391] WWM, Str P 6/1: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1633. See also WWM, Str P 8/33–4: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Oct. 1633: 'let not the worde *Thorough* be left out in any Case … If others doe not their Partes, I am confident the Honour shall be ours, And the shame theirs. And thus you have my *Thorough* and *Thorough*.'
[392] A. Ford, '"That Bugbear Arminianism": Archbishop Laud and Trinity College, Dublin', in C. Brady *et al.* (eds), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 160.
[393] WWM, Str P 6/130: same to same, 16 Dec. 1634. Both viewed Scottish nonconformity as an expression of disobedience. Laud once wrote that 'none of your Baggpipes in the North [Scotland] could alter me': WWM, Str P 6/16: Laud to Wentworth, 2 Dec. 1633. Indeed, the Scots accused Wentworth of having ordered his 'under–officers' 'to draw near in arms beyond the Tees, in the time of the treaty of Ripon': *The Fairfax Correspondence*, ed. G.W. Johnson, (2 vols, 1848), ii, p. 24.
[394] *Radcliffe*, ed. Whitaker, p. 214 (Wentworth to Radcliffe, 5 Nov. 1640). Cf. '*The Archbishop ... is universally considered the sole advisor of the king about the disturbances of Scotland*': *CSPV, 1636–9*, p. 394. See also Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle, Sy: Y.I.47.: 'the Prelate of Canterbury [Laud] and the L[i]eute[nan]t of Ireland [Wentworth] whome the Kingdome of Scotland hath conceaved … to have been prime Incendiaries' (14 Dec. 1640).

in the 1630s might have recast his characterization of the personal rule as a whole. If, as he insists, Charles did not seek to innovate, Wentworth seems to have been out of step in Ireland.'[395] His self-declared mission, 'to keep this Kingdome as much subordinate and dependant upon Englande as is possible', unravelled before his eyes.[396] Where Laud's involvement in the southern province of England is still open to debate – it remains deeply questionable, however, whether the archbishop was 'more politically pragmatic' than the king[397] – there is little doubt that his ideological concerns and inner motives were both exposed in Ireland. His alliance with Wentworth gave him space for manoeuvre. He was not merely a subsidiary to the Lord Deputy: from 1628, the year of his elevation to London, Laud orchestrated various ecclesiastical appointments and his correspondence demonstrates that the formulation and the implementation of policy were left to him.[398] Wentworth once told him that he was indebted to his efforts – 'in all Affaires belonging [to] the Church, I put myselfe w[i]th an implicite faith upon your Grace'[399] – and forever took it for 'a mighty favour' to be friendly with the archbishop, 'taking along w[i]th me throughout your Lo[rdshi]p[']s Judgm[en]t and Directions, w[hi]ch I will perfectly conforme my opinion unto in all the affaires Ecclesiasticall.'[400] He had expressed 'great joy' at Laud's translation to Canterbury – 'I dare say you shall be ranked amongst the best of your Predecessors'[401] – but it proved the end of them both. What began as a ruthless attainment of goals – the treatment of Parliament as little more than a financial generator for the Exchequer,[402] the slick expropriation of land to the crown and the use of the prerogative jurisdiction of the Court of Castle Chamber to intimidate critics – soon became a dim and distant prospect when considered as a universally 'British' manifesto. The ambitious determination with which they both adopted and pursued ecclesiastical

---

395 D. Hirst, 'The King Redeemed', *Times Literary Supplement* (15 Jan., 1993), p. 3. See also James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 173: 'he [Laud] was just as strident and forceful in his approach to Scotland as he was in England and Ireland.' See also ibid., p. 10: 'Laud's behaviour in Scotland broadly echoed his approach in England *and* Ireland' (my italics).
396 WWM, Str P 3/45: Wentworth to Weston, 31 Jan. 1633–4.
397 Davies, *Caroline Captivity,* pp. 301–5, at pp. 302–3, argues that the archbishop exercised no real direct power.
398 WWM, Str P 6/174: Laud to Wentworth, 20 Apr. 1635 ('I have allsoe now receaved a letter from his Ma[jes]ty giveing me [the] power to alter the Statut[e]s of the Coll[ege] of Dublin, and I shall proceed in that worke as fast as I can') and Str P 6/350: same to same, 22 Aug. 1636 ('I will not faile to acquaint the King w[i]th the bottome of this businesse').
399 WWM, Str P 6/357: Wentworth to Laud, 14 Sept. 1636.
400 WWM, Str P 8/43: same to same, 31 Oct. 1633.
401 WWM, Str P 8/13: same to same, 28 Aug. 1633.
402 Charles I encouraged this view, insisting that he would not accept any attempt to limit his prerogative: if any attempt arose, the Lord Deputy was to dissolve Parliament. Charles I warned him to be wary of 'that Hidra', the parliament that are 'as well cunning as maliti[o]us': WWM, Str P 40/4: Charles I to Wentworth, 17 Apr. 1634.

reforms was surprising, even startling, at times, but Wentworth and Laud were seeking to reconstruct the church in their own image, a revival of its legal and material fabric which would sustain its long-term future.[403] Laud cannot be excused – or exonerated – from responsibility for promoting the ecclesiastical policies of the 1630s, distancing himself from earlier royal directions;[404] he approved, even applauded, the vast majority of the reforms. The archbishop and Lord Deputy were joined in a fierce bid to secure the destiny of the Church of Ireland, a pursuit neither lucrative nor lacklustre in its effort. These operations caused protracted difficulties, both material and spiritual: the plan was too aggressive and a victim of its own over-optimism. Wentworth and Laud, nevertheless, formed a unique marriage of matching strength, which could resist – heroically, if not permanently – the sheer weight of the opposition. 'The violence … of the storme fell on the Earle of Strafford first, then on the ArchBishop of Canterbury'[405] four years later, but they were, in fact, a phenomenal force of industry and imagination. The archbishop was incorruptible; the Lord Deputy similarly so. Laud became one of his most faithful friends, holding a powerful position and assuming at times the role of a godfather.[406] He had vigorously argued for years, despite a few complications, that 'the King shall have the Glory of the settling of that Churche, but the Care and the Paines is yours'.[407]

Wentworth had successfully alienated the Catholic as well as the Old and New English Protestants,[408] unbalancing the delicate working arrangement that had been achieved

---

403 WWM, Str P 8/18: same to same, 9 Sept. 1633: 'your new wife, the Church of Canterbury, w[hi]ch whatever I doe I beleeve you will love and like better then you did your former [bishopric of London].' See also WWM, Str P 6/18: Laud to Wentworth, 2 Dec. 1633: 'You doe well to give me good hopes of my new Canterbury wife'.

404 Milton briefly discusses 'the waning of Laud's star' in the later 1630s based upon his own self-evaluation: idem, '"That Sacred Oratory": Religion and the Chapel Royal during the Personal Rule of Charles I', in A. Ashbee (ed.), *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on His Life, Times and Work* (1998), pp. 69–96, at p. 79. Cf. *CSPV, 1636–9*, p. 395: '*trying to exonerate himself … from this deeply rooted opinion* [of his influence and power]'.

405 BL, Add. MS 15567, fo. 31r: 'had endeavoured the subversion of the Lawes and an introduction of innovations in Religion.' Wentworth, however, held his absolutist Irish government as 'a prolonged advertising campaign', displaying his abilities for direct employment back in England: Milton, 'Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', p. 145. He desired, therefore, to establish and maintain court contacts with a wide range of individuals: J.P. Cooper, 'Strafford: A Revaluation', in J. Morrill *et al.* (eds), *Land, Men and Beliefs: Studies in Early-Modern History* (1983), pp. 192–200, esp. p. 196. Wentworth believed they – the lords pursuing a trial – were self–interested (*Radcliffe*, ed. Whitaker, p. 218: Wentworth to Radcliffe, 5 Nov. 1640: 'little lesse care ther[e] is taken to ruin me then to save the[i]r owne souls.')

406 WWM, Str P 6/109: Laud to Wentworth, 20 Oct. 1634: 'as long as you shall retaine the obedience of a Sonne, I will take upon me to be your Ghostly Father.' There was exactly twenty years of difference in their age.

407 WWM, Str P 6/190: same to same, 12 June 1635: 'God lend you life and strength to continue it'.

408 Mark Empey argues that Wentworth's attitude towards the Catholic faith in Ireland was far less tolerant than has previously been claimed, drawing attention to his efforts to curtail the activities and influence of the Catholic clergy: idem, 'Paving The Way to Prerogative: The Politics of Sir Thomas Wentworth, c.1614–1635' (Univ. College Dublin Ph.D. thesis, 2009), chs 7 and 9. See also TCD, MS 816, fo. 90r (deposition of Thomas Ashe, reporting the claims of one of the Catholic rebels involved in the uprising of Oct. 1641): 'the king was deposed, the Palsgrave [Charles

within the church in the decades before his arrival. Laud had persuaded – or, at least, not dissuaded with any firm conviction – the Lord Deputy to tackle many of the entrenched interests in Ireland. He directed, even masterminded, a policy of Anglicisation, 'regulat[ing] the Irish church unto the English',[409] with which Wentworth was more than willing to comply. Their correspondence is often self–consciously bland, avoiding indiscreet attention were the letters ever intercepted, but together they made up formidable partners in crime. Laud's position at court, his unique influence, was unrivalled – he proved critical in 'lodge[ing]' information in the king's mind, delivering messages to his Majesty 'w[i]thin one hower after I received them'[410] – and Wentworth recognised the importance of his overall presence as an effective ally.[411] Laud also entertained the warmest admiration for the strength of character and ability of the Lord Deputy, establishing the firmest bond of union intended to preserve the prerogative from unscriptural and unconstitutional rebellion. Indeed, Ireland had been subject to later Tudor patterns of centralization and integration, but Wentworth's time as direct governor functioned as something of a *trompe d'œil*. So fearless and formidable a champion of the privileges of monarchy, he yielded to the fascinations of Charles I *in absentia* – there was little, if any, testimony to suggest Wentworth, after his abandonment of Parliament's cause in 1628, made even the faintest attempt to accommodate matters between the subject and the crown.[412] The archbishop sympathised heartily with the Lord Deputy's efforts to establish authoritarian rule; in return, Wentworth gave his best wishes for the success of that ecclesiastical policy whereby the archbishop was endeavouring to restore the discipline of the church. Both

---

Louis] was crowned, and that the king had give[n] the Catholics in Ireland direction to rebell, lest they [the Irish Protestants] should assist the Puritans in England' (19 Feb. 1641–2).

409 P. Warwick, *Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1813), p. 124.

410 WWM, Str P 6/79: Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634; WWM, Str P 6/279: Laud to Wentworth, 16 Nov. 1635.

411 For example, Wentworth, unlike Laud, clearly valued John Bridgeman's administrative talents: B.W. Quintrell, 'Lancashire Ills, the King's Will and the Troubling of Bishop Bridgeman', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 132 (1983), p. 69. A budding prospect of the Jacobean age – as he told Wentworth, 'I forget not what I was (a worme, a poore creature) when that (now blessed s[ain]t) King James [I] raised mee up out of the dust' – Bridgeman remained in office throughout the following decade of the 1630s: SRO, D1287/18/2: Bishop John Bridgeman to Wentworth, 3 Feb. 1632–3 (P/399/3B).

412 Barely a year later, Wentworth can be found saying that 'ther[e] lives not a prince fuller of religion and vertue, god give us the grace to be truly thankfull for him as we ought': SRO, D1287/18/2: Wentworth to Bridgeman, 23 Dec. 1629 (P/399/48). He found himself six months later 'intirely affected to the honoure of my Maister': ibid., same to same, 18 Aug. 1630 (P/399/56). Once more he spoke of 'the duty I owe his Ma[jes]tie[']s service' (ibid., same to same, 28 July 1631 [P/399/60]), although he faced many problems ('allmost distraction'), 'my businesse lying in soe many severall places', both in England and Ireland: ibid., same to same: 10 Oct. 1632 (P/399/71). His venture into Ireland, however, was going to be 'gratiouse … w[hi]ch I asseure you noe earthly preferment how greate or profitable soever could have don[e]': ibid., same to same, 11 Jan. 1632–3 (P/399/72). Wentworth states that he was 'beginning of the next weeke to leave this place [England]': ibid.

men shared the king's ceremonial worldview,[413] a vision that built upon the Poynings' Law (1494) which subordinated the Irish Parliament to the Privy Council,[414] following a strict pattern of alliance and action indebted to quasi–confessional criteria. A deep distrust of Parliament in Dublin also permeated Laud's administrative mind, advising Wentworth to steer clear of ratifying the Irish canons after their approval by Convocation in 1634–5, 'least it make a noyse'.[415] Charles was never to revoke the Elizabethan ecclesiastical settlement and thus acquiesce in the fanciful logic of a multiple monarchy – each country bearing their own religion – but his minimal anti-recusant legislation and penal campaigns led many to believe in the (re–)creation of a Catholic nation, a daunting prospect that Laud did little, if anything, to disavow. Wentworth was a fierce and frightening character; however, Laud benefited from his physical isolation, with William Raylton acting as a loyal agent and 'a very carefull Servant',[416] bringing and collecting letters.[417] While it was true that the archbishop

---

[413] Over thirty-five letters survive from Charles I to Wentworth during the era of the Personal Rule, esp. 1638–9: WWM, Str P 40/3–41, from 26 Oct. 1633 to 23 Apr. 1641. In the mid–to–late 1630s, Charles I wrote to Wentworth in his own hand about every six months usually to express much praise. Between 1638 and 1639 their correspondence was mostly concerned with the provision of Irish troops for the possible Scots' war. In his letters to the Earl of Pembroke, Wentworth insisted that ceremonies were *adiaphora*, 'purely & simply Indifferent', an opinion which he would never have shared with the archbishop or the king: WWM, Str P 10(a)/169: Wentworth to Earl of Pembroke, 28 Aug. 1638. Laud also once chided him for using the term, 'Pastors': WWM, Str P 6/67: Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634. It was also apparent that Wentworth transcended the specific virtues and vices of a favourite. In fact, Charles placed him in Ireland to avoid his intimidating presence at court. As a result, he always craved public testimony. See, e.g., n. 6. Although they both desired material and financial improvements to the Church of Ireland, it would be a grave misunderstanding to portray Laud and Wentworth as benign reformers uninterested in harmonizing religious practices. Kevin Sharpe's attempt to avoid the temptation to demonize both Laud and Wentworth is not entirely convincing: idem, *Personal Rule*, esp. pp. 140–2. Wentworth's life and career ought to be raised to a new level of sense, style and sophistication by Anthony Milton in his forthcoming – and eagerly anticipated – biography. On 3 May 1641, Pembroke promised the Westminster crowds that he would 'move his Majesty, that Justice … according to their requests' must be done, i.e. execution: *A Perfect Journal of the Daily Proceedings and Transactions in that Memorable Parliament, Begun at Westminster, 3 November 1640 …* (1641), p. 90. For Pembroke's signature on the declaration against Wentworth, see BL, Add. MS 19398, fo. 72r.

[414] The Irish Parliament, despite some scholarly efforts to deny its continued existence, in both its constituent houses continued to meet until well into the late 1640s: C.A. Dennehy, 'The Irish Parliament After the Rebellion, 1642–48', in P. Little (ed.) *Ireland in Crisis: War, Politics and Religion, 1641–50* (Manchester, 2020), p. 101.

[415] WWM, Str P 6/51: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634: 'w[i]th us the Cannons have no other Confirmation then the Broad Seale [royal approval].' Wentworth virtually bullied Convocation into its conclusions. Archbishop Ussher was ashamed, finding the result deeply displeasing: the Irish Articles of 1615 – which incorporated the Thirty-Nine and the Lambeth Articles – were not confirmed by Charles I, aspiring instead to a unity built upon the English canons of 1604: A. Capern, 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension', *HJ*, 39 (1996), pp. 74–5. Laud also commented in a letter to Bramhall that parliaments had succeeded in 'tak[ing] off all power from the Church': HMC, *Hastings*, iv, p. 67: Laud to Bramhall, 11 May 1635. Laud admitted to Wentworth that some of the canons 'will not presently fill that Churche', but still argued that their introduction would remove 'such a confusion … as hath hitherto been among them': WWM, Str P 6/143: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Jan. 1634–5. See also James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 82 for Laud's 'deep involvement' in drafting the Scottish canons.

[416] WWM, Str P 12/158: Philip Mainwaring to Wentworth, 29 Oct. 1630.

[417] F. Pogson, 'Public and Private Service at the Early Stuart Court: the Career of William Raylton, Strafford's Agent', *Historical Research*, 84 (2011), pp. 53–66, esp. pp. 62–4. He was also experienced in the Signet Office. See ibid., pp. 55–60, at p. 60: 'his long service in the signet office, enabled him to wait "at the backstairs" and observe how long Secretary Coke was closeted with the king preparing his dispatch on Irish affairs.' Conscious of the administrative perils of cipher, Laud used Raylton on more than one occasion to pick up news about rumours and to circumvent the need for encoding letters ('saves us the trouble of a Cipher'): WWM, Str P 6/364–6, at 364: Laud to

attached greater significance to their relationship, Wentworth remained bound to him for prime details of the court.[418] Those vehemently opposing Wentworth in the Commons, including Oliver St John, did 'excellently acquitte' themselves in pushing for the Bill of Attainder,[419] but Wentworth and Laud's enduring and enigmatic relationship stood the test of time.[420] Charles would attend his Lord Lieutenant's trial

---

Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1636. Raylton even provided the archbishop with pen and paper when he awoke him in a foul mood ('not in ease to rise') in the autumn of 1630: WWM, Str P 12/152: Raylton to Wentworth, 12 Oct. 1630. For Wentworth's 'domestic friendships' as opposed to 'political', see Brownhill, 'Personal and Professional Relationships between Thomas Wentworth … and his closest advisors', esp. chs 2, 4 and 5. See also WWM, Str P 12/47: Raylton to Wentworth, 31 Dec. 1628: Raylton's first letter to Wentworth dates from the final day of Dec. 1628, when the latter was beginning his work as Lord President of the Council of the North. Both the date and the content suggest that Raylton had been recruited relatively recently by Wentworth to act as his agent in London.

[418] BL, Sloane MS 1467, fo. 37r: unlike Archbishop Laud's performance on the scaffold in the prime days of 1644–5, Lord Lieutenant Wentworth is even described as having 'saluted' all the noblemen present. The presence of a number of noblemen on Wentworth's scaffold is proven by a contemporary manuscript account in which Wentworth is described as taking 'his everlasting leave from the Lo[rdshi]ps and others present, as if he had taken but a civill leave for [a trip to] Ireland': BL, Sloane MS 3317, fo. 21v. Raylton's surviving correspondence is certainly not extensive; only fourteen of his letters remain in the Str Ps, covering almost ten years from 31 Dec. 1628 to 30 May 1638.

[419] KHLC, U269/C267/12: Earl of Bath to Countess of Bath, 29 Apr. 1641: 'w[i]th great applause.' St John had been one of the many fierce defenders of the bill in the Commons and was one of the men who carried the attainder bill up to the Lords later that month: Bodl., MS Tanner 66, fo. 69r: Henry Kinge to Martin Calthorpe, 24 Apr. 1641. St John had displayed a growing animus towards Wentworth ever since his impeachment trial had collapsed on 10 April 1641. Oliver St John 'endeavoured to prove the Legality' of the Bill of Attainder a mere fortnight before Wentworth's execution, BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 57v (29 Apr. 1641). It was passed by the Upper House on 7 May 1641. By the 1 March, only two months earlier, the impeachment articles had been suddenly printed in an unauthorized edition, despite the best efforts of the Lords – they were in circulation by 2 March: A. Milton and T. Kilburn, 'The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, pp. 232–3. The Bill of Attainder was carried by John Pym up to the Lords on 21 Apr. 1641, but was not read in Upper House until 26 Apr. 1641.The Upper House records of the readings and of the orders concerning the Bill of Attainder were expunged from the record and are not included in the printed edition of the *Journals of the House of Lords*. During the fierce legal prosecution of Wentworth, the English Parliament was declared to be 'the supream[e] Judicature in the said Realme [of Ireland]': TCD, MS 1180, fo. 3r: declaration of both Houses of Parliament, 24 May 1641. An attainder was the unalterable act of a judicial or legislative sentence for treason or a felony. It involved the forfeiture of all real property of the condemned person and such 'corruption of blood' that he (or she) could not transmit by inheritance any goods. St John tried to avoid on 14 April 1641 a discussion of the law of treason within the House before the attainder bill was passed: BL, Harl. MS 163, fo. 44r ('it was resolved affirmativelie & it was ther[e]upon ordered accordinglie.') When John Glyn was stopped from presenting before the Lords this 'evidence offered … for the fuller provinge of the 23rd article ', he presented it to the Commons later the same day: BL, Harl. MS 1601, fo. 55r. The twenty–third and fifteenth articles, which argued that Wentworth had positively counselled war on 5 May 1641 to reduce Charles' English subjects to odedience, would eventually form the basis of the bill of attainder against Wentworth. See also NAL, V&A Museum, Forster MS 30: Prince–Elector Charles Louis of the Palatinate to Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia, 18 May 1641: 'Bill against my L[ord] of Strafford is now also passed in the upper Howse [or Lords]'. He recorded that the king was in tears at the council table ('the king hath shewed himselfe a good Master & a good Christian').

[420] Their correspondence provides few, if any, clues about where or when their close association began. Wentworth first sat in the House of Lords in the 1629 session whilst Laud sat as Bishop of London, but the session was a short one and the two men were members together on only one committee: 'the Committee appointed to take a View of the Store of Munitions of Shipping and Arms, and the Defence of the Kingdom'. Compared to Wentworth's one committee, Laud sat on six others: *Journals of the House of Lords* (147 vols, 1509–1916), iv, pp. 37 and 7, 19, 25, 31, 34 and 39. It is very difficult, however, given everything which Wentworth did, to disagree with John Adamson's conclusion that he was 'the most intellectually gifted of all Charles's ministers': Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 9. He did encounter some difficulties in the raising of loans in order to tackle the Scots in 1639 – 'hopelesse of doing any good therein in these broken and ill disposed times' – but remained more confident than the Earl of Northumberland about the slim chance of mounting a campaign, believing he could raise an Irish army: *Radcliffe*, ed. Whitaker, p. 199: Wentworth to Radcliffe, 2 May 1640. The cost in 1639 had been estimated at £935, 000 per year.

almost religiously, if curiously,[421] but showed neither the time nor the patience for his closest figure within the Church. The sight of Wentworth kneeling 'at the Barr' of the House of Lords was a sombre recognition of the advancement and subsequent decline of one of the most powerfully gifted individuals to set foot in a foreign land.[422] He has often been portrayed as an isolated character, but his relationship with Laud – and direct reference to his close associates such as Radcliffe and Wandesford, *inter alios*[423] – offers a missing dimension. Navigating through the religio–political waters of the seventeenth century with his personality intimately bound up with his policies, Wentworth attached himself to an archbishop, twenty years his senior, whose clear and invaluable access to the king made him critical.[424] It seemed that the Junto lords – the earls of Warwick, Essex and Northumberland, to name but three – (or 'the precise partie') were 'still most prevalent in the higher howse [of Lords]'.[425] Wentworth, after all, had only arrived in Ireland to complete three tasks: to make it fiscally stable by

---

[421] BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 26r: on 24 Feb. 1640–1, Charles had originally promised never to appear again at the debates over impeachment of Strafford for fear of 'alter[ing] or hinder[ing] the Justice of the Tryall', but he reneged on this promise later when he announced before the Lords his presence at 'Tryalls for Treason': fo. 39r. Charles I, in fact, 'laughed' in his royal box on Saturday 10 April 1641 as the proceedings degenerated into farce: TNA, SP 16/479, fo. 56r: Nathaniel Tomkyns to [John Lambe?], 12 Apr. 1641 (meanwhile, 'the Earle of Straff[ord] was so well pleased therewith that he could not hide his joy'). See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 393: '*Wentworth* … was presently made Lord Leiutenant of *Ireland*, and not long after with great solemnity Created Earl of *Strafford*'.

[422] BL, Add. MS 15567, fo. 32r. Pym said that 'Hee [King] is the husband to his people[,] the head to his subjects', placing much, if not all, the blame on Strafford's shoulders. It was he who desired 'to dissolve the bond of protection' between monarch and subject: BL, Harl. MS 164, fo. 170v (13 Apr. 1641, a month before Wentworth's execution). Edward Bagshaw, a reformist lawyer yet a future Royalist, said exactly what Pym had in mind but did not quite have the heart or courage to say, 'that the kingdo[m] cannot be saff[e] while he [Wentworth] lives': BL, Harl. MS 477, fo. 28r.

[423] John Bramhall may first appear as an obvious candidate to include in this small group, but the specific form of affinity developed between Wentworth and his associates or 'men–of–business' had a far greater longevity and intensity. P. Collinson, 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments', *Parliamentary History*, 7 (1988), p. 192, describes these sort of men, in a much earlier time, as 'secondary political figures whose identities were less important than the fact that they looked after everything admirably. They were not opponents of the regime but its functionaries'. Operating within semi–covert, arguably more private than public, worlds, these men transformed informal position–papers and courtly discussions into Parliament, press or pulpit. Archbishop Neile's dependence on his own men, for instance, rather than the local gentry allowed him to override vested interests and corruption; his was a 'personal, centralized government with a vengeance'. See A. Foster, 'The Function of a Bishop: The Career of Richard Neile, 1562–1640' in R. O'Day *et al.* (eds) *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England, 1500–1642* (Leicester, 1976), p. 46. This is not to say the closest associates could not still express some worries about their position. See. e.g., Bodl., MS Add. C. 286, fo. 29v: 29 June 1640: Wandesford felt isolated, since during the summer of 1640 both Wentworth and Radcliffe were in England. Radcliffe was an important asset in Wentworth's government, as his 'ingenious legal trickery was vital in enabling the crown to regain the political initiative in Ireland.' By manipulating 'legal loopholes, quibbles and technicalities'. Radcliffe, on Wentworth's behalf, was able to increase the power of the Court of Castle Chamber: Milton, 'Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule' in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, p. 140.

[424] Dougal Shaw observes how the Lord Deputy's public building programme 'mirrored' that of Charles' plans for London, specifically the renovation of Christ Church, Dublin and the improvements to St Paul's Cathedral: idem, 'Thomas Wentworth and Monarchical Ritual in Early Modern Ireland', *HJ*, 49 (2006), p. 351. Wedgwood, interestingly, claims that Wentworth sat on the commission for the restoration of St Paul's, but provides no source of reference to support her contention: eadem, *Wentworth*, p. 97.

[425] TNA, SP 16/479, fo. 56v: Tomkyns to [Lambe?], 12 Apr. 1641. There was a five–man committee, chaired by the Earl of Warwick, 'for examination of witnesses in Ireland', that had been appointed in January 1640–1 to scrutinise the claims against Wentworth: BL, Harl. MS 457, fo. 51v

eliminating its annual deficit; to pay down its accumulated debt; and support, crucially, the expansion of the troubled Church of Ireland, supporting, in the process, the growth of new Protestant communities. This objective was a little irksome, given the ferocity of the Irish rebellion of 1641,[426] but it succumbed to Parliament.[427] Wentworth was, indeed, under the mistaken impression only a month before his enforced death 'that the Lords are inclinable to preserve my life and family'.[428] The Church of Ireland was, essentially, a malfunctioning institution disabled, as it were, by self–inflicted issues that rendered it incapable of competing with the continental advances of the Counter–Reformation. Wentworth's remarkable success, however, lay in uniting previously antagonistic groups in common opposition to his own rule; indeed, those who had left 'God[']s portion naked, And desolate to posterity' deserved immediate retribution in his eyes.[429] His rather abrasive handling of senior Irish office–holders, such as the earl of Cork,[430] inspired a close political partnership with Archbishop Laud, espousing particular *Thorough* opinions on government and ensuring grave punishment for offenders. Two years after his speedy execution in 1641, a royalist preacher lamented how

> Princes have beene sometimes overawed by the Peeres of the Realme, or otherwise for fear of the tumult in the State, they durst not either shew

[426] News of the Irish insurrection to reach London came first not from the official channels of the Lords Justices in Dublin, but from John Clotworthy's own man–of–affairs, Owen O'Connolly. After quite a lengthy and tiresome journey, O'Connolly reached the capital on Sunday 31 Oct. 1641 and appeared first at Leicester House. For Leicester House, see L.W. Cowie, 'Leicester House', in *History Today*, 23 (1973), pp. 30–7. It was the London home of Robert Sidney, the earl of Leicester, Strafford's successor as Lord Deputy of Ireland. For O'Connolly's success in being on the spot when Protestant riots had broken out in Antrim in the spring of 1641, see BL, Egerton MS 2541, fos 235v–6r. For O'Connolly's role in the news surrounding the insurrection, see M. Perceval–Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Dublin, 1994), pp. 240 and 270. See also TCD, MS 836, fo. 82v (23 Oct. 1641): 'there was an Army of 40000 to bee sent out of England & Scotland to see such lawes speedilie Executed against all Catholiques in the kingdome of Ireland.' See also TCD, MS 809, fo. 13v (information of Owen Connallie, 22 Oct. 1641): 'great numbers of Noblemen and Gentlemen of the Irish Papists from all parts of the Kingdome in this Towne' in order to seize Dublin Castle was somewhat of an exaggeration.

[427] Peers engineered the removal of Strafford, Laud and Windebanke, amongst others, and urged the king to replace them with bridge appointees (e.g. Bristol, Bedford, Essex, Hertford and Saye *et al.* went to the Privy Council in mid-Feb. 1640–1). Oliver St John had already been admitted only a fortnight earlier. These cynical appointments were designed to win vote in the House of Lords for Strafford, whose trial was only a month away (i.e. to hold out the expectation of future favour). In particular, the high rise of Essex to Lord Chamberlain and Saye's appointment as Master of the Wards were influenced, in part, by Charles' wish to dismantle and disarray the chorus of aristocratic grandees, to drink 'the sweet *Refreshments* of Court favours': A. Wilson, *The History of Great Britain being the Life and Reign of King James the First* (1653), p. 162.

[428] NRS, GD406/1/1335: Wentworth to Hamilton, 24 Apr. 1641: 'the greate god of mercy will rewarde them'.

[429] WWM, Str P 5/24: Wentworth to Coke, 8 Nov. 1633. Contra Davies, Carolinism was *not* the driving force of liturgical change. Even the concept of Laudianism is not strictly applicable to Ireland during the mid–to–late 1630s; Wentworth as Lord Deputy inclined to it because it was compatible with his ambitious plans for efficient government.

[430] See the second chapter on the Earl of Cork for more details.

kindnesse, and give entertainment to good men whom they loved.[431]

Maurice Wynn, writing to his brother at the end of March 1640–1, could not help overtly praising Wentworth's command performance at the trial as 'the ablest Subject of his [Charles'] 3 kingdoms'.[432] Wentworth, indeed, joined with Laud during the 1630s to root out determined and long–standing criminals in the process of government, forming a faction committed to strengthening government.[433] Wentworth had, indeed, completed two virtually impossible tasks: he generated a revenue surplus that enriched Westminster coffers, and united antagonists who were divided by race and religion. He had immersed himself in a study of the problems of governing a land that was partially 'Conquered'[434] and partially colonised.[435] Charles I was understandably guilt–ridden as a result of agreeing to the brutal execution of Wentworth, one of his most trusted servants, 'an able, ruthless and ambitious politician'.[436] A discussion of Laud's solid relationship with Thomas Wentworth would at first appearance seem to offer a decidedly limited opportunity to write something new about his career, but 'Wentworth, like Charles and Laud, was a man of few close contacts and fewer warm friendships.'[437] Neither Laud nor Wentworth were ever dismissed from their office; their 'fascinating

[431] H. Killigrew, *A Sermon Preached Before the King*['']*s Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, 1643), sig. C2.
[432] NLW, MS 9063E/1681: Maurice to Owen Wynn, 30 Mar. 1641. Indeed, Maurice, after listening to the trial's first week formed a positive picture of Wentworth. See also NLW, MS 9062E/1678: same to same, 22 [23] Mar. 1640–1: throughout London in 1641, detachments of 'trained bands in verie manie places' were set 'to keepe men in order' – a measure which suggests, at least, the possibility of clashes between pro– and anti–Straffordian parties or factions. See as well CALS, CR/63/2/19, fo. 86r: the Cheshire gentleman William Davenport copied a poem written against a man in Parliament who had waded in 'Stafford[']s blood', brought the 'Bishopps' down, 'plotte[d]' with 'the Scotts', and sought to make England like the 'Dutch'.
[433] J.R. Tanner, *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century, 1603–1689* (Cambridge, 1962), pp. 70–73.
[434] Parliamentary Archives, HL/PO/JO/5/1/7: Wentworth allegedly said that the king might deal with them as 'a Conquered Nation' (25 Mar. 1641).
[435] Ibid.: 'The E[arl] of Strafford[']s proceedinge in this case was mostly arbitrary' (26 Mar. 1641).
[436] Durston, *Charles I*, p. 26. See also Wedgwood, *King's Peace*, p. 275: Wentworth was the king's 'ablest, strongest and most devoted servant'. See as well: with the Treaty of London on 7 Aug. 1641, the English Parliament conceded that warfare and the halting of trade within British dominions required parliamentary approval in both Scotland and England: Univ. of Edinburgh Library, MS Dc.4.16., pp. 79–83, 86, 94, 100–1 and 105–7. See also NRS, GD406/1/167: Charles I to Hamilton, 2 Dec. 1642: 'the failing to one fr[i]end [i.e. Wentworth], has, indeed, gone very neere me; wherefor I am resolved that no consideration whatsoever shall ever make mee doe the lyke; upon this ground I am certaine that God he[']s rather so totally forgiven me, that he will still blesse this good Cause in my hands, or that all my punishement shall bee in this World'. Warwickshire County Record Office, CR2017/C48/9: Nicholas to Lord Feilding, 13 Dec. 1631: 'he is a shrewd Champion for the king in all affaires'.
[437] P. Gregg, *King Charles I* (1981), p. 243.

relationship'[438] endured. 'He [Wentworth] denies that the King put more trust in him or Canterbury then in others'.[439]

[438] Pogson, 'Public and Private Service', p. 65.
[439] BL, Harl. MS 6424, fos 35r–v. Others have emphasized the role of 'invaluable' women in Wentworth's management of governmental duties: M. Lawrence, 'New Perspectives on 'Black Tom'? The Female Relationships of Sir Thomas Wentworth, 1593–1641' (Univ. of Kent MARes thesis, 2021), p. 133.

Chapter 2: 'I never undertooke a Businesse more against my owne private affections in all my life'[440]: Laud, Wentworth and the Earl of Cork, 1634–5

Upon his appointment as Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1632–3, Wentworth had his eye upon one thing: the royal prerogative, an ideal tinged with the conviction that he alone would be able to repair the depredations it had recently suffered. Wentworth also knew that expressions of 'decency' and 'order' would find ready sympathy with the archbishop. If Laud's aim was to restore the church as a dignified companion of the crown, if the last fifty years of Irish rule had been such 'an unmitigated disaster',[441] then Charles I was also ready to restore impropriations in the royal gift. Laud urged Wentworth to assess their value in order for the king to know the extent of his generosity and also – and more significantly – to remedy the problem of pluralism. The most spectacular victim was Richard Boyle, the Earl of Cork and a leader of the New English planter party, whose wealth and land had been acquired mostly through dubious exploitation of ecclesiastical property but who claimed neither to begrudge Wentworth his elevation nor thirst 'after high imployments'.[442] Wentworth, however, sought to enhance the crown's position as a conquering power; his unassailable status was supported by Laud's unflinching attention at court against Wentworth's enemies, including Crosby and Mountnorris. The Earl of Cork proved to be collateral damage, an unnecessary obstacle in Wentworth's timely agenda for bolstering royal authority, assisted as ever by that 'other essential prop to his power' – his alliance with Laud.[443]

Present–day scholars have obscured, even ignored, the presiding role occupied by the archbishop. A great deal of emphasis had been placed upon the dirty tactics associated with Wentworth – 'the witty and pungent remarks' contained in his correspondence,[444] 'the personal vendetta' between the two earls,[445] and his 'waspish pen and heavy

---

[440] WWM, Str P 6/212: Wentworth to Laud, 26 Aug. 1635.
[441] Ranger, 'Boyle', p. 292.
[442] WWM, Str P 1/34: Cork to Wentworth, 4 Mar. 1631–2. Cork claimed to look forward to the prospect of 'retire[ing] to my former countrey-life': ibid.
[443] Cust, *Charles I*, p. 202. For the strength of Lord Deputy Wentworth's alliance with Archbishop Laud, see ch. 1. Although touched on briefly here, the Church of Ireland (1633–41) is a large topic indeed, extending far beyond the ambit of this thesis. For a reliably in-depth study, see McCafferty, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, esp. chs 2–5. Wentworth was, however, a ruthless and uncompromising beast who envisaged the Church of Ireland conforming to a particular Laudian vision of the Church of England in both liturgical and canonical terms.
[444] Canny, *Upstart Earl*, p. 13.
[445] P. Little, 'The Earl of Cork and the Fall of Strafford, 1638–41', *HJ*, 39 (1996), p. 630.

hand'[446] – but Laud, by sharp contrast, scarcely receives a mention in many of these studies. In so doing, scholarship risks portraying the disputes between 1634–5 as wholly about landed property when, in fact, they comprised many issues dear to Laud's heart: diocesan government; ecclesiastical revenue; and, most significantly, the altar policy. 'He [Cork] was cal[le]d to the Counsayle Table' that year, '& ther[e] the busines[s] was debated publicklie, w[hi]ch itt seems did a littell stir his Lo[rdshi]p for his Complaynt to me was he had not bin used formerly to be called to that place to have his busines[s] discussed.'[447] The administrative oversight of the archbishop, moreover, was critical to the personal conduct of the Lord Deputy, forming the basis of the vast majority of his sour actions.

As early as autumn 1633, Wentworth was able to report to Laud in a triumphant mood of self-congratulation that he had made the earl 'disgorge … two Vicaradges that his Tenant and he had held from the poore incumbents these thirty yeares.' Cork was told that the incumbents' title was 'as cleere as the day': 'All this to his face, Before the whole Counsell. And was not this now *Thorough*?'[448] Cork was likened to John, bishop of Constantinople, a figure who if 'lett alone … would have beene his Universall Vicar',[449] but the whole business was considered 'sufficient for an opener', a 'preparative physick',[450] and it was not long until Wentworth had taken several more vicarages from out of Cork's hands.[451] Laud could only see irony in Cork's projected restoration of Lismore[452] – 'a direct Rapine upon the Patrimony of the Churche'[453] – but by March the next year the attack had moved on. Michael Boyle, bishop of Waterford and Lismore,[454] wrote to Laud accusing the earl of holding lands belonging

---

[446] J. Ohlmeyer, 'The Irish Peers, Political Power and Parliament, 1640–1641', in Brady *et al.* (eds), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland,* p. 161.
[447] Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 54: George Buttler to Clifton, 25 Oct. 1634.
[448] WWM, Str P 8/34–5: Wentworth to Laud, 22 Oct. 1633. Those lay persons who held impropriated vicarages were 'the most pestilent vermine of the whole Kingdome': WWM, Str P 6/4: same to same, n.d. Dec. 1633.
[449] WWM, Str P 8/44: same to same, 31 Oct. 1633: 'And soe away w[i]th him.'
[450] Ibid.: 'I have in readynesse a stronger potion that will provoke three more from him'. WWM, Str P 6/2: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1633: 'you have taken a very judiciouse Course to administer one soe early to my Lord of Corke. I hope it will doe him good though perchance he thinke not soe … Goe on my Lord, I must needs say this is *Thoroug*[*h*] indeed'. The earl had initially dismissed these events, writing to Lord Clifford that Wentworth 'enjoyes, & upholds his great command here with much h[e]ight of hono[u]r & reputation': Chatsworth House, Cork Miscellaneous Letterbook III, p. 43: Cork to Lord Clifford, 21 July 1634.
[451] WWM, Str P 6/4: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633.
[452] WWM, Str P 6/68–9: Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634: 'None soe fitt to build a new one by Repentance as hee that pulled downe the old by Sacriledge.'
[453] WWM, Str P 8/58: Wentworth to Lord Clifford, 7 Dec. 1633.
[454] '~~Michael Boyle B[isho]p of Waterford & Lismore deceased at Waterford.~~ (a false Rumo[u]r)' only to write later that on 27 Dec. 1635 he 'deceased': Dublin City Library and Archive, Gilbert MS 169, p. 215 (James Ware's diary of events).

to his see and preparing to 'swallow… up' Youghal with all its endowments, 'the best, most ancient, and most religious foundations of the kingdom.'[455] He asked Laud to inform the king of this matter and write also to Wentworth, giving him the authority 'to procure the Kinge[']s majesties['] letter to the right honourable the Lord Deputie'.[456] Such correspondence was not written spontaneously – Bramhall, an industrious councillor, had already told the fellows of Youghal to petition the king.[457] In spite of his low opinion of Boyle, who 'would at any tyme loose a fr[i]end rather then spare it', Laud gave the cause his support.[458] Boyle's replacement, John Atherton, was not closely associated with the Cork family – the earl should 'thinke the Devill is lett loose upon him forth of his Chaine'.[459]

The Earl of Cork naturally appealed to England and throughout the following year of 1635 Wentworth faced bitter opposition at court.[460] Cork hoped his friendships would secure him good fortune – Wentworth was informed of attempts by the earl's 'freinds here', 'especially the Lo[rd] Chamberlaine [Pembroke] and Lo[rd] of Salisbury', to persuade the king to allow Cork 'to come over' to England[461] – but Laud reminded Wentworth of the weight of royal favour.[462] After an enquiry as to whether he should hold a public hearing or a private composition, Wentworth was informed that 'the King

---

455 TNA, SP 63/254, fo. 248r: Michael Boyle to Laud, 7 Mar. 1633–4 and *CSPI, 1633–47*, p. 49.

456 TNA, SP 63/254, fo. 248r: same to same, 7 Mar. 1633–4: 'it hath pleased god to make you so great'.

457 Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 127. Wentworth claimed that the case was not brought forward for small details but for 'noe lesse then the whole Bishoprick of Lismore, And Colledge of Youghall, w[i]th two thowsand pounds a yeare good lands': WWM, Str P 6/9: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4.

458 WWM, Str P 6/39: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4: 'For if the Earle will feed him w[i]th a little Money, farewell Lismore & your Petition too.' 'Laud and Strafford give him a very bad character. He was obviously one of the less desirable nominations of the pre-Laudian era': H. O'Grady, *Strafford and Ireland: The History of His Vice-Royalty* (2 vols, Dublin, 1923), i, p. 508. Michael Boyle would die in Dec. 1635, being replaced by Atherton who pursued Cork vigorously in Castle Chamber. Atherton received, nonetheless, £500 from the earl '*to build a new house for himself*': *CSPI, 1633–47*, pp. 166–8, at p. 167. 'Atherton deserves well of this Churche': WWM, Str P 6/201: Wentworth to Laud, 14 July 1635. Boyle was a distant and estranged relative of the earl.

459 WWM, Str P 6/331: same to same, 9 Mar. 1635–6. See A. Clarke, 'A Woeful Sinner: John Atherton', in V.P. Carey *et al.* (eds), *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2003), pp. 138–49. See WWM, Str P 6/338: Laud to Wentworth, 8 Apr. 1636 ('132 [Cork] will be gladd of his preferrm[en]t'), but they both shared apprehensions about Atherton; it was neither a plum promotion as Derry was for Bramhall or a poor bishopric as Ferns and Leighlin was for George Andrews, a defender of the Irish Articles.

460 Ranger, 'Boyle', pp. 308–12.

461 WWM, Str P 3/218: Cottington to Wentworth, 4 Aug. 1635. The earl had already asked the Lord Chamberlain 'to joyne with my Lord the Earle of Salisbury, and move his sacred Ma[jes]ty to give order to his Lord Deputy, that the sayd informac[i]on be w[i]thDrawne, and the prosecution thereof stayed soe': Chatsworth House, Cork Miscellaneous Letterbook III, p. 89: Cork to Earl of Pembroke, 28 June 1635. See also WWM, Str P 34/10: Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636: 'My Lord of Corke his businesse is don[e] to his contentment … but I cannot finde his Ma[jes]ty inclined to let his lo[rdshi]p cum over this winter'. WWM, Str P 6/283: Wentworth to Laud, 14 Dec. 1635: at the end of the year, Wentworth informed Laud that he had requested permission from Charles I to 'come over' to England 'for a month or two'.

462 WWM, Str P 6/51: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634: 'He is very well edifyed in the businesse I asseure you.'

likes all.'[463] Nevertheless, the Earl of Cork sent an agent to court with letters to the earl, Salisbury, amongst others, desiring to submit himself to his royal master, to 'preserve him from the disgrace of a publique Sentence, & give him leave & wayte upon him, & lay his person & his Cause at his feete.'[464] The king was ready to show his mercy, receiving 'such Submissions and Satisfactions as shall be thought fitt',[465] but Wentworth was determined not to allow Cork to reach English shores.[466] It 'would protract the Prosecution very much'[467] – 'Beleeve me,' he wrote to Laud, 'if he once gets over he will have so many windings and turnings, strew and throw his golden apples with such art in the way as he will infinitely delay the cause … and in Conclusion win the race'.[468] The earl ideally wished to govern alone, but he soon realised that living under Wentworth was the worst-case scenario, subject as he always was to a 'remorseless hunting down'.[469] Laud wrote to Wentworth that 'when the Great Cause of Lismore comes before you, I doubt not but you will doe the Church that favour w[hi]ch you may, w[i]th Honoure & Justice',[470] but after heard his complaint that 'the Bishopps of Derry and Waterford are in Treaty w[i]th my Lord of Corke concerning Lismore'.[471]

In his attempt to make Ireland financially solvent, Wentworth was liable to alienate the New English as much as those belonging to Catholic communities; he envisaged himself as 'the Storke … amongst thes[e] froggs'.[472] Lord Mountnorris, a formidable rival of the Boyle faction in the Dublin administration, alleged that the wealth and

---

463 WWM, Str P 6/138: same to same, 12 Jan. 1634–5: 'soe foule a practise against the Churche.'
464 WWM, Str P 15/241: Earls of Salisbury and Pembroke to Wentworth, 21 Oct. 1635. William Cecil, the 2nd earl of Salisbury, was pursuing the king in private.
465 WWM, Str P 9/308: Windebanke to Wentworth, 22 Oct. 1635.
466 The king would not have the Earl of Cork arrive in England, but Laud's faith ('tis a wonder to see 100 [the king] … soe Constant': WWM, Str P 6/259: Laud to Wentworth, 4 Oct. 1635) vanished upon hearing that Charles I had changed his mind. When Wentworth received the new order, he was startled – it went 'directly Crosse' the previous decision (WWM, Str P 3/224: Wentworth to Charles I, 31 Oct. 1635) – but Laud had already warned him 'that a Nobleman of his Ranke may not be disgraced there in a Publike Court of Justice': WWM, Str P 6/245: Laud to Wentworth, 14 July 1635. Wentworth was worried that it would 'be a Blemish upon the Administration … and rayse an overweening in Persons of Power': WWM, Str P 6/213: Wentworth to Laud, 26 Aug. 1635.
467 WWM, Str P 6/216–17: A Collection of all the private p[re]parations, Publike Proceedings & present state of the Cause now depending in the Castle Chamber of Ireland against the Earle of Corke: 'the Earle to goe over into England, And humbly Advised his Ma[jes]ty might be desired not to Grant it.' See also WWM, Str P 3/219: Wentworth to Cottington, 11 Sept. 1635: 'nothing of Advantadg[e] to his Ma[jes]tie can come by the Granting [of] itt'.
468 WWM, Str P 6/273–4: Wentworth to Laud, 2 Nov. 1635.
469 J.F. Merritt, 'Historical Reputation of Thomas Wentworth', in eadem (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, p. 10. Cust, *Charles I*, p. 201, writes that the earl was 'one of the most aggressive of the 'New English' planters'.
470 WWM, Str P 7/12: Laud to Wentworth, 18 Jan. 1636–7.
471 WWM, Str P 7/37: Wentworth to Laud, 10 July 1637.
472 WWM, Str P 1/89v: Wentworth to Weston, 6 Dec. 1632.

power of Cork was based upon a ‘rotten foundac[i]on’ which would sooner collapse than withhold if Wentworth ‘pursue[d] them with any stricktnes[s] of Justice’.[473] Of course, Mountnorris had every reason to be angry – he had looked upon Cork’s appointment as joint Lord Deputy for the years 1629–32 with considerable unease[474]– but the threat of the Clifford match, a strategic alliance between the Cork and Clifford families,[475] now loomed largest in his mind. Even before Wentworth met Cork on the day of the inauguration ceremony,[476] he confronted the earl with the charge that his negotiation over the marriage was ‘a proceeding of too great meannesse to descend to, for any gaine or advantage soever.’[477] As part of his signature policy of re–endowing the established ministry of Ireland, Wentworth would also use the ecclesiastical and prerogative courts to divest landowners of alienated church property, but his priority was dismantling the reputation of Cork, a man who had outstretched his own ambition and ‘most men I talke w[i]th being willing enough his wings should be clipped’.[478] Cork had witnessed the seizure of some of the major religious houses of Dublin – ‘this is a great triumph for the good cause’[479] – as part of the government’s attitude towards religious conformity, but now was Wentworth’s chance to turn the tide.[480] He had already insisted that his ‘Ma[jes]ty would ground a full resolution, not to take it out of the handes of your Justice for any solicitation of himselfe, or fr[i]endes, w[hi]ch doubtlesse, when he findeth himself pinched, will be very importunate & instant’. He

[473] WWM, Str P 1/61v: Mountnorris to Wentworth, 23 Aug. 1632: the earl ‘wants not Instruments to succeed more then truthes to magnifie his power and greatnesse in freindes and estate’. By late autumn, Mountnorris wrote that Charles Coote, William Parsons and many others were ‘all birds of a feather, and of the Earle of Corke[’s] partie’: WWM, Str P 1/84: same to same, 21 Nov. 1632.

[474] Viscount Dorchester warned the earl that there was more than a friendly ear at court ready to hear any explanation Mountnorris chose to send to England: D. Townshend, *The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork*, (1904), p. 181. This ear belonged, quite possibly, to Wentworth, who was Mountnorris’ connection by marriage. Mountnorris wrote dismissively of Cork’s impropriated ecclesiastical properties, being ‘yet farr from that greatnes[s], w[hi]ch is published’: WWM, Str P 1/61v: same to same, 23 Aug. 1632. The earl was, however, the richest man in Ireland – his amassed wealth was highly significant when one considers that he came to Ireland with only £27 3s 0d in his pocket, eventually amassing extensive lands in Munster and Connacht. However, the impropriation of the college of Youghal was held responsible for causing ‘a light of religion and Charity, [to become] clouded under a palpable darknesse of impyety and rapine’: WWM, Str P 6/11: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4.

[475] Cork ‘ever desired’ that the bride should be from amongst the ranks of the English nobility: WWM, Str P 1/44v: Cork to Wentworth, 1 July 1632. Wentworth declared himself ‘passive’ in the business: ‘to expect other from me was the greatest injury could be done me’ (WWM, Str P 6/9: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4).

[476] *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond*, ed. T. Carte (6 vols, Oxford, 1851), i, p. 114.

[477] WWM, Str P 1/95v: Wentworth to Cork, 25 Dec. 1632.

[478] WWM, Str P 6/14: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4: ‘not to be the object of any man[’]s pitty.’ Clarke has reminded us that scholars ought to treat Wentworth’s version of events with extreme ‘caution’, stating that they have often read Wentworth’s ‘appraisals of policies and assessments of problems’ as statements of fact rather than of personal opinion: A. Clarke, ‘28 November 1634: A Detail of Strafford’s Administration’ *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 93 (1963), p. 161.

[479] *CSPI, 1625–32*, p. 522.

[480] CALS, DLT/B43, p. 6: ‘He had taken great Paines to enforme himselfe in the controverted points of Religion’.

compared the situation to 'losse of the State'[481] and was 'very Confident [that] The King hath The Earle of Corke in the taille'.[482] Although the earl was unaware of the reasons for the criminal investigation, Wentworth was confident that 'he will infallibly fall under a grievouse Sentence'.[483] Laud fully supported this prosecution, desiring a strong and court–led judgement that would signify the policy of *Thorough*. While George Wentworth informed the Lord Keeper, Thomas Coventry, that the Lord Deputy carried himself 'w[i]th all indifferency, soe farr as it stood w[i]th honour and Justice' in regard to the earl's troubled possessions, projecting virtuous intentions, Wentworth revealed his closest – and darkest – secrets to the archbishop.[484] Laud proved an important contact in London, a figure who could be directly encouraged into offering crucial support at pressing moments. The archbishop possessed much greater strength and power in Ireland than Scotland, a close and strategic alliance that was not mirrored north of Hadrian's Wall despite his intimate and key conversations with the Marquess of Hamilton and the bishop of Ross, John Maxwell.[485]

The opening campaign against the earl – 'that Great Giante', 'the most violent and passionate man in the whole worlde' and the 'most vindicative man held to be that lives'[486] – was not, however, the impropriation of ecclesiastical lands but the relatively minor issue of the positioning of the family tomb in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.[487] Historians have been prone to dismiss the matter as bordering 'almost on the comic', but the Lord Deputy was not so inclined.[488] Its erection was said to be emblematic of 'the vanity and insolent Novelties of the Earle of Corke'.[489] It represented everything to which Wentworth considered himself most stridently opposed, a 'Kingdome abandoned for these late yeares to every man that could please himselfe to purchase what best liked him for his money'.[490] It was 'a Gloriouse Tombe … such a thing I

[481] WWM, Str P 3/94–5: Wentworth to Charles I, 26 May 1634.
[482] WWM, Str P 6/31: Wentworth to Laud, 7 Mar. 1633–4. WWM, Str P 6/103: same to same, 19 Nov. 1634: 'unlesse the Earle have a Pardon I know nothing els[e] that can save him from a very deep Sentence'.
[483] WWM, Str P 8/231: Wentworth to Lord Clifford, 2 May 1635.
[484] WWM, Str P 13/220: George Wentworth to Wentworth, n.d. Mar. 1633–4.
[485] James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 171: 'multi–church integration'.
[486] WWM, Str P 3/226: Wentworth to Cottington, 31 Oct. 1635; WWM, Str P 16/181: Lord Clifford to Wentworth, 2 Apr. (no year, but approx. 1635–6); and WWM, Str P 7/92: Wentworth to Laud, 23 Apr. 1638.
[487] *The Lismore Papers: Autobiographical Notes, Remembrances and Diaries of Sir Richard Boyle, first and 'Great' Earl of Cork*, ed. A.B. Grosart (2 ser., 5 vols, 1886), 1st ser., iii, p. 70. 'This was as much a political battle of wills as a debate over theological principles': Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', p. 103.
[488] O'Grady, *Strafford and Ireland*, i, p. 504.
[489] WWM, Str P 6/34: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4.
[490] WWM, Str P 8/11: Wentworth to Earl of Arundel, 19 Aug. 1633: 'in the society of a Strange People'.

persuade myselfe as was neither done nor seene before',[491] but the monument itself contravened liturgical regulations, though Wentworth had more secular insecurities, especially relating to social status, when he remarked that if it remained in position

> men might thinke the King[']s Deputy were crouching to a Dr Weston, to a Jeffray Fenton, to an Earle of Corke and his Lady, or if you will to a Killalneka his second son, the veryest sharke they say in a kingdome, or to those Sea Nimphes his Daughters, w[i]th Coronetts upon their heads, their haire disheviled, downe upon their shoulders.[492]

Such an attack upon Cork must not be overlooked. As Nicholas Canny has observed, 'the fact that most of these comments were excluded from Knowler's edition of Wentworth's letters has meant that many historians have failed to recognise a purpose behind Wentworth's comments on Cork.'[493] The tomb made the earl's opposition to innovations seem particularly discordant; the Boyle monument was seen to be more idolatrous than St Patrick's purgatory. It had 'given occasion to some disputes here'[494] and Laud recognised the difficulties inherent in crossing the reports of two archbishops, James Ussher and Lancelot Bulkeley,[495] who both found the tomb fitting, but 'confesse[d] I am not satisfyed w[i]th that they say'.[496] Cork believed 'it were done only because he will not marry his Sonne to my Lo[rd] Clifford[']s daughter',[497] but Laud insisted that 'for the Tombe itselfe I cannot smother my judgm[en]t. I am where I was'.[498] Wentworth wrote that the earl would 'rather dye' than see it pulled down;

---

[491] WWM, Str P 8/59: Wentworth to Lord Clifford, 7 Dec. 1633.
[492] WWM, Str P 6/35: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4: 'And if my father[']s Monument stood soe in my private Chappell, downe it should goe.'
[493] Canny, *Upstart Earl*, p. 13.
[494] WWM, Str P 5/231: Windebanke to Wentworth, 16 Apr. 1634.
[495] WWM, Str P 6/34: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4: Ussher and Bulkeley were ready 'to sett forth this Earle as a cheefe Patriarke of this Church … how unworthy this of ArchBishopps, or if I durst speake it of Parish Preests!' The earl would only follow the instructions of 'the Lord Prymate [Ussher], the Lo[rd] Archb[isho]pp of Dublin [Bulkeley], & the Deane & Chapter of S[ai]nt Patrick[']s': Chatsworth House, Cork Miscellaneous Letterbook II, p. 759: Cork to William Beecher, 20 Mar. 1633–4. Laud's position as the chief ecclesiastical adviser to Charles I over the British Churches goaded Ussher into a more vigorous oversight of the church. The visitation report of Bulkeley in 1630 is a perfect example of 'decay[ed]' and 'runious' churches: M.V. Ronan, 'Archbishop Bulkeley's Visitation of Dublin, 1630', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 8 (1941), pp. 56–98, at p. 64.
[496] WWM, Str P 6/32: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4: 'Both of them Justifie that the Tombe stands not in the place of the Altar, and that it is a great ornament to that Church.' 'To that I answeared,' Laud replied, 'I that never saw it could not be judg[e] but would leave it to your Lo[rdshi]p and them that were upon the place': WWM, Str P 6/53: same to same, 12 Apr. 1634. Laud professed himself glad to hear of the charitable works performed by the earl, but commented harshly that reports had also reached him 'that you have not been a very good fr[i]end to the Church in the Point of her Maintenance': WWM, Str P 6/62: Laud to Cork, 21 Mar. 1633–4.
[497] WWM, Str P 6/33: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4.
[498] WWM, Str P 6/53: same to same, 12 Apr. 1634.

he regarded the archbishop's advice as crucial.[499] Windebanke also expressed concerns with their 'Certificate concerning the said Monument',[500] but Laud found it especially difficult, as they were 'eyewittnesses of what they write, my self haveing never been upon the place',[501] although he insisted that he did not take 'offence lately only, but before even my Lord Deputy that now is was named to the Place'.[502] Cork was assured that, despite Wentworth's resolution 'to cause the Tombe to be pulled downe', he could procure Laud's satisfaction 'for the allowance and continuance thereof'.[503] Wentworth was not reassured. 'The plaine truth is', he wrote to Windebanke a few months later, 'I see it well enough his Grace of Canterbury makes himselfe merry, and exercises his witt on all sides.'[504] Wentworth argued that the reports had been procured by Cork himself.[505] The constant pleas for support meant that the Lord Deputy was indebted to the archbishop for his endeavour 'to lock it up w[i]th the King, as his [Cork's] earnest pursuits and Guifts underhand be not able to fetch him off'.[506] He wished to appeal over Ussher and Bulkeley to Charles I, but remained, satisfied or not, with Laud's view. Cork had written to Archbishops Ussher and Laud to protest the complaint, with Wentworth acknowledging that if they 'should be of an opinion to lett it stande I should hold myselfe excused from troubling him any more'. Clearly he valued the opinion of Laud more than Ussher, regarding the tomb as 'one of the most Scandalouse peeces that ever was seene'.[507] Ussher alleged 'that the pulling [of] it downe would breake the Earle[']s h[e]art'.[508] Laud also found that 'the Tombe was built in the Place where the

---

499 WWM, Str P 6/14: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4. Cf. *CSPI, 1633–47*, p. 43: Cork to [?], 20 Feb. 1633–4: 'the Archbishop … orders him [Wentworth] to pull it down, if I do not remove it. I had rather die.' It is extremely difficult to say definitively whether it was the Lord Deputy or the archbishop who instigated this action, however.

500 WWM, Str P 4/208: 'His Ma[jes]tie to the Lo[rd] Deputy concerning the Earle of Corke[']s] Tombe' signed by Windebanke: 'wee are not soe well satisfied as presently to determine the busines[s]'.

501 WWM, Str P 6/72–3: Laud to Wentworth, n.d. but read and/or received on 18 Apr. 1634. 'It is hard for me that am absent to Crosse directly the report of two ArchB[isho]pps': WWM, Str P 6/32: same to same, 11 Mar. 1633–4. 'Neither can your Lo[rdshi]p thinke that I shall make my self Judge of these or any other inconveniencyes, haveing never been upon the Place to see it, But shall leave it wholly to such view & consideration as shall there be had of it': WWM, Str P 6/61: Laud to Cork, 21 Mar. 1633–4.

502 WWM, Str P 6/63: Laud to Bulkeley, 21 Mar. 1633–4. However, Juxon was sent a letter by the dean of the Cathedral three days before, warning him against 'enemyes w[hi]ch perhaps wish not well unto … the flourishing estate of any church': TNA, SP 63/254, fo. 254r: Dean of St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin to Juxon, 18 Mar. 1633–4.

503 Chatsworth House, Cork Miscellaneous Letterbook II, p. 758: Cork to Beecher, 20 Mar. 1633–4.

504 WWM, Str P 5/89: Wentworth to Windebanke, 5 June 1634. Such was the special nature of their friendship that Wentworth could often criticize its resilience and longevity to others. See, e.g., ch. 1.

505 WWM, Str P 6/34: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4: '*penned* by the Earle himselfe' (my italics).

506 WWM, Str P 6/79: same to same, 3 June 1634.

507 WWM, Str P 6/14: same to same, 29 Jan. 1633–4. He wrote that it was 'the most scandalous and barbarouse peece standing, I thinke, in any Church of Christendome': WWM, Str P 6/34: same to same, 18 Mar. 1633–4.

508 WWM, Str P 6/15: same to same, 29 Jan. 1633–4.

high Altar stood'[509] – Wentworth called it a 'prophane Monument'[510] – but Secretary Windebanke warned the Lord Deputy of overplaying his hand in regard to Cork since 'a Person of his Quality[,] now in the declination of his yeares, and that heretofore had soe eminent a ~~place~~ part in the Government of that Kingdome' was bound to arouse sympathy at court.[511] Weston had written a letter earlier in the year directing Wentworth to allow the tomb to stand and, in the failed hope of obtaining the king's signature, had become 'very angry'.[512] Even though such strategies had failed, Cottington told Wentworth the next day that

> My Lord of Corke has putt much trouble into my Lord Treasuror[']s minde by meanes of his Informations touching the Chancellor Weston[']s [Robert Weston, c.1515–73] Bones over w[hi]ch he had built the Tombe: thinking by that meanes to save the Removeing of the Tombe, But he doth now beleeve it is a trick of Corke[']s Cunning, And that the Bones will have noe dishonour done them by the remove.[513]

The earl had sought his intercession concerning 'soe fayre & costly a monument', but this hindered rather than helped matters.[514] Wentworth was confident that he had failed to provoke Weston into showing Cork much support, especially since the Lord Treasurer had not mentioned the matter in any of his letters: 'The name of a Weston shall never be looked upon w[i]th more obligation & reverence by the Earle of Corke, then it is and shall be by me.'[515] A month earlier Laud had been convinced that Weston

---

509 WWM, Str P 6/61: Laud to Cork, 21 March 1633–4. He claimed to have 'heard of it' before Wentworth was 'soe much as named to that Place [i.e. Lord Deputy of Ireland]': ibid. Laud had already claimed that 'the Complaint came against it to me out of Ireland, and was presented by me to the King before I knew that your Lo[rdshi]p was named for Deputye there. But Jealousyes knowe noe end': WWM, Str P 6/33: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4. One of Wentworth's letters, however, proves that he *was* the critical instigator of the attack, for 'the Ga[u]ntlett is throwen downe': WWM, Str P 14/291: Wentworth to Coke, 16 Dec. 1634. See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/3: A copy of His Majesty's letters to the Lord Deputy Wentworth, 16 Apr. 1634: '[where the] high Alter did anciently stand'. WWM, Str P 17/202: Lord Dungarvan to Cork, 24 Mar. 1634: 'I had been with my Lord of Canterbury, … [he] co[u]ld not tell what answer to give mee, for other persons of qualitie had certified unto him that the monument was built just where the altar heretofore stood'.

510 WWM, Str P 6/15: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4: 'And his Lo[rdshi]p [Ussher] could never approve in such an hallowed place of such representations set up in stead of the Commandement of Allmighty God that forbidds to make to ourselves any graven Imadge.' See also A. L. Capern, 'Slipperye Times and Dangerous Dayes: James Ussher and the Calvinist Reformation of Britain, 1560–1660' (Univ. of New South Wales PhD thesis, 1991), ch. 3.

511 WWM, Str P 9/308: Windebanke to Wentworth, 22 Oct. 1635: this letter arrived 'by the E[arl] of Corke[']s delivery.' The coffin of Katherine, the earl's second wife, at her funeral was carried by the esteemed pallbearers, Adam Loftus and William Parsons – two important figures who would independently be sworn as a witness (Loftus) and prepare some of the charges (Parsons) for Wentworth's impeachment in 1640–1.

512 See Ranger, 'Boyle', p. 298, n. 1 and WWM, Str P 6/55: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Apr. 1634. Laud warned Wentworth for 'your owne good' that this should not 'occasion a breach between you [Weston and Wentworth]': WWM, Str P 6/32: same to same, 11 Mar. 1633–4.

513 WWM, Str P 3/81: Cottington to Wentworth, 16 Apr. 1634.

514 BL, Add. MS 19832, fo. 34r: Cork to Weston, n.d., but c.1633–4. See also Str P 6/37: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4: the panegyric 'was drawen from him, by the extreame pressure and importunity of the Earle.'

515 WWM, Str P 3/83: Wentworth to Cottington, 14 May 1634. Wentworth attempted to nurture better relations with the Lord Treasurer via Cottington in the hope that he might be granted far greater access to the Exchequer.

would obstruct the Commission of Inquiry into the tomb[516] – 'the Treasorour was now interessed about the Tombe'[517] – Wentworth had also written to Cottington the year before, stating that he had 'spoke[n] to him [Cork] in way of fr[i]endship to remove his Tombe w[hi]ch gave great occasion of scandall both in Englande and Ireland.' He lamented the present situation – 'the thing would not be suffered in the condition it stood now'[518] – but Wentworth proceeded with the appointment of a special commission, 'passed under the great Seale of that our Kingdome',[519] to 'ascertain whether the tomb … is really injurious to the Cathedral',[520] requiring Cork to dismantle it. Laud, however, wrote to the earl and explained the situation, acquitting himself of a judgement but 'wishing w[i]th all my h[e]art that you had erected that Monument upon the Side … or any other Convenient place rather then where you have now sett it.'[521] Wentworth was also confident that 'all equall mindes must when the Truth is once knowen, approve me ther[e]in.'[522] What had not bothered Wentworth before – lay intrusion and profanity[523] – was elevated to a most delicate status, an unwanted disruption of his pious devotion and a ghastly insult to his godly prayers.[524] It was duly removed to make way for an 'altar–wise' communion table at the east end of the cathedral.[525]

What began as an inquiry soon became 'the first trumpet of the apocalypse',[526] a business of an atypically foul nature and a command by a resolutely bitter enemy, '*a moste cursed man to all Ireland, and to me in particular*.'[527] The seizure of the family tomb was but the start, for 'if this come on against him, it opens every floodgate'. It

---

516 WWM, Str P 6/53: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634: 'since some so neare him in blood were buryed there'.
517 WWM, Str P 8/83: George Wentworth to Wentworth, 13 Mar. 1633–4: 'My Lord of Canterbury said'.
518 WWM, Str P 3/19: Wentworth to Cottington, 15 Sept. 1633: 'it were better [to] doe it voluntaryly as a man[']s owne act, upon better consideration, Then to have it done to his hand by an other.' However, Cork clearly received 'their unanimous consent … to purchase a place' to erect the tomb, i.e. Archbishop of Dublin (Lancelot Bulkeley) and the Dean of the Cathedral: Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 17/197: Cork to Laud, 20 Feb. 1633–4.
519 WWM, Str P 4/208: 'His Ma[jes]tie to the Lo[rd] Deputy…' signed by Windebanke.
520 *CSPI, 1633–47*, p. 90.
521 WWM, Str P 6/61: Laud to Cork, 21 Mar. 1633–4. Laud had received a letter a month before from Bulkeley, however, claiming that the tomb improved ('much beautifyed') 'the celebrat[i]on of divyne service' with the 'audience better accommodated then heretofore': BL, Add. MS 19832, fo. 35r: Bulkeley to Laud, 17 Feb. 1633–4.
522 WWM, Str P 8/91: Wentworth to George Wentworth, 22 Mar. 1633–4: 'fully written to my Lord of Canterbury'. See also WWM, Str P 6/48: Wentworth to Laud, 23 Apr. 1634: 'For the Tombe wee shall be hudgely in the right'.
523 WWM, Str P 8/3: same to same, 4 June 1633. York Minster's seating arrangements had bred 'ill blood': ibid.
524 St John's College, Cambridge, MS L.12, p. 34: once the king approached his throne in the coronation ceremony, 'Here the Archb[isho]p will use a Prayer', to which Laud added in the margins that 'He [Abbot] did not use it.'
525 See, however, Dublin City Library and Archive, Gilbert MS 169, p. 210: 'The Communion Table in Christchurch was set up after the manner of an altar, north & south' (21 June 1633).
526 McCafferty, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, p. 201: '1641 would be the shrillest blast', however.
527 *Lismore Papers*, ed. Grosart, 1st ser., iii, p. 202. This caption was retrospectively added on 23 July 1633, the date when Wentworth arrived on Irish soil.

would reduce 'the great Act wher[e]by he hath preserved himselfe hithertoo' – the blockage of complaints – to little more than a delaying tactic, 'draine[ing] much from that Current, that beginns to runn in so full streames, for restoring the desolate and despised Churches, and Churchmen of this Kingdome.'[528] Although Wentworth characterised his attack as a mission to recover impropriated church property,[529] scarcely a year later Cottington wrote again, albeit in a different frame of mind, informing him that the king had 'laughed h[e]artyly' at a passage in one of Wentworth's letters that suggested that the Lord Deputy was not crucial to Castle Chamber proceedings.[530] In September 1635, Wentworth wrote to Cottington to emphasise the strength of the case against Cork and stating his opinion that allowing him to fulfill 'his desire of comeing over into England' would simply 'delay the Proceedings of the Castle Chamber'.[531] Almost a year earlier Cork had sent a secretary over to try to postpone the business and befriend Weston[532] – the archbishop reassured him later on, however, that 'you are [in] every way held worthy of Trust'[533] – but Wentworth complained that Cork's case was to be removed from Ireland and 'taken of[f] my hand', despite his best efforts to strengthen his authority.[534] He had attempted 'to Committ it alltogether to our Managing here',[535] but it was still desperately hoped that 'the Sacriledge of this Great man exemplaryly punished, will be an Honour befitting the tymes of our Piouse Maister, and a mighty security and furtherance, more then you can Imagine, to all our Church affaires on this side.'[536] He finished with an awkward pun, writing that 'there is an end of the Tombe before it come to be intombed indeed.'[537] It was 'put in Boxes' under Lord Deputy Wentworth's guidance[538] and Laud was supremely pleased that 'you will see the Altar restored … againe'.[539]

---

[528] WWM, Str P 6/36: Wentworth to Laud, 18 Mar. 1633–4.
[529] WWM, Str P 6/3: same to same, n.d. Dec. 1633: 'by an open example to lead on and incouradge the poorer Clergie, to exhibite their just Complaints, against Persons, how greatsoever.' The archbishop was delighted that the tomb was to be taken down; he had been furious about it ('vehemence'): Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 17/202: Lord Dungarvan to Cork, 24 Mar. 1633–4.
[530] WWM, Str P 3/155: Cottington to Wentworth, 22 Nov. 1634.
[531] WWM, Str P 3/219: Wentworth to Cottington, 11 Sept. 1635.
[532] WWM, Str P 6/112: Laud to Wentworth, 26 Oct. 1634.
[533] WWM, Str P 6/259: same to same, 4 Oct. 1635: 'Soe now I hope you are past all rockes in this businesse'.
[534] WWM, Str P 3/226: Wentworth to Cottington, 31 Oct. 1635: 'I wish his ill talent were taken of[f] me too'.
[535] WWM, Str P 6/214: Wentworth to Laud, 26 Aug. 1635.
[536] WWM, Str P 6/86: same to same, 23 Aug. 1634.
[537] WWM, Str P 6/84: same to same, 23 Aug. 1634.
[538] WWM, Str P 6/146: same to same, 10 Mar. 1634–5.
[539] WWM, Str P 6/168: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635: 'I am glad the Earle of Corke[']s Tombe is downe'.

Charles I played an especially minor role in the ecclesiastical affairs of Ireland – Wentworth's letters, for example, went unanswered.[540] The beginning of Charles I's reign was a happy and confident time for committed English Protestants in spite of their doubtful and precarious position in re-Catholicising Europe.[541] Charles was, however, reticent about expressing his religious thoughts – he much preferred to take informed counsel, depending upon a wide but not diverse range of advisors in the ecclesiastical sphere.[542] The sheer force of Mark Kishlansky's defence of 'a cardboard figure with no more substance than the one etched by William Marshall for … *Eikon Basilike*', however, should not be allowed to distract us from the fact that Charles' longer-term ambitions seldom expressed themselves in an Irish context[543] – it barely occupied his thoughts; he never visited the country; and rarely placed its interests at the top of his agenda. This significant lack of attention gave Wentworth and Laud plenty of space and room for directing the king towards the decision/s that they wanted – in this case, Cork's complete humiliation, disgrace and degradation. A dark caricature of the earl emerged – 'too Great a fish to be held in that Slender Nett'[544] – which was in direct opposition to his own cultivated self-image as a virtuous man whose wealth, land and property would be employed to honour God, serve the king and enhance the commonwealth. The style and character of Charles I's policy was fraught with irreconcilable paradox, distinct from the aims and ambitions of a pacifist and unified

---

[540] WWM, Str P 6/151: Wentworth to Laud, 10 Mar. 1634–5: 'I might be able to shew his M[ajes]ty at least approved of the proceedings.' See also Cust, *Charles I*, p. 198: 'For most of his reign Charles had little interest in, or awareness of, Irish affairs.' One also agrees with Richard Cust's view that Laud was 'the driving force', despite the notorious fact that he 'was adept at covering his tracks and concealing the extent of his role': ibid., p. 134. Charles I was never interested in the affairs of his conquered dominion. He never visited Ireland and was content to allow the Lords Deputy to exercise an almost autonomous power. Wentworth used the legal machinery of the Lieutenancy, of which he was deputy, to restore Church lands which Laud obviously enjoyed, though they were often in the possession of some of Ireland's most powerful Irish landlords ('the great *remora* to all matters is the head of Strafford'): *Baillie*, ed. Laing, i, p. 309: Baillie to the Presbytery of Irvine, 15 Mar. 1640–1.

[541] The king often met with opposition from MPs. See, e.g., Univ. of Nottingham, MS CL C 77: Cheynell to Clifton, 24 Feb. 1636–7: 'The King hath tryed this way already [demanding large sums of money from Parliament] and the subjects have failed him, and quarrelled at those in whom hee tooke most delight, and therefore hee neede not bee putt to shifts, but make use of his praerogative.'

[542] K. Fincham and P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 36: 'To gauge Charles's opinions, much must be inferred from what he did'. See Capern, 'Ussher', p. 77: 'his [Charles I's] deep attachment to conformity informed their ecclesiastical policy decisions with regard to Ireland.' Laud proved an effective intercessor, ensuring his letters were well received. The conflict with the earl 'was a fight over access to Charles', moreover: McCafferty, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, p. 140.

[543] M. Kishlansky, 'Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', *Past and Present*, 189 (2005), p. 47. Kishlansky does not consider Ireland in any sufficient detail; indeed, it is mentioned once in regard to Wentworth's appointment: ibid., p. 53. In sharp contrast to his all-embracing investigation of the Scottish Prayer Book (ibid., esp. pp. 70–79), the reforms in Ireland between 1633 and 1641 are not discussed at all. Although he defends – or even denies – Wentworth's supposed 'apostasy' in 'Reply', *Past and Present*, 205 (2009), p. 232, the argument is unconvincing. Kishlansky remains the most outspoken advocate of a reinterpretation that calls for a new assessment of Charles I.

[544] WWM, Str P 9/130: Wentworth to Windebanke, 14 Dec. 1635.

Jacobean government.[545] Laud and Wentworth regarded his father's achievements as pure illusion, however; obedience to the dictates of their ideological agenda superseded James' ideal of accommodation. Cork was a premature victim of this process known as *Thorough*, an individual who was no Puritan in any definition of that complex term – doctrinal, ecclesiological or otherwise – but who had successfully speculated in land, encroaching in the process upon regal interests. He proved 'a vulture stuffed with carrion stolen from the crown and the church', but was – temporarily, if not permanently – caught by an even stronger, more agile and far bloodier predator: the Lord Deputy.[546] Charles gave little time or consideration to Ireland or Scotland, leaving Laud in a prime position to assume decision-making responsibilities beyond his natural station. The king might have favoured very similar ceremonial reforms – the policy was the archbishop's personal achievement, not exclusively or directly related to Charles I[547] – but Laud instigated these reforms with dedication and drive.

Of course, Wentworth was still finding his feet in the culture of his adopted country, 'dropped here', as it were, 'into a New World'.[548] He had forged some friendships and connections, but still relied heavily upon the archbishop for assurances and direction. In such correspondence, we are surely watching a superb execution of skill, strength and style, in which Wentworth was able to achieve his objective/s because he had learnt the grievances against which Laud was almost certain to react. James Ussher's recommendation – that the archbishop ought to be more thankful towards the Earl of

---

545 For more details on the Caroline policy, see Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, ch. 1. By sharp contrast, no one wished to exclude themselves from the English Church of James I; it was doctrinally lax and ceremonially inconspicuous, requiring few, if any, acts of enforced conscience.
546 Kishlansky, *Monarchy Transformed*, p. 125: 'He harried him everywhere … the ferocity of Strafford's attack upon Cork was terrifying to the 'new English'.'
547 Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, ch. 6 and Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 333–45. See further Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, esp. p. 176 (the altar policy was 'clearly a 'Laudian' not a 'Caroline' enterprise') and K. Fincham, 'The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s', *HJ*, 44 (2001), p. 940: 'Charles I was not the architect of altar policy, though he was to become a vigorous supporter of it by the later 1630s'. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 106: Abbot to Charles I, 2 Jan. 1632–3, when in the previous year Lady Wotton was summoned to 'the highe Commission' for refusing to take down 'a bolde Epitaph upon her L[ord']s Tombe' which he considered 'necessary for the avoydeing of Scandall in the Country.'
548 WWM, Str P 10(a)/97: Wentworth to Lord Clifford, 17 Jan. 1637–8.

Cork, returning four hundred sequestered livings[549] – was blissfully ignored.[550] Laud also possessed Charles' fully-fledged support, a position that the archbishop was not hesitant to acknowledge and one that prevented Cork from appealing to the king. His correspondence with Wentworth is full of references about Cork vomiting up ecclesiastical lands, deriving sadistic pleasure from such an eructatory metaphor,[551] but the Lord Deputy promised that there were 'noe angles hidd from your Lo[rdshi]p but in all things Proceed w[i]th light and clearnesse.'[552]

Of the human condition, Wentworth had a poor estimation indeed. The Earl of Cork was motivated by profit alone and could only be won by that which he valued most: base things, which appealed to weak vanity rather than strong values. Wentworth, however, impersonated the king in Ireland in power and ceremonies. As rich symbols for imaginative minds, Wentworth knew all too well the social and political currency on display at times of the court magnificence associated with his vice-regal office.[553] Cork had originally played his designated part in such proceedings, even processing the king's mace and sword through the streets to Dublin Castle in the summer of 1633 and confirming, even arguably approving, the fertile iconography of monarchy. Nevertheless, Wentworth reported less than six months later that Cork was both 'the prime mover and actor' in the dark business of gaining 'unlawfull oathes … for obscuring the rights of the Church.'[554] Although evidence remains limited in its scope, Wentworth certainly 'played to Laud's feelings in order to gain much-needed support at an important time.'[555] He pursued Cork with restless determination, devoting

---

[549] *CSPI, 1633–47,* p. 6. Ussher nonetheless dedicated his *The Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God* (1638) to Wentworth and sent it as a New Year's gift. Laud, however, was not convinced by Ussher's affections, believing he was 'content to sacrifice honest men for their humo[u]r & to loose any fr[i]end to be revenged upon, not an enemy, but an opinion. Is this your saint?': WWM, Str P 6/356: Laud to Wentworth, 8 Sept. 1636. Ussher was a promoter of absolutism – power must be 'supreme and uncontrollable': Bodl., MS Rawl. D.1290, fo. 76v. See also the 1641 deposition of Archbishop Ussher of Armagh which was read: it said that Wentworth had asserted before the Lord Primate in April 1640 'that in case of eminent necessity he [the king] might make use of his prerogative, but in his opinion he was to trie parliament first' (UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 32v). See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/134: 'Remembrances touching the £15,000 fine imposed on me by the Lord Deputy' (27 Apr. 1636 – 2 June 1636): 'the Lo[rd] Primate [Ussher] came from the Castle to my house [Cork's], it being then neere about twelve a clock, And told me, he had more care of me, then I had of myselfe'.

[550] It is difficult to determine what possessed Archbishop Ussher to return to his scholarly pursuits in Drogheda between 1634–5, but Laud's arrival onto the scene and the Irish Convocation certainly claim some of the credit.

[551] WWM, Str P 6/2: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1633: 'no physick better then a vomitt'.

[552] WWM, Str P 6/80: Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634. Such protestations of friendship were quite commonplace in Wentworth's correspondence, for he was absent from Whitehall during most of the 1630s, being resident either in York or Dublin. He was thus forced to maintain close associations with many individuals. See ch. 1.

[553] Shaw, 'Wentworth and Monarchical Ritual', esp. pp. 340–53, at p. 353: 'Wentworth's experiences in Dublin indelibly shaped his self-perception'.

[554] WWM, Str P 6/13: Wentworth to Laud, 29 Jan. 1633–4.

[555] Merritt, 'Power and Communication', p. 119.

considerable time and energy towards the exercise of his own authority at the earl's expense. The tomb was removed in spring 1635, after much deliberation. The archbishop ensured that Wentworth retained the king's blessings, serving a necessary function at the Caroline court and providing an all-important line of access.

Cork's tomb, however, was reassembled six months later but in a less bold position. 'The Consequences will be extreame naught if the Tombe stande[s]', Laud once wrote, 'few will dare to shew themselves in the other great businesse. If they see his money, Cunning or fr[i]ends can carry him out,'[556] but Wentworth was confident that 'the Earle shall have small tyme of breathing given him, before I bring him to Judgment.'[557] Laud was assured that the earl would dismantle the tomb of his own accord rather than suffer the humiliation of 'pulling … it downe'.[558] Only a year later, Wentworth's opinion had changed but he remained resolute.[559] He claimed that in 'the happynesse of his conversation' he had never known the earl 'to deliver … one truth'[560] and a few years later Wentworth confirmed suspicions about 'what was done by his Lo[rdshi]p [Loftus] and my Lord of Corke in their Justiceshipps … I dare confidently affirme not one service done for the Crowne or Publike worth the Reckoning, nothing but Contestations'.[561] Wentworth brokered a deal with the earl to 'sett up his Tombe againe in St. Patrick[']s under the uppermost Arche on the Right Side, in a Place Convenient enough',[562] but it was clear that the Lord Deputy had won the first battle, if not necessarily the war.[563] Laud was also suitably enclosed in the king's affections, being 'the great man' at court in the highest 'esteeme' in the same year that saw him appointed

---

556 WWM, Str P 6/53: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634. Capern, 'Ussher', p. 71: 'Laud, and not Wentworth, emerges as the initiating force behind the actions taken.' However, Capern categorically apportions the blame for 'being dictatorial' onto Wentworth's shoulders: ibid., p. 74. Her assertion that 'Caro-Laudianism' is a better term for the Irish reforms (ibid., p. 84) has yet to be heeded, but remains much more compelling than recent attempts to assert the predominance of the king and his pretensions to sacramental kingship: Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, ch. 1.

557 WWM, Str P 6/86: Wentworth to Laud, 23 Aug. 1634.

558 WWM, Str P 6/107: Laud to Wentworth, 20 Oct. 1634.

559 WWM, Str P 6/212: Wentworth to Laud, 26 Aug. 1635: 'Indeed I never had soe hard a Part to play in all my life, But come what please God, and the King, neither Allyance, Fr[i]endshipp, or other thing … shall be ever able to Separate me from the Service of God, or my Maister'.

560 WWM, Str P 6/36: same to same, 18 Mar. 1633–4.

561 WWM, Str P 7/91v: same to same, 23 Apr. 1638. Laud also described both of them as staunchly averse to truth–telling – Loftus 'for mischeefe', Cork 'for vanity': WWM, Str P 7/175: Laud to Wentworth, n.d. Mar. 1638–9.

562 WWM, Str P 6/239: Wentworth to Laud, 12 Sept. 1635 (misdated to 1634).

563 Cf. Patrick Little has argued that Cork was, in fact, a late comer to the anti-Straffordian faction at Wentworth's trial in 1640–1, a reluctant recruit out of the fear that Wentworth might expose his irregular, even corrupt, dealings over the college at Youghal: idem, 'Earl of Cork', p. 630. It is a flawed account of Cork's influence and prestige, speculating as to the reasons behind 'Cork's reluctance to commit himself' without much evidence: ibid., p. 634.

to lead the Treasury Commission following Richard Weston's death.[564] The Earl of Dorset commented barely a year later that the archbishop, 'the lit[t]le man[,] is turn[e]d up trump.'[565] The time between 1634 and 1635, however, bore witness to 'a vast multi-tentacled action' against one of the strongest and most prosperous earls in the three kingdoms,[566] a man who espied the opportunity in 1640–1 to discredit Wentworth[567] and destroy the prerogative direction and enhanced conformity of reconstruction. The Lord Deputy, however, 'seemed to go out of his way to cause offence in the case of such powerful figures as Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork',[568] but with the unwavering support of Laud he could pursue his enemies with little thought or consideration of the consequences.[569] Indeed, Cork was an early victim of this fierce campaign of Anglo-hegemony, an acquisitive figure who neither realised nor cared much for the substance and significance of Laud and Wentworth's ecclesiastical reforms. Although the issue of the 'Tombe' appears in Wentworth's correspondence with Cottington four months before its arrival in his letters to the archbishop,[570] he managed the earl with greater fire and fury at Laud's helm.[571] Wentworth would later claim that he held 'noe Gall nor Edge personally towards him',[572] but the facts speak for themselves: by the end of his rule, in less than a decade, Wentworth had reduced the earl to little more than a bystander, a socially insecure, though sufficiently astute and unscrupulous, liar. The Earl of Cork would return upon the Lord Deputy's impeachment in December 1640 as a witness, adding his own grim details to the defects outlined by Mountnorris and

---

564 TNA, SP 16/286, fo. 80v: Roe to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 5 Apr. 1635. William Juxon's appointment was held against Laud at his trial, for 'hee procured a Clergyman[,] one of his owne[,] to bee made Lord Tr[easur]er': Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 16 Apr. 1644 (the seventh day of hearing).

565 KHLC, U269/1/CP40: Earl of Dorset to Earl of Middlesex, 1 Oct. 1636: 'I ne[i]ther envy his fortune, nor malice his person and am very well I think in his opinion and affections.'

566 J. McCafferty, 'Ireland and Scotland, 1534–1663', in A. Milton (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism: Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), p. 257: following on from these vindictive events, 'Ireland's elite rushed to settlement.'

567 WWM, Str P 21/unnumbered, but between 206 and 207: Wentworth to Loftus, 4 Feb. 1640–1: 'Old Richard [Boyle] hath sworne against mee gal[l]antly'.

568 H. Kearney, 'Strafford in Ireland, 1633–40', *History Today*, 39 (July, 1989), p. 21.

569 See, e.g., Cork's diffidence when dealing with Wentworth's bitter enemies in 1640. Speculation about a match between Lord Esmond's nephew (and heir) and Cork's grand–daughter, Lettice Digby, were only entertained 'And now that his lo[rdshi]p hath cleared all things w[i]th the Lord Lieutenant, he is restored to his favo[u]r': Sherborne Castle, Digby MSS, FAM/C/I: Earl of Cork to Lady Offaly, 1 Mar. 1639–40.

570 WWM, Str P 3/17: Cottington to Wentworth, 2 Sept. 1633: 'The King was told by some of my Lo[rd] of Corke[']s fr[i]endes that you had allready discontented him two wayes[:] one about his Tombe[,] the other about I know not what Armes and inscription. But they say the King laughed and swore you did like yourselfe, seemeing to be much pleased w[i]th it.'

571 Later on, Laud advised Wentworth to end his differences with the earl on behalf of his Majesty ('the King's … desire is that there should be a Freindship'): WWM, Str P 7/185: Laud to Wentworth, 1 May 1639.

572 WWM, Str P 7/165v: Wentworth to Laud, 11 Feb. 1638–9. 'I was never other then a wellwisher to his person [Cork], and a freind to his Family': WWM, Str P 7/169: same to same, 12 Feb. 1638–9.

Crosby, but the close involvement of Laud in the original assault upon the earl's possessions has been obscured by his placatory, even conciliatory, demeanour.[573] Wentworth's attitude towards the New English, however, was 'erratic, unpredictable and unconventional',[574] an adversarial approach which ensured that the personality of Cork became a social caricature. His elevation to eminence neither engendered a humble approach to religion; his spiritual exercises, such as his reading of William Perkins' *Cases of Conscience* and his strict attendance 'devoutly' at two sermons a week,[575] were deemed by Wentworth as hypocritical displays of sanctimony. As a result of his social ascent, Cork was said to consider himself as belonging to a much higher class than in reality was the case – 'those filthy hands' would inevitably reach too far.[576] Richard Cust has recently emphasized the substantial degree to which Charles I attempted to reinvent the aristocratic order,[577] extending his own sense of self–honour, value and worth, but Laud and Wentworth, two individuals who were hitherto unacknowledged among the noble elite,[578] saw to it that the earl, a prime figure in poor Ireland, was eventually humiliated and disgraced, despite – or arguably because of – his title and rank. John Atherton,[579] the bishop of Waterford and Lismore from 1636, continued to seek damages from the earl, principally Ardmore manor and Kilbree town, although Cork retained some lands at Bewley and Killmolash.[580] Cork's unsavoury reputation has long reduced him to a mere position of academic neglect, a disreputable

---

[573] C. Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714* (1961), p. 12. One agrees with Kenneth Fincham that 'the public timidity of Laud' should neither be allowed to obscure nor demote his dominance in the formulation and execution of policy: idem, '*Archbishop William Laud: A Study in Failure?*' (Anglo–Catholic History Society, 2004), p. 5. Cf. K. McElroy, 'Laud and His Struggle for Influence from 1628 to 1640' (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1943), p. 130: 'Laud was never sufficiently influential politically to bring about the thorough–going reforms'. His power has been questioned in each historical generation with claims of limited capacity; however, the inexorable pressure of business – and of relentless correspondence – has yet to be 'fully appreciated': Fincham, 'Introduction', p. xxv. Laud and Wentworth's reforms to the Church also featured heavily in a three–cornered pamphlet war between Nicholas Bernard, Hamon L'Estrange and Peter Heylyn in the late 1650s: Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, ch. 5, esp. 174–79.

[574] Canny, *Upstart Earl*, p. 11.

[575] WWM, Str P 6/4: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633.

[576] WWM, Str P 8/253: Wentworth to Lord Clifford, 22 July 1635.

[577] R. Cust, *Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625–1642* (Cambridge, 2013), esp. p. 47: 'If his monarchy was to prosper and flourish it was as important to promote the welfare and loyalty of his nobles, and respect for their honorific status, as it was to promote Laudian reform in the church.'

[578] For Wentworth's elevation to the aristocracy in January 1639–40, see ch. 1, n. 6.

[579] A year after Atherton's execution, Nicholas Bernard devised *The Penitent Death of a Woefull Sinner* (Dublin, 1641), which was pro–episcopal and pro–Ussher in its orientation. It was written, of course, at Ussher's request as a vigorous answer to *The Life and Death of John Atherton* (1641), sig. A2, which depicted Atherton as a criminal 'unto Lust he himselfe set to saile', i.e. he was executed for sodomy and buggery in 1640. See also P. Marshall, *Mother Leakey and the Bishop: A Ghost Story* (Oxford, 2007), chs 4 and 5.

[580] The agreement was dated 19 July 1637. Laud had written to Bramhall only a month beforehand, wishing him well and 'good speed in your treaty between the Lord Treasurer [Cork] and the Bishop of Waterford [Atherton]': *HMC, Hastings*, iv, p. 75: Laud to Bramhall, 27 June 1637. Cork had been the Lord Treasurer of Ireland since 12 Oct. 1631: Dublin City Library and Archive, Gilbert MS 169, p. 207.

figure scarcely worthy of a mention. Apart from an otherwise accomplished biography,[581] Wentworth's keenest adversary remains a strange curiosity of the Anglo-Irish plantocracy in spite of his attempts to gain recognition and reward in England. His *nouveau* or *arriviste* status has never entirely vanished, though he remained an effective, if not formidable, instrument among the leading developers, patrons and landlords of English imperialism.

Wentworth and Laud have traditionally been regarded as determined servants of the crown, acutely aware of the symbolic power enshrined in the funerary monument,[582] but the earl, an overt figure of ridicule interested only in strategies of self-promotion, was a member of the insubordinate New English and therefore subject to an extensive campaign aimed at the swift reclamation of ecclesiastical property and lands.[583] In the summer of 1633, Laud had written to John Bramhall, lamenting and bemoaning 'the horrible profanations which have seized upon the houses of God in that kingdom.'[584] One can only speculate as to whom – or indeed what – Laud was referring, but Cork's alleged profanities to bolster – and create – his family history ranked high on the list, being 'very bold w[i]th the Patrimony of the Church'.[585] Indeed, Wentworth repeated Michael Boyle's claim that Cork would soon 'swallow' the bishopric of Lismore and the college of Youghal, alleging that he risked being 'Boyled to death'.[586] The role of Laud in the earl's undoing has not been explored in any significant detail before, but Wentworth relied upon his authoritative voice and administrative talent at the Caroline court. Although he 'suc[c]eeded in breaking down a structure which it had taken Cork thirty years to build',[587] Wentworth certainly required Laud's dutiful combination of ecclesiastical authority and power in order to assume his role in a dramatic contest, 'the pack in full cry after the stately quarry penned against the wall, fighting undauntedly for life and dear honour.'[588] Cork was, however, the 'anti–noble' – corrupt, ambitious

---

581 See, e.g., Canny, *Upstart Earl*, *passim*, esp. chs 2–4.
582 Wentworth used similar grand strategies to underline his own vice-regal position. See, e.g., Merritt, 'Power and Communication', pp. 111, 115 and Shaw, 'Wentworth and Monarchical Ritual', esp. pp. 340–53.
583 Capern writes that Ussher was similarly 'a victim of authoritarian and interfering rule in the Irish church': eadem, 'Ussher', p. 58. Wentworth attributed his decision to retire 'to Drogheda' and 'come noe more at Dublin' in 1635 to his inability to 'digest' the English Articles: WWM, Str P 6/271–2: Wentworth to Laud, 2 Nov. 1635.
584 *HMC, Hastings*, iv, p. 55: Laud to Bramhall, 16 Aug. 1633. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 33r: 'Lord Cork had seized upon Mass–houses, and before his coming to Ireland had converted them to his own use'.
585 WWM, Str P 6/62–3: 'The lo[rd] ArchB[isho]pp of Cant[erbury] his answeare to that Branch of the lo[rd] Primate of Armagh's [Ussher] letters concerning the E[arl] of Cork[']s Tombe.' This lettered excerpt is not dated.
586 WWM, Str P 6/23: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Jan. 1633–4.
587 Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland', p. 40.
588 W. Burghclere, *Strafford* (2 vols, 1931), ii, p. 261.

and subversive, endlessly shifting opinion. Wentworth and Laud both mocked the earl for his excessive swagger but behind this humorous demeanour, which most historians have treated as circumstantial, lay a visceral distaste of him. The highly personalized nature of the prosecution, including an attack upon the deal struck between Cork's agent Dermot O'Dingle and the bishop of Ardfert,[589] made reconciliation almost impossible. The earl abided by the Elizabethan settlement, a legal fiction that made the country – officially, at least – Protestant, but Wentworth saw it as his personal duty to make Cork pay for all of his morally dubious exploits.

Subsidies, in fact, laid a harsh burden on the entire population. Wentworth appointed Catholic sheriffs in 1635 who then had to raise the taxes locally. Cork and Mountnorris suffered vindictive assessments. Cork indeed complained bitterly about his heavy assessment of £3,600, justifiably as peers collectively paid only £6,000 and Mountnorris objected to being rated at £1,000, claiming that 'men of farre greater visible and knowne estates are not charged with halfe [of] that proportion'.[590]

As a conspicuous public example, Wentworth and Laud both pursued the earl without ever contemplating the brokerage of a deal or compromise. In his pursuit of reform, however, Wentworth encountered many obstacles but always enjoyed the support of the archbishop.[591] Charles I also remained sympathetic, despite Wentworth's amassing of enemies: 'as at this tyme Clanricard[e], Corke, Wilmot & Mountnorris must (though unwillinglie) wittness to you'.[592] The earl was subject to an onslaught of suits in the coming years,[593] but his vested interests and the irreversible economic effects of the Reformation ensured that the conflict transcended its local context – landed wealth was

[589] Or 'Ardfart', as Laud chose to call his diocese: WWM, Str P 6/53: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1634.
[590] Mountnorris, 'Humble Petition ... to the ... Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, of the Commons House of Parliament', in T. Cadell and W. Davies (eds), *Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts on the Most Entertaining Subjects: Reign of King Charles I* (1810), pp. 203–5, at p. 205. See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/111: for £1200, 9 Jan. 1636; 18/130: Wentworth to Cork, 11 Apr. 1636; and 19/51: Chancellor and Lord Chief Baron to Cork, 10 June 1638.
[591] Cf. Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', p. 113: 'by the late 1630s, Laud was weary of having to defend Wentworth's actions in these almost constant struggles with Irish magnates and their English supporters.'
[592] WWM, Str P 40/11: Charles I to Wentworth, 30 Sept. 1635: 'you shall ~~not~~ never want that countenance that your Service requyres'. Nevertheless, Wentworth felt 'weak at court' upon his visit to England a year later in 1636 when he possessed neither the time nor the energy 'to preserve his influence' and combat the 'many opportunities to disparage him'. He thus returned to Ireland 'greatly depressed': Merritt, 'Power and Communication', p. 131.
[593] WWM, Str P 20/169: Commission to investigate Lismore, ensuring that all activities are towards 'pious endes'. See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/60: His Majesty's Attorney General vs the Earl of Cork and others, 13 Feb. 1634–5: 'when the answeres of the L[ord] B[isho]p of Corke and Waterford are come in, there might bee Com[mission] named and ap[p]ointed by the Court to examine the s[ai]d Earle of Cork'.

protected by common law. Atherton would be executed in 1640,[594] the college of Youghal would be settled in 1636[595] and Cork would spend some time during the early months of 1641 outlining personal evidence of mistreatment at Wentworth's trial.[596] His words in March 1640–1 convey sufficiently the impact of the attention he had to endure and suffer in the 1630s – 'I doe beleeve there is noe man living hath suffered soe much by his oppressions and injustice as my selfe'[597] – but Wentworth drew considerable strength from his *Thorough* rhetoric and regime, aided and abetted as ever by Laud.[598] From the outset, however, the pace and detail of Wentworth's campaign to belittle the earl were informally dictated by the archbishop. Laud effectively managed to define the terms in which the various disputes were held – profanation, sacrilege and impiety – and maintain the important support of Charles. As a means of obliterating the prospect of any opposition forming around the earl, Laud and Wentworth aptly outmanoeuvred Cork between the years of 1634 and 1635. With the family tomb in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, the college of Youghal and the diocese of Lismore, Cork was reduced to a social position of *persona non grata*. His perverse and prolonged

---

594 There has been some speculation as to the depth and level of Cork's involvement. Clarke, 'A Woeful Sinner', p. 148: 'The evidence against Cork, however, … consists of no more than the fact that he had sufficient motive.' See also Marshall, *Mother Leakey*, p. 97: 'It seems very unlikely, however, that Cork was simply uninterested in Atherton's fate.' See also BL, Add. 35331, fo. 77v (July 1640) ('B[ishop] of Waterforde in Irelande is nowe imp[ri]soned … for … Buggery [i.e. homosexual acts of intercourse]') and SRO, D661/20/2, p. 5: 'he [Wentworth] befreinded the B[isho]p of Waterford; he conceived of him, as of a man that had both Integritie of life, & good learning … Nor was there the least suspition then, of those monstrous Impieties wherew[i]th he was afterwards charged.' Laud was not so friendly with the bishop; he claimed to have 'noe opinion either of His worth or Honesty. I pray god I be deceaved': WWM, Str P 6/337: Laud to Wentworth, 8 Apr. 1636.

595 Little, 'Earl of Cork', p. 622. Wentworth would finally settle the score in early 1636. Youghal, a controversy that involved alleged forgery and improper oath-taking, was the last case initiated personally by him; the earl was to pay a fine of £15,000 while Wentworth would procure 'a new graunt' from Charles whilst in England for the college ('howse, garden, & lands thereunto belonging'), though not impropriated rectories: *Lismore Pape*rs, ed. Grosart, 1st ser., iv, p. 185. He told Wandesford, however, that he did not want Cork to visit England in mid-1636 as 'ther[e] are divers[e] writings to be perfected and evidence delivered inn concerning Youghall before that possession can be conveyed backe and secured to the Churche': WWM, Str P 34/10: Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636. See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/134: 'Remembrances touching the £15,000 fine imposed on me by the Lord Deputy' (27 Apr. 1636 – 2 June 1636): 'that the lord deputie thought it fitt to impose 15000th upon me for the rents and meane proffitts of the Colledge of Youghall, for the last 30 yeares, that I had receaved them'.

596 See, e.g., BL, Harl. MSS 162, fo. 362r (26 Mar. 1641) and 164, fo. 143r (23 Mar. 1640–1). However, Wentworth wished to have, in particular, Laud and Windebanke also present at his trial on 29 Mar. 1641 to declare 'whether they heard these Words or no[t]', i.e. whether to raise an Irish army to suppress the Scottish rebellion which Wentworth was said to have proposed in the Council of War on 5 May 1640. He 'desire[d] all those Lords of the Counsell … may be examined': SRO, D661/20/2, p. 42. Laud was accused of 'corrupt[ing] the ffountaynes of the kingdom': UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 39r. It was on 29 Mar. 1641 that the earl, however, was also examined: BL, Harl. MS 476, fos 106v–110r. Juxon, Hamilton, Cottington and Northumberland all testified that they had *never* heard those words: BL, Harl. MS 164, fo. 154v (5 Apr. 1641). The archbishop had been in the Tower for just over a month by this date, while Francis Windebanke had fled to France as early as 4 Dec. 1640. He had been charged with high treason on the very same day as Wentworth.

597 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 21/92A: Cork's Memorandum to the House of Lords, 1 Mar. 1640–1: 'his Lo[rdshi]pp [Wentworth] caused an Informac[i]on to be professed ag[ains]t me in the Castle Chamber.'

598 McCafferty has cast some doubt upon the sincerity of Wentworth's opinions, claiming that he 'wished to please and flatter Laud so he accepted the archbishop's ecclesiology and its attendant strategy in its entirety': idem, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, p. 227.

downfall was part of a much wider onslaught, much to Laud's applause and acclamation, against laymen who diverted ecclesiastical revenues. 'Thus have I fixt the first Linke of that Chaine', Wentworth duly remarked,

> w[hi]ch I asseure myselfe will drawe back after it, a hundred liveings w[i]th Cure of Soules into the Bosome of the Church; besides some Thousands Acres of Lands for their Gleabes, I have some thirty in view allready And some ten dayes since I presented to three other vicaridges, in the Earle of Corke his Possession.[599]

Cork was merely a means-to-an-end, a very public example – '*flagrante crimine*'[600]– used to send out an explicit message to all those who held ecclesiastical property, culminating in 'an impressive exhibition of political manipulation by Wentworth.'[601] Even before the Parliament was called in the summer of 1634, the earl was seldom separated – in Wentworth's mind, at least – from the recusants. Considering Ireland as a potential source of revenue, however, meant swiftly dealing with impropriations[602] – an unorthodox approach, indeed, but one that proved to be extraordinarily successful. 'Since the Reformation', Laud told him, 'there was never any Deputy in that Kingdome [who] intended the good of the Church soe much, as your Lo[rdshi]p doth'.[603] Laud's support went beyond offering the virtues of 'his personal counsel',[604] but to say that there was some 'unkyndnes[s] conceaved by my L[or]d of Corke against the L[or]d D[eputy] for certayn Church Lands' would be too severe an understatement.[605] 'Before his Lo[rdshi]pp[']s [Wentworth's] comminge', Bishop Bramhall later told Laud, 'the Church was free to aliene the whole revenues thereof butt had their hands bound by sundry Acts of Parliament from receivinge any thinge.'[606] His gross attack upon Cork was directly implicated in his reforms to the civil government of Ireland, but coloured

---

599 WWM, Str P 6/4: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633.

600 WWM, Str P 6/13: same to same, 29 Jan. 1633–4: 'he will be taken … highly Criminall in the Castle Chamber'.

601 M. Empey, 'Paving the Way', ch. 9, at p. 233.

602 The start of the Personal Rule, however, saw a revival of interest in strengthening ecclesiastical income. Attorney General William Noy, for example, reported that 'the rectoryes & tythes in Irelande … are Rumo[u]red to be of farre greater valew then they are': LPL, MS 943, p. 529: Noy to Laud, 2 Sept. 1631.

603 WWM, Str P 8/41: Laud to Wentworth, 14 Oct. 1633: 'I hope you are as resolute in your thoughtes for me.'

604 Empey, 'Paving the Way', p. 220. Cf. p. 221: 'Laud's role in supervising religious conformity in Ireland is probably overstated.'

605 Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 54: Buttler to Clifton, 25 Oct. 1634. Gervase Clifton attended his Royal Majesty on the 1634 royal progress.

606 LPL, MS 943, p. 535: Bramhall to Laud, 'Rec.d' 22 Jan. 1638–9. Bramhall had long been talking the Irish Church down ('it is hard to say whether the churches be more ruinous … or the people irreverent'), but his duty bound him 'to pray for a blessing upon both your good ende[a]vours [Wentworth and Laud]': TNA, SP 63/254, fo. 101r–2r: same to same, 10 Aug. 1633. He spoke of Wentworth's high regard for Laud, 'your fatherhood[']s wisdome and zeale for the Church': ibid., fo. 102r. McCafferty describes this letter as 'a litany of disrepair and decay', however: idem, *Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, p. 33.

also as a 'busynesse [which] concern[e]d the Church' and which 'was dearer and car[r]yed more p[r]erogative w[i]th me, then any man[']s Person whatsoever.'[607] Pembroke, *inter alios*, determinedly supported Cork to little avail[608] – Wentworth was already on negative terms with the Lord Chamberlain by 1635,[609] making it very clear to his brother-in-law, Gervase Clifton, two years before, that he was reluctant to

---

607 WWM, Str P 6/4: Wentworth to Laud, n.d. Dec. 1633.

608 He would have to wait around half a decade in order to vote for Wentworth's execution, although his support can be adduced from his pacification of the crowds – estimated at approx. 5,000 – demanding Wentworth's death. He was nominated in the August of that year by both Houses to the Lord Stewardship of the Household, but later at the trial of Laud in mid–1644 was used as evidence by Michael Oldisworth ('Oldesworth'), MP and secretary to the earl, as someone who was obstructed in his right to appoint royal chaplains ('noe Chaplaine should bee … never knowne or heard of by him [Laud]'): Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 5 July 1644. See, e.g., Laud, *Works*, iv, pp. 87 and 294–5, at p. 295, for Laud's retort that Oldisworth had yet to receive the sufficient fees that were due him. For more on Pembroke's appointment, see BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 90r.

609 WWM, Str P 14/197: Earl of Arundel to Wentworth, 28 Oct. 1634, for an attempted, though failed, reconciliation between them: 'my lo[rd] Chamberlayne did lately breake into a mighty Com[m]endacion of your lo[rdshi]p to me w[i]th a very extraordinary profession of his love & respecte'. Cf. WWM, Str P 8/169: Wentworth to Earl of Arundel, 18 Dec. 1634, for his continued efforts 'to p[re]serve & improve myselfe in his [Pembroke's] favour.' Half a decade beforehand Newcastle had informed Wentworth that there was 'no faction nowe' at court ('how longe it will laste God knowes': WWM, Str P 12/182: Earl of Newcastle to Wentworth, 26 Dec. 1630), but Charles I always wished for the appearance of 'such a Calme at Court' (WWM, Str P 8/47: Wentworth to Lord Goring, 4 Nov. 1633), something which seldom existed. The elder Pembroke was, however, a loyal supporter of 'the Protestant Cause' during the 1620s – he saw the assassination of Buckingham in 1628 ('the fearfull & fatall blow given to the Duke') as a providential deliverance for the country and for himself (John Felton, the assassin, 'grows every day more admirable unto me'): TNA, SP 16/529, fo. 15r: Earl of Pembroke to Earl of Carlisle, 31 Aug. 1628. In fact, his heir, the younger brother – about which this chapter focuses – had been on very good terms with the duke, serving also as godfather to one of Buckingham's children, but was foul-mouthed and tempestuous. He had 'spoken suche contemptuous wordes as I dare not relate', causing the Lord Deputy to seek 'from his Ma[jes]ty satisfaction against my Lord Chamberlain for calling him [a] Viper of the Common Wealth … Northren [*sic*] clowne, Parl[i]am[en]t breaker': TNA, C 115/106/8405 and 8406: John Pory to Scudamore, 26 May and 9 June 1632. For his 'falling out' with Lord Powis and even the poet Thomas May ('not knowing who he was' but still breaking 'his Staffe over his sho[u]lders'), see WWM, Str P 13/159: Garrard to Wentworth, 9 Jan. 1633–4 and WWM, Str P 13/207: same to same, 27 Feb. 1633–4. For Pembroke's rift with Charles I following his vote for the attainder and 'for countenancing of God[']s tumultuous people … against my Lord of Strafford', see TNA, SP 16/482, fo. 178r: Thomas Wiseman to John Pennington, 29 July 1641. He was, in effect, pilloried in the press as one of the many 'Nobles … who have striv'd t'usurpe our great Jove[']s throne' and 'He pawnd [*sic*] his Honour, Justice they should have;: T. Herbert, *Vox Secunda Populi, Or, The Commons Gratitude to the Most Honorable Philip, Earle of Pembroke and Mongomery* [*sic*] (1641), pp. 4 and 5. Pembroke was said to have gone before the king a few days before Wentworth's execution and delivered 'a peece of Scripture' (2 Sam. 19 – Joab causes King David to stop mourning), but they were 'Words that had little Analogie w[i]th the businesse … they [Parliament], [are] not sor[r]y for the shedding of Innocent Bloud': SRO, D661/20/2, p. 100. It came as little surprise that the earl – as well as Salisbury, Essex and Northumberland, the last of whom 'Strafford liked and respected … and made every effort to win his support' – would join Parliament's cause in the early 1640s: R.M. Smuts, 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', in McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism*, p. 55, n. 54. Pembroke was also a patron of George Morley, a future bishop who attacked clergymen '*hunting after Secular imploiments*' – a direct remark upon Juxon's elevation to the Treasury in 1635–6 – and urged '*that pietie and godlinesse (the Substance of Religion) be more attended than rites and ceremonies*': idem, *A Modest Advertisement Concerning the Present Controversie About Church-Government* (1641), p. 19. Indeed, a mere week before Wentworth's execution, Pembroke along with the Earls of Holland and Bristol 'cryed Justice & Execution' – he was deemed 'our Mortall Enemie': SRO, D661/20/2, p. 95. For his simultaneous quarrel with the son of the earl of Arundel, Lord Mowbray and Maltravers in mid–1641, see *Historical Manuscripts Commission, The Manuscripts of the Marquess of Abergavenny, Lord Braye, G.F. Luttrell, Esq.* (1887), p. 143, in which the 'Lord Chamberlayne reached out his white staffe and over the table strok[e] him [Mowbray] on the head.' See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 82v, for their committal to the Tower of London for their 'provoking, [and] quarrelling' (19 July 1641). Pembroke was still in contact with Laud in the 1640s, recommending the appointment of his 'Chaplaine in House' John Oliver to be a chaplain to the king ('I will be answerable for hime [in] everye waye'): LPL, MS 943, p. 603: Laud to Earl of Pembroke, 25 Sept. 1640. He even cited Oldisworth, who 'knowes hime well', as evidence of his good standing among the peerage: ibid. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 85r: 'The E[arl] [of] Pembroke & L[ord] Mowbray this afternoon are to come & kneel at the Bar to crave pardon for their misdemeano[ur].' (24 July 1641).

approach the earl[610] – but the Lord Deputy would enjoy Laud's assistance throughout the conflict with Cork. Given the 'spectacular scale' of the earl's impropriations, [611] Wentworth never flinched, a remarkable achievement which stands the test of time, but the archbishop was forever interested and involved in the Lord Deputy's reforms: Laud 'should not be wanting to doe your Lo[rdshi]p service w[i]th the best readines[s] he could'.[612] Beyond Wentworth's execution in May 1641, the earl strengthened and consolidated his familial ties with the godly – a dynastic alliance between Cork and Warwick, the daughter of the former marrying the son of the latter as recently as 21 July 1641,[613] cemented Cork's newfound credibility among the opposition elements of the peerage. Due to his apt credentials and experience, Cork knew as early as a decade before – that is, the summer of 1631 – of a rival for the esteemed position of Lord Deputy,[614] while he had meanwhile heard very high and treasured estimations of King Charles.[615] Wentworth remained indebted to core support from all quarters, including Weston,[616] but Laud offered a formidable and unqualified degree of support to his campaign which 'threat[e]ned' all of Cork's possessions[617] and became 'his Mortall

---

610 Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 720: Wentworth to Clifton, 27 July 1633: 'I am not very willing to trouble my Lo[rd] Chamberlaine [Pembroke]'. See also BL, Harl. MS 5047, fo. 61v: 'E[arl] of Pembrok[e] may surrender' post–1641. The Earl of Pembroke influentially backed a scheme for 'modified' or 'reduced episcopacy' in the early 1640s as a means of bridging the gap between Charles I's position and the Puritan grandees. It was Ussher, however, who (along with Richard Holdsworth and Ralph Brownrigg) had presented Charles I with a plan for 'reduced episcopacy' in 1641: Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 246–7 and D.L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640–1649* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 145–7. It proved to be the ultimate royalist stance in the parliamentary negotiations during the civil war.

611 Laud, *Corresp.*, p. 90, n. 5.

612 WWM, Str P 13/220: George Wentworth to Wentworth, n.d. Mar. 1633–4: Laud 'discoursed w[i]th me concerning the Earle of Corke[']s monument'.

613 Lord Dungarvan's sister, Mary Boyle, had married Charles Rich, the second son of Warwick, in Shepperton, not too far – only five miles – from Hampton Court. See BL, Add. MS 27357, fos 5r–18v, at fo. 11r, in which she recounts that 'the smal[l]enes[s] of his fortune [was offset] by the kindnes[s] he wo[u]ld have still to me.' Rich would, however, inherit the earldom of Warwick from his elder brother in 1659 just over twelve months after his sibling had received it.

614 He had dramatically switched from issuing complaints to Viscount Dorchester about co–governing with Loftus – 'Neither indeed can I fynde, that this manner of gover[n]m[en]t is soe propper for the publique affaires in this Kingdome' (TNA, SP 63/252, fos 99r–101v, at fo. 100v: Cork to Dorchester, 18 May 1631) – to assuring him 'that there is a very faire concurrence and agreem[en]t' between them: ibid., fo. 162r–v, at fo. 162v: same to same, 28 June 1631. Wentworth was created Lord Deputy of Ireland on 12 Jan. 1631–2, but there were sharp discussions by, *inter alios*, Edward Stanhope much before this date: WWM, Str P 21/79: Stanhope to Wentworth, n.d. Oct. 1631.

615 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 17/108: Lord Dungarvan to Cork, 17 Aug. 1632: 'I protest to God my Lord I never found more sweetenesse in any man in my life then there is in him, hee is a man of the finest temper in the world and free from all passion … the best example of any King alive'.

616 WWM, Str P 3/63: Wentworth to Weston, 14 Mar. 1633–4. Wentworth wished no one to damage his opinion of him, 'that your lo[rdshi]p be pleased to preserve me cleare & sound in the opinion of my Lord your Father': WWM, Str P 8/106: Wentworth to Jerome Weston, Weston's son, 24 Apr. 1634. 'Exception' was made to the earl at Wentworth's trial since 'an information [much earlier in the 1630s had been] exhibited against him by the King … in the Castle Chamber' to which Cork 'submitted': BL, Harl. MS 2233, fo. 174v. See also UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 25r: Wentworth said, 'I conceive him noe competent witnesse [Cork] because there was an Information exhibited in the Castle Chamber.'

617 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 28r: 'That he [Wentworth] would have his [Cork's] Lands … and did arrogate to himself power above Law' (24 Feb. 1640–1).

Enemie'.[618] On 26 March 1641, Wentworth used the occasion of the fifth day of his trial to attack the earl – 'Marke[,] my Lords[,] L[ord] of Corke how swift and quick and positive he ~~was~~ is in witnessing the formall words of the Article [the fourth, i.e. that Wentworth would have neither the law nor lawyers dispute or question his orders], which shows how prone he is to witnesse against me'.[619] The tomb in St Patrick's may at first appear rather trivial, but for those allies and agents of Cork, who left 'noe way untried', it was a momentous, almost decisive, decision which Laud had, according to Lord Dungarvan, the eldest surviving son of the earl, reneged on.[620] Cork would return almost six years later with an axe to grind against the Lord Deputy, describing in some detail his troubled years of grievance. Historians have been prone to distort such events. Certain narrative points – such as the moment when Strafford, on his way out of the Lords' chamber, passes 'Lord Cork' – are illusory fictions courtesy of Wedgwood.[621] Cork found himself 'fined … privat[e]ly' for the 'impropriations' on 2 May 1636.[622] It was barely the latest in a long line of assaults on his personal dignity orchestrated by the all–seeing Lord Deputy.

---

618 SRO, D661/20/2, p. 11. See also Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 21/75: John Walley to Cork, 12 Dec. 1640: Cork's agent Walley wrote to inform him at the end of 1640 that God had removed 'owt of yo[u]r L[ordshi]p[']s way his [Wentworth's] Confederates Radcli[f]fe [impeached], and Wandesford [dead]'. Walley informed Cork that Wandesford had died 'even upon a Soden, not 2 days sicke... on the third day of this moneth early in the morninge': ibid. Walley also stated that God's 'wrathfull hand' was to be thanked for Wentworth's downfall as He cast down 'the proude and loftie from there [*sic*] seates, and Exaltes the meeke and lowly; for it co[u]ld not be thought that the Lo[rd] Lieutenant[']s tirranising, and most intemp[er]ate hand in the gov[er]nm[en]t of this Kingdom wo[u]ld longe p[er]sist': ibid.
619 UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 27v.
620 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/7: Lord Dungarvan to Cork, 10 May 1634: 'my Lord of Bristoll farther told mee that some have done your l[ordshi]p very ill offices to my Lord of Canterbury'.
621 Wedgwood, *Wentworth,* p. 317. Cork was never a member of the English House of Lords.
622 Dublin City Library and Archive, Gilbert MS 169, p. 216.

Chapter 3: 'The Great and Neare Ministers of Princes seldome or never agree'[623]: Laud, Cottington and the Crypto–Papists at Court, 1633–41

Compared to the rich work on Wentworth and Williams, the role of the crypto–papists in the Caroline government has been ignored. Scholars have customarily paid much closer attention to their oppositionists in Parliament, an understandable preoccupation given that the victors in any contest often attract more students than the vanquished. However, some historians have struggled valiantly to rescue a few of them from the margins of historical research. 'Cottington [Chancellor of the Exchequer] probably worked harder', Martin Havran once argued, 'than all the other Privy Councillors with the exception of Laud.'[624] Michael van Cleave Alexander, meanwhile, has attempted to overcome 'the absence of collected papers' about Richard Weston, Lord Treasurer from 1628, and, in effect, rewrite 'a biography' of an official with an 'enviable record of government service.'[625] While Windebanke, Secretary of State, has yet to receive a published monograph devoted to his career, Patricia Haskell has written a doctoral dissertation which is extensive in its detail and range but particularly brutal in its commentary: 'He was a man of the second rank'.[626] Other than these pre–Revisionist studies, however, there has been little, if any, work upon the administrative side of Caroline affairs, resulting in a quite significant *lacuna* in our general knowledge. This chapter aims to illuminate partly the courtly positions[627] in which the archbishop and this neglected group of crypto–papists found themselves. Such attention is spoiled or frustrated by the decidedly laconic nature of the sources – none of them (Cottington, Weston[628] or Windebanke) ever saved their correspondence for future reference, a fact

---

[623] WWM, Str P 3/220: Wentworth to Cottington, 11 Sept. 1635. One would like to thank the duke of Northumberland for permission to consult and cite from his family's papers at Alnwick Castle. I am grateful to be allowed to cite material in his possession.
[624] M.J. Havran, *Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington* (1973), p. 108.
[625] M. van Cleave Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer: Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland (1577–1635)* (1975), pp. xi, xi and 220. 'Few English statesmen have been as poorly served by history as Sir Richard Weston': ibid., p. xi. Cf. 'It would be misleading to portray Weston as either a reformer or a moderniser': ibid., p. 160.
[626] P. Haskell, 'Sir Francis Windebank and the Personal Rule of Charles I' (Univ. of Southampton Ph.D. thesis, 1978), p. iii. Cf. ibid., p. viii: this study, however, 'endeavours to convert the sketchy caricature of Sir Francis Windebank that is so often displayed, if not into a finished portrait, at least into a recognisable human likeness.' Ibid., p. iii: 'He possessed nothing of the stature of Laud'.
[627] One agrees with Derek Hirst's view that the Caroline court was not 'ideologically monolithic' *per se*, but still allowed only 'the airing of a single viewpoint': D. Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, p. 31. Charles I's court was never exactly large; it was, essentially, that group which contemporaries labelled 'the Spanish faction': A.J. Loomie, 'The Spanish Faction at the Court of Charles I, 1630–8', *Historical Research*, 139 (1986), pp. 37–49. See also *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, ed. Questier, p. 85: Southcot to Biddulph, 11 May 1632.
[628] Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 8: 'Perhaps the greatest disappointment is the failure of any substantial collection of Lord Treasurer Weston's papers to survive'. Weston was created Earl of Portland on 17 Feb. 1632–3, but this thesis will refer to him consistently as Lord Treasurer Weston.

somewhat mitigated by the fortunate survival of their letters to and from Wentworth in the highly personal archive of the Strafford Papers. Belonging to a tyrannous clique, at least in the archbishop's staunchly hostile view, whose only claim to authority was based upon the conditional favour of the monarch, this remarkable set of statesmen deserve our much closer attention. Leading textbooks have devoted a few paragraphs to them – usually in reference to the deliberately cultivated cosmopolitanism of Prince Charles' trip to Madrid in 1623[629] – but as a whole their careers have not been fully scrutinized. They remain as unstudied – and consequently little understood – administrators, pruning the expenses of the royal household at the same time as exploiting all means of increasing the royal revenue.

In Laud's view, Weston was hostile, inactive and determinedly obstructive. The Earl of Clarendon severely disliked Weston, too,[630] though he nevertheless remains 'the most poorly documented major figure of the Caroline Court.'[631] His careful economy enabled the king to dispense with Parliament for the decade of the 1630s and performed indispensable services in reversing the extravagant policy followed by the Duke of Buckingham in the mid–to–late 1620s.[632] He was determined on a policy of inexpensive, though unadventurous, peace, humouring, not materially forwarding, his master's continental ambitions.[633] 'William Laud … deserves disapprobation for bringing the strategy [of Weston's] down in ruins.'[634] The duke had been informed that while he was away with the Prince in mid–1623 ('your Grace[']s departure' to Madrid) Weston had spoken ill words about him.[635] Weston felt compelled to defend himself; he requested that Buckingham should not 'depart from that [good] opinion you have hitherto conceaved of me.'[636] Weston's friendship with Cottington was further

---

[629] Ibid., p. 248. See also Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 141: 'The Prince [Charles I] and the Marquis Buckingham set forward very secretly for Spain' (17 Feb. 1622–3).

[630] Clarendon charged that he had 'a desire to be the sole favourite, that he had no relish of the power he had' – a man 'of a mean and abject spirit': Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, pp. 89 and 92. Wentworth, however, often found himself confiding in Weston. See, e.g., WWM, Str P 3/8: Wentworth to Weston, 3 Aug. 1633: 'I find them in this Place a Company of men the most intent upon the[i]r owne endes that ever I mett w[i]th'.

[631] J. Adamson, [Review of L.J. Reeve's *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*], *JEH*, 42 (1991), p. 323, though he was 'the most important of his [Charles'] servants': Kishlansky, *Monarchy Transformed*, p. 119. See also Hampshire Record Office, Henry Sherfield papers: MS 44M69/L35/52: on the matter of sweet wines in 1633, Weston was unable to be present and 'had lefte his vote unto my L[or]d Cottington'.

[632] B.W. Quintrell, 'The Making of Charles I's Book of Orders', *EHR*, 376 (1980), p. 555: 'At Charles' faction ridden court, Weston was clearly the directing influence on the shaping of wide areas of policy.'

[633] Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, pp. 34–5 and 289: Weston as the leading councillor/figure.

[634] Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, p. 147.

[635] BL, Harl. MS 1581, fo. 202r: Weston to Buckingham, 17 July 1623: 'I have had many ill offices don[e] me'.

[636] Ibid.

hampered by Wentworth: 'Befo[r]e his sickness he grew very drye toward me insoemuch as in some dayes together he would scarce speake to me'.[637] Laud controlled ecclesiastical policy almost to the same domineering effect as Weston, a prominent councillor, did financially: 'he [Laud], next to Weston, shaped policy most.'[638]

In Ireland, Wentworth accepted the esteemed position procured for him by Weston partly because he had few other choices.[639] While he was a privy councilor, his position as President of the Council of the North in 1631 precluded him from permanent residence at court. Wentworth strenuously denied that he sought Weston's position as Lord Treasurer at the court, an 'ambitiouse fals[e]hoode'.[640] Weston, not Laud, was the royal nominee for the vacant Chancellorship of Oxford in April 1630, though by the time the king's letter reached the university it was, indeed, 'after the election [of Laud] had been completed.'[641] However, Weston never enjoyed the personal access to the bedchamber nor the personal friendship that was the foundation of Buckingham's power. Unlike Buckingham, Weston never controlled the reins of patronage or built a party or faction dependent upon himself.

Laud has been described as one of the hardliners on the council (along with Weston and Cottington), particularly in the debates surrounding the Forced Loan and the re–summoning of Parliament for the following year.[642] Wentworth, Cottington and Laud were, in fact, friends of Madrid; they showed respect, even a certain admiration, for Spain,[643] but aversion – or, at least, indifference – to any cordial relations with the Reformed Dutch and the German Lutherans.[644] There was a courtly divide in existence

---

[637] WWM, Str P 13/219 Cottington to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4.
[638] Havran, *Caroline Courtier,* p. 89.
[639] WWM, Str P 12/86: Weston to Wentworth, 13 Oct. 1629: Within months of his appointment allegations were made that he was bullying poor recusants into compounding at high rates ('your proceedings w[i]th the recusants') and the Lord Treasurer, Weston, in effect, warned him to make sure his behaviour would bear scrutiny.
[640] WWM, Str P 21/98: Wentworth to Weston, 21 Oct. 1632. However, another version of the same letter dates it a day earlier: BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 472r–473v: same to same, 20 Oct. 1632. One quotes from the Strafford Papers, however.
[641] K. Fincham, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (8 vols, Oxford, 1984–94) iv, p. 199
[642] Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 78–9.
[643] WWM, Str P 12/71 and 73: Cottington to Wentworth, 5 and 20 Aug. 1629: talks with Spain – likelihood of peace. See also WWM, Str P 12/70: same to same, 1 Aug. 1629; WWM, Str P 12/71: same to same, 5 Aug. 1629; WWM, Str P 12/73: same to same, 20 Aug. 1629; and WWM, Str P 12/79: same to same, 7 Sept. 1629: as well as discussing private suits on behalf of friends, this early correspondence stresses Cottington's views on the likelihood of peace with Spain. See also Russell, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Origins*, p. 14: 'its pro–Spanish members, among whom Strafford was the most prominent, gave unfailing loyalty to Charles.'
[644] WWM, Str P 3/5: Wentworth to Charles I, 16 July 1633 ('ther[e] was all the reason in the world for the King of Spaine to beleeve in your Ma[jes]tyes['] reall intentiones to nourish all good understanding betwixt yourselves'); WWM, Str P 3/15: Wentworth to Weston, 8 Sept. 1633 ('the Hollanders … will I feare prove farr worse neighbours

between the Cottington and Pembroke factions, though points of conflict and tension can be – and indeed have been[645] – exaggerated. Laud, Cottington, Windebanke and even Wentworth can be said to have belonged to a group which tended to possess strongly anti–Puritan, anti–parliamentary and pro–Spanish views, while the Earls of Pembroke and Holland were more attendant to French and Protestant alliances on the continent which were increasingly Calvinist in their complexion. Allegiance during the civil war was a fairly accurate, though somewhat unsteady, determinant: Laud, Windebanke and Wentworth were all impeached in the Long Parliament, while Pembroke and Holland supported Parliament. In fact, Wentworth and Laud were claimed to be 'as much Spanish as Olivares',[646] whilst Cottington sought 'a neerer freindship w[i]th the K[ing] of Spain … out of reason of State'.[647] Too much emphasis has been placed upon aristocratic dissidence,[648] not enough attention has been given to the other side of the equation: loyal – and easily upset – defenders of the *status quo*. Wentworth's advice on the 5 May 1640 to the Council of War[649] – an offensive war into the heart of lowland Scotland, according to him, would bring victory in a matter of months – was backed by two of the strongest Hispanophiles, Laud and Cottington, former ambassador to Madrid, attempting to avoid the summons of a Parliament at all costs.[650] In early autumn 1633, Cottington indeed complained that while Charles I and Weston had been riding in the country, he meanwhile had been 'stucke here like a Turd upon a wall' and had since only been granted ten days' leave.[651]

---

to us then the Spaniard howse'); WWM, Str P 8/15: Wentworth to Lord Wilmot, 8 Sept. 1633 (as to 'the Affaires of the Princes in Germany … I am indifferent'); and WWM, Str P 9/28: Wentworth to Nicholaldie, 24 Dec. 1633 ('it greeves me that the Hollanders should growe thus insolent') .

645 See, e.g., Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 174: 'However, it is to oversimplify to see the Spanish and French factions as solid ideological blocs, or parties, irresolubly bound together and antagonistic to each other.' See also Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 126, n. 165: 'It is always tempting to interpret divisions in the Council in terms of the pro–French memberts against the pro–Spanish'. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, pp. 181–2, adds Arundel, Weston and Porter to the Spanish supporters.

646 Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle MS 14, no foliation but between fos 238r and 239r: Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 14 Nov. 1639. However, the earl claimed that 'there is not a person in this court, more 394 [Spanish] then 115 [Wentworth] in all his wayes': ibid., fo. 248r: same to same, 5 Dec. 1639.

647 BL, Egerton MS 1820, fo. 164r: Cottington to Arthur Hopton, ambassador to Spain, 9 Mar. 1631–2.

648 This is certainly not to detract from the sheer brilliance of Adamson's *Noble Revolt*, however.

649 Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 2.

650 He also placed control of the Tower of London in Cottington's hands in August 1640. See also BL, Harl. MS 164, fo. 954v: Vane's testimony for a defensive war on 5 May 1640 was corroborated by the deposition of 'the E[arl] of Northumberland', the Lord Admiral, who was too ill to attend the proceedings of that day ('being sicke'). These expressions concerning the king's right to revenue resemble those of Wentworth and Laud, as recorded in Vane's Privy Council notes: *CSPD, 1640*, pp. 112–3. The meeting was 'a moment of ominous transition': Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 19.

651 WWM, Str P 3/17: Cottington to Wentworth, 2 Sept. 1633.

After a few uncertain months following Buckingham's death in the summer of 1628,[652] Weston, indeed, emerged as the dominant force within the Caroline government, retaining the favour and support of the king despite multiple attempts to remove him from office.[653] Bureacuratic efficiency, for which Weston earned his place, made him an important figure.[654] Weston bore a close association with Cottington,[655] regardless of the occasional upsets,[656] and with the reliable support of the earls of Denbigh, Carlisle and Dorset, *inter alios*,[657] he was fortunate enough to possess a strong presence at court, something which the archbishop strongly disliked.[658] He assumed the title of 'Lady Mora', the agent of delay and the antithesis of *Thorough*, in much of Laud's

652 Cf. K. Sharpe, 'Crown, Parliament and Locality: Government and Communication in Early Stuart England', *EHR*, 101 (1986), p. 344: 'Weston, Laud and Wentworth, often wrongly thought of as successors to Buckingham's place, never secured a monopoly of favour or influence and often doubted their position in the king's estimation.'

653 F. Pogson, 'Wentworth, the Saviles and the Office of *Custos Rotulorum* of the West Riding', *Northern History*, 34 (1998), p. 206: 'arguably the single most powerful minister following Buckingham's death'. Cf. Cust, *Charles I*, p. 106: 'it was clear that he enjoyed a much less dominant position than the duke.' He was never as personally intimate with the king as Buckingham had been. See, e.g., S. Poynting, '"I Doe Desire to be Rightly Understood": Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Charles I', in J. McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 141: 'none of the letters [to other prominent councillors and statesmen] … reflect the real warmth that emerges from Charles's letters to Buckingham, almost the only person other than Henrietta Maria whom he addressed with the intimate 'thou'.' See also Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, pp. 84–5. Despite his lack of personal charm, Weston was deemed by many people to be 'the most potent man in this state': TNA, SP 16/529, fo. 28v: Goring to Earl of Carlisle, 16 Sept. 1628. Weston may not have been able to read Charles' mind so clearly – he was certain by the winter of 1631–2, for example, 'that for certaine we should have a parl[i]ament': TNA, C 115/106/8386: Pory to Scudamore, 17 Dec. 1631. It was not called for another nine years.

654 Friction at Court between the adherents of Henrietta Maria and the Lord Treasurer was largely based on matters of honour and clashes of personality, as well as resulting from the Treasurer's attempts to reduce household expenditure: Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 175–7.

655 His relationship with Wentworth was strained somewhat. See, e.g., BL, Egerton MS 2597, fo. 140v: Wentworth to Carlisle, 25 June 1633. Wentworth felt comfortable enough with Carlisle to lecture him on the subject of friendship, on hearing rumours of a new alliance between Carlisle and 'Lo[rd] of Hollande' aimed at attacking the Lord Treasurer ('secrett designe to fortifie themselves the better').

656 Cottington's ambition was to acquire the Mastership of the Court of Wards, which infuriated Weston who before 'his death … had an Eye upon' the role for his son: WWM, Str P 14/338: Garrard to Wentworth, 17 Mar. 1634–5. TNA, C 115/106/8436: Rossingham to Scudamore, 3 Oct. 1634: 'the king settles the Mastership of the Wards upon his lo[rdshi]p [Jerome Weston]'. Cottington's 'wonted Affection' and 'favour', however, had helped to secure a 'wardshipp' for Wentworth's son a year later: WWM, Str P 3/173: Wentworth to Cottington, 18 Feb. 1634–5 and Str P 3/203: same to same, 23 May 1635. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 225: '*Francis Cottington*, who succeeded the Lord Treasurer *Weston* in the place of Chancellor, was made Successor unto *Nanton* in the Mastership of the Wards'.

657 Alexander, *Lord Treasurer*, pp. 173–4. He had especially brought Arundel back into favour in Jan. 1628–9 which saw 'p[re]parations made for the Lorde Arundle' to ride 'in State from his house to Whitehall … by vertue of his place of Lo[rd] Marshall' on 'the firste daye of the sittinge of the p[ar]liam[en]t': BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 26v. Arundel had been subject to Charles' suspicions a year beforehand: TNA, SP 16/95, fo. 61r: Earl of Arundel to Charles I, 9 Mar. 1627–8 ('heavy disfavo[u]r'); TNA, SP 16/95, fo. 105r: Conway to Arundel, 14 Mar. 1627–8 ('the heavy burthen of his Ma[jes]ty[']s disfavo[u]r'); and TNA, SP 16/96, fo. 24r: Arundel to Conway, 16 Mar. 1627–8: 'I am very sor[r]y I cannot yet, have the happines[s] to kisse his M[ajes]ties['] handes as I much desired'. For 'the political eclipse of Arundel' post–1642, however, see Cust, *Charles I and the Aristocracy*, p. 244, n. 103.

658 Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 220: the entry for December 1633 shows an enduring, quite fanatic, disgust for 'the falsehood and practice that was against me, by [the] L[ord]. T[reasurer].'

correspondence with Wentworth,[659] an adversary whom both Cottington[660] and Weston truly feared.[661] Wentworth did not share these suspicions,[662] although Laud believed Weston had deliberately obstructed impropriations in the royal gift from being restored to the Church of Ireland.[663] Weston had promised Wentworth 'a true & quick correspondency' in the summer of 1633,[664] but within two months he complained to Cottington about the substantial delay.[665] He believed it was his fervent ties with Archbishop Laud, a man with few discernible friends at court, which first arose Weston's suspicions, 'being growen extreame jealouse of my often writting to my Lord of Canterbury',[666] a concern which found much earlier confirmation in his correspondence with George Wentworth.[667] Indeed, Weston 'faced determined

---

659 See WWM, Str P 6/138: Laud to Wentworth, 12 Jan. 1634–5, showing 'a passadge of your Letters' to Charles I 'hee espyed my marginall note the *Ladye Mora,* and would needs know what wee meant by it.' Laud claimed it was 'a Common bye word between us [Wentworth and Laud] when wee meant to expresse any extreame delay, and soe passed on.' A couple of months later Laud regretted not telling Charles I 'plainly' what it meant, for 'indeed I doe beleeve w[i]th you that 100 [the king] did understand': WWM, Str P 6/168: same to same, 27 Mar. 1635. Laud had originally claimed half a decade before – and sardonically, it should be added – that it was Weston who 'hath bine & is most *Thorough*': WWM, Str P 20/107: same to same, 17 Nov. 1630 ('thorough' is enlarged). This is the earliest known letter from Laud to Wentworth. Its contents, including references to the 'desyred' burning of their correspondence, suggest both had been writing to one another for some length of time: ibid. See also B. Donagan, 'A Courtier's Progress: Greed and Consistency in the Life of the Earl of Holland', *Historical Journal*, 19 (1976), p. 329, describes that 'its venom derived from profound personal dislike.' Wentworth's early reputation as a champion of the Petition of Right in 1628 was not so easily forgotten: SRO, D661/20/2, p. 14: 'Mr [John] Glyn [one of the prosecutors in 1641] bitterly replyed, That he knew the time when the Earle of Strafford was no lesse Active & Stirring to enlarge the Liberties of the Subject, & advance the Petition of Right [of 1628], then now he is for extending his owne Arbitrarie & Tyrannicall Gover[n]ment.' See as well M. Hawkins, 'The Government: Its Role and Its Aims', in Russell (ed.), *Origins,* p. 49: 'The methods characterising 'Thorough' (in the person of the Lord Deputy) and 'Lady Mora' (in the person of Cottington, Master of the Wards) may not have been such poles apart as they have been represented.'

660 The first letter from Cottington to Wentworth is dated 1 Aug. 1629: WWM, Str P 12/70. See also WWM, Str P 15/253: Cottington to Wentworth, 30 Oct. 1635: '… and certainly if this man [Laud] doe hate any one (of w[hi]ch ther[e] is little doubt) I am he, and indeed have least deserved it.'

661 WWM, Str P 21/79: Stanhope to Wentworth, n.d. Oct. 1631: 'there is noe man these ~~two~~ your two greate fr[i]ends [Weston and Cottington] are soe jealous of, and feare more, then your Lo[rdshi]pp'. This letter runs to more than twenty-four pages, warning Wentworth of the perils that would come with the appointment.

662 WWM, Str P 21/76: Wentworth to Stanhope, 25 Oct. 1631: though he did say that they both intended 'to sett me a little farther of[f], from treading upon anything themselves desire'.

663 See, however, WWM, Str P 6/169: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635: 'the impropriations shall come noe more into the *Lady Mora's* hands' following his death earlier that month.

664 WWM, Str P 13/34: Weston to same, 27 Aug. 1633. Cottington reported later that year, however, that Weston must receive 'some letters … for he is mighty jealouse when others have letters, and he none. And harkens much after it': WWM, Str P 3/53: Cottington to same, 26 Dec. 1633. See also WWM, Str P 12/86: Weston to Wentworth, 13 Oct. 1629: Wentworth acquired a reputation for bullying the recusants into compounding at high rates, Lord Treasurer Weston warned against such 'proceedings w[i]th the recusants' compared, that is, with Wentworth's 'wisdome and moderation'.

665 WWM, Str P 3/20: Wentworth to Cottington, 22 Oct. 1633: 'I have not any answeare of mine'.

666 WWM, Str P 8/221: Wentworth to Earl of Newcastle, 9 Apr. 1635: 'for I confesse I did stomacke it very much to be soe meanly suspected (being as innocent and cleare of crime towards him [Weston] as the day)'. Wentworth reacted to news of Weston's death by rejoicing to Laud that he had been 'delivered from a mighty and determined malice': WWM, Str P 6/163: Laud to Wentworth, 13 Apr. 1635.

667 WWM, Str P 13/238: George Wentworth to same, n.d. Mar. 1633–4: 'W[illia]m Raylton being w[i]th me at Newmarkett: 190 [George Goring] tould him that 174 [Weston] had unto 190 [Goring] expressed much Jealousy against 186 [Wentworth] for want of letters; saying that he did perceive 186 [Wentworth] would forsake his ancient freinds, and adhere now unto 171 [Laud].'

opposition from William Laud.'[668] It was claimed that Weston represented nothing more than the rigid, if industrious and at times ingenious, expression of profiteering through the exploitation of office. Given the Stuart financial problems, the Lord Treasurer, who presided over the Exchequer, was becoming the key royal official. The Exchequer gradually gained control over the audit of revenue, though separate courts like the Court of Wards and separate receivers like the Privy Purse remained independent. He was considered to be the one in the know.[669] The office of Secretary of State gained power as the volume of business which passed through their hands increased. The Secretary was in constant attendance upon Charles I, controlled the signet and was thus responsible for all royal correspondence and Privy Council administration. The Earl of Carlisle waxed lyrical on the position of the king within the complex – and increasingly disturbing – mess of 'Christendome'.[670]

Laud had many reasons for strongly disliking the Lord Treasurer. Weston would assume the post of Lord Treasurer in July 1628 on the very same day as Laud's elevation to London. The two men would enjoy somewhat of a poor relationship in the 1630s, though at this point they were clearly political allies in their hostility to Parliament, both seeking dissolution (Weston principally to improve the prospects of signing peace with Spain, Laud to stave off further attacks upon his religious policy). Laud abhorred Weston's Roman Catholic tendencies, however, and feared his support for his lifelong animus, John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln. Laud was more than ready in the mid–1630s, after Weston's forestry difficulties, to renew his attack on the Lord Treasurer. Working with the former customs farmer John Harrison and the diplomat Thomas Roe, Laud was able to present the king with a wide–ranging indictment of Weston's administration. Charles' reaction was to demand that Weston give him a detailed list of his receipts since the beginning of his Treasurership. The king signed this document, signifying his approval of Weston's conduct, which must have convinced Laud that attempts to open Charles's eyes to what he considered gross corruption were futile. The relationship between Laud, Weston and Cottington has to

[668] Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', p. 51. See p. 48: 'unmitigating hostility of William Laud.'
[669] BL, Egerton MS 1820, fos 225r–226v, at fos 225v–226r: 'I referr it to your Lo[rdshi]ps['] considerac[i]on whether it would not bee a good occasion to call a Parl[i]am[en]te': Hopton to Weston, n.d.
[670] WWM, Str P 15/49: Earl of Carlisle to Wentworth, 30 Apr. 1635: 'in this universall combustion that threatens all Christendome[,] onely our blessed master [Charles I] stands unshaken, and unmoved'.

be understood in the light of their differing personalities and attitudes towards the business of government.

While Cottington remained on agreeable terms with Laud, believing him to be 'a gallant man'[671] until the bitter end of 1633:[672] 'as Grave as he is w[i]th you, in good faith he [Laud] is as merry w[i]th me as before, you have ang[e]red him'.[673] He was duly warned, however, 'to keep faire w[i]th the Archbishop'.[674] Even though Cottington failed to secure the post of Lord Treasurer in 1635–6, John Temple informed Wentworth that, despite Cottington having gone 'foxehunting' with Pembroke in the country and having less work in the Exchequer than before, he had not lost any of the King's favour: 'his Ma[jes]tie findes his service absolutely necessarie.'[675] Such messages must have sunk deep into Wentworth's troubled psyche.

In 1634, Laud claimed that, upon advising Cottington to make a speedy visit to Ireland, where 'it would advantage him both in wisdome and judgment how to expresse himselfe', Cottington had argued that there was absolutely no need for him, as he could learn from Wentworth and remain at home. He allegedly had a copy of the speech that Wentworth intended to make at the opening of the Irish Parliament and was passing it around the court. Laud could not get hold of it, however. In a later letter from Laud, the archbishop passed on Cottington's description of its various passages, a description which, indeed, tallied with Wentworth's actual speech.[676] Cottington was also friendly with another ceremonialist bishop, Matthew Wren, planning to attend his 'consecration' as bishop of Hereford at Lambeth, but the dying Weston 'intreat[ed] him to stay w[i]th him.'[677] Despite some speculation as to his religious identity and faith,

---

[671] WWM, Str P 3/35: Cottington to Wentworth, 29 Oct. 1633. See also WWM, Str P 3/37: Wentworth to Cottington, 24 Nov. 1633: 'I am very much satisfyed in finding you approve soe much of my Lord of Canterbury, and I wishe you may rightly understand one another, and then I am persuaded you will like and valewe one another very much'.
[672] WWM, Str P 3/54: Cottington to Wentworth, 1 Jan. 1633–4: 'My Lord ArchBish[o]p [Laud] growes still in favour w[i]th both their Ma[jes]ties. And I can assure your Lo[rdshi]p he is cleane another kind of man from what you left him. Ther[e] is now no being merry w[i]th him'.
[673] WWM, Str P 3/58: Wentworth to Cottington, 7 Feb. 1633–4. See also WWM, Str P 17/46: Cottington to Wentworth, 28 Apr. 1637: 'my Lo[rd] of Canterbury useth me very fairely for w[hic]h (I take it) your l[ordshi]p is to give him thank[s]'
[674] WWM, Str P 3/77: same to same, 10 Apr. 1634. Laud, however, regarded Cottington as corrupt and slothful: WWM, Str P 6/191–2: Laud to Wentworth, 12 June 1635.
[675] WWM Str P 16/19: Temple to Wentworth, 18 Apr. 1636.
[676] WWM, Str P 6/92: Laud to Wentworth, 23 June 1634 and WWM, Str P 6/323, same to same, 2 Aug. 1634. See also WWM, Str P 6/82, Wentworth to Laud, 19 July 1634.
[677] WWM, Str P 14/323: Garrard to Wentworth, 12 Mar. 1634–5. Despite a few upsets as per every political career, they were quite close. The Earl of Newcastle was also an important contact in London: WWM, Str P 15/112: Earl of Newcastle to Wentworth, 17 June 1635.

‘there is no unassailable evidence to support the assumption made by his [Cottington’s] critics that he was a convert Catholic in the 1630s.’[678] Within forty–eight hours of Wentworth’s imprisonment, the Earl of Bedford gave Cottington a quick and easy choice: wait to be hounded out of office by impeachment or, alternatively, be protected ‘upon condition that he [Cottington] should (as he did) surrender all his Offices of Chancellor’.[679] He was duly up–to–date with continental events[680] and often avoided serious censure.[681] Cottington himself claimed that he possessed scarcely any grip on either power or place at court due to the efforts of his enemies, including Archbishop Laud.[682]

Although Laud could sometimes extend his occasional thanks,[683] the archbishop regarded them both – originally Weston,[684] but after his death[685] Cottington took centre stage in his complaints – as despicable time–wasters, serving no purpose other than their self–aggrandisement. Cottington often reported that ‘Canterbury is angry w[i]th me … His Grace is very Great, and I am very little; his power w[i]th the King is much, and mine none at all.’[686] He had reported to Wentworth almost two years before the archbishop’s ‘great’ status with the king as well as the queen,[687] but it was now proving

---

[678] Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 120. Havran casts severe doubt on Cottington’s alleged conversion to Catholicism.
[679] BL, Stowe MS 326, fo. 77r.
[680] WWM, Str P 15/79: Cottington to Wentworth, 20 May 1635: ‘French’; WWM, Str P 15/139: Cottington to Wentworth, 6 July 1635: ‘Hollanders’; and WWM, Str P 16/139: Cottington to Wentworth, 27 Feb. 1636–7: ‘Ireland’.
[681] Cottington appears to have escaped with not even a harsh word over the Spanish silver incident in mid–1636. Havran alludes only briefly to this incident: *Caroline Courtier*, p. 135. Haskell argues, conversely, that Charles was not even angry over Windebank’s role in the matter either: eadem, ‘Windebank’, pp. 256–8.
[682] WWM, Str Ps 15/79 and 15/253: Cottington to Wentworth, 20 May 1635 and 30 Oct. 1635.
[683] In the autumn of 1632, Laud asked Wentworth to ‘thanke’ both Weston and Cottington for their assistance and ‘their noblenes[s]’ regarding a private suit: WWM, Str P 20/112: Laud to Wentworth, 1 Oct. 1632. Needless to say, this was much before Wentworth travelled to Ireland. In 1629, Laud still saw Weston as ‘very noble to the Church’ but half a decade later the two men were bitter rivals: Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 273.
[684] WWM, Str P 6/3: Laud to Wentworth, 15 Nov. 1633: ‘the wisest Physitians [Weston and Cottington] doe not allwayes hitt upon the malady & malignancy of the disease; for now the Compounders [i.e. recusants] thinke themselves freed from all Command’. This was recorded in an endnote or sidepaper.
[685] After ‘takeing my last farewell of my Lord Treasuror’ on 12 March 1634–5, the Earl of Dorset presumed, quite correctly a day before his death, that ‘w[i]thout [a] miracle, [he] cannot survive many howers’. See further WWM, Str P 8/234: Earl of Dorset to Wentworth, 12 Mar. 1634–5: written ‘at foure of the Clock in the afternoone.’ See also Carlton, *Laud*, p. 112: ‘following Weston’s death, Sir Francis Cottington emerged as his [Laud’s] bogeyman.’ Laud’s refusal to preach hostility towards Rome did not extend to the approval of crypto–Catholics in the king’s counsels. After Weston’s death and the resulting vacancy, Laud saw a great opportunity to achieve dominance with the king.
[686] WWM, Str P 3/225: Cottington to Wentworth, 30 Oct. 1635: ‘I goe seldome to the Court (yet oft[e]ner then I would) & his Grace [Laud is] seldome from thence.’ See also ‘Laud’s role as a conductor of information to and from the Court was an important one, but Cottington provided an alternative means of access to the King and in some cases a quicker and no doubt more effective one’: Pogson, ‘Wentworth and Court Politics’, ch. 2, esp. p. 74.
[687] WWM, Str P 3/53: Cottington to Wentworth, 26 Dec. 1633: ‘hugely in the favour of her Ma[jes]ty (w[i]th whom he is often). But if it be true (as is said) that he [Laud] aspires to a favourit[e]ship, he will quickly loose himselfe.’ Cf. Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 837 and 840, for Laud’s ardent opposition to the influence of the queen’s party. However, Laud reported in the autumn of 1635 – i.e. when the appointment to the Treasury was the hot topic – that

detrimental to the pursuit of the public good.[688] Despite their shared feelings on the subservience of Parliament, the suppression of dissent and the solvency of fiscal practice, the personal animosity between the two overrode the mutuality of their interests, attitudes and convictions.[689] Before Weston's death, they had walked among different men and in different circles. Cottington was portrayed as a self–seeking, even corrupt, official, greasy individual who possessed few social skills other than the 'makeing of leggs to faire Ladyes.'[690] In the correspondence between Wentworth and Laud, Cottington is usually referenced in regard to his crypto–Catholic and pro–Hispanic feelings, 'a dangerouse wench' who openly or even covertly engaged in 'Spanish tricks'.[691] In the summer of 1635, Cottington told Wentworth that the archbishop 'declares much his displeasure against me, and peradventure it increaseth by my takeing noe notice of itt.'[692] A month after Juxon's appointment as Lord

---

Cottington was acquiring influence over the royal couple: WWM, Str P 6/252 and 254: Laud to Wentworth, 4 Oct. 1635: 'I thinke 100 [the king and others] doe all of them love and trust the wayting woman as well or better then the old *Lady Mora* [Weston] herselfe' and 'the Lord Cottington feasted the Queene at Hanworth … [she is] exceedingly well content.' See WWM, Str P 15/206: Garrard to Wentworth, 1 Sept. 1635: '… where she was well pleas[e]d.' See also BL, Egerton MS 2597, fo. 128r: Cottington to Earl of Carlisle, 3 June 1633, for the king's coronation in Scotland when Cottington was left in 'Greenw[i]ch'.

688 For Weston's slowness in answering letters, see WWM, Str P 6/113: Laud to Wentworth, 26 Oct. 1634.

689 Laud was particularly concerned to see impropriations in the royal gift be restored to the Church of Ireland and he believed that Weston was obstructing this: WWM, Str P 6/169: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635. Laud was primarily concerned with securing the restitution of Irish royal impropriations to the Church and noted the rumours that Weston 'dyed a Roman Catholike': Str P 6/169: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635.

690 WWM, Str P 6/70: Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634: 'I cannot tell how to trust him for any thinge'.

691 See, e.g., WWM, Str P 6/66: Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634 ('Spaniard'); WWM, Str P 6/92: same to same, 23 June 1634 ('his Spanish tricks'); WWM, Str P 6/194, same to same, 12 June 1635 ('*Lady Mora*[']*s* waiting maide'); and WWM, Str P 6/255: same to same, 4 Oct. 1635: 'a dangerouse wench.' The first letter from Cottington to Wentworth is dated 1 Aug. 1629: WWM, Str P 12/70: Cottington to Wentworth, 1 Aug. 1629.

692 WWM, Str P 3/218: Cottington to Wentworth, 4 Aug. 1635. This was the same letter in which Cottington speculated as to who 'the King [will] give the Staffe [Lord Treasurer's] to … it will be either to your Lo[rdshi]p or to my Lord of Canterbury': ibid. Some of the closest ears to the ground, however, belonged to George Garrard, who reported that 'his Ma[jes]tye hath an intention to call the bishop of London [Juxon] to be of his Councell', though his belief that 'Cottington shalbe made Lord Treasurer' was ill–founded (TNA, SP 16/298, fo. 18v: Garrard to Conway, 18 Sept. 1635) merely six weeks later. There is no mention of the archbishop in this letter, but a reference is made to the contemporary affairs surrounding the Earl of Cork: 'the King [who] at the sollicitation of the L[or]d Chamberlayne [Pembroke] and my Lord of Salisbury writt to the Deputy [Wentworth]': ibid. For much more on this, see ch. 3 as well as WWM, Str P 21/79: Stanhope to Wentworth, n.d. Oct. 1631 for a very early suggestion that 'Lo[rd] Cot[tington] will desier to fill up that blanke [i.e. Lord Treasurership] himselfe.' Many court observers, not just the archbishop (WWM, Str P 6/287: Laud to Wentworth, 30 Nov. 1635), did indeed think the position would fall into the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (WWM, Str P 3/236: Wentworth to Cottington, 19 Dec. 1635 – 'still something tells me w[i]thin you will have the Staffe'; TNA, SP 16/291, fo. 60r: Roe to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 23 June 1635 – 'Cottington shall have the desired staffe'; and Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 376: Edmund Raskington to Clifton, 8 Aug. 1635 – 'my Lord Cottington, whoe knowes the businesse best, might solely manage it'), but Garrard had much earlier discussed rumours of Juxon's appointment a day before Weston's passing ('though not yett dead'): WWM, Str P 14/323: Garrard to Wentworth, 12 Mar. 1634–5. Laud's intentions in this episode can be detected in his early appointment as president of the treasury commission of John Juxon, William Juxon's brother, among those who were to administer the income from the Feoffees for Impropriations. 'From the outset,' Quintrell argues, 'Juxon had gone his own way,' but a way that was still remarkably reminiscent of Laud's climb to power and bore all the hallmarks of the archbishop's help: idem, 'Church Triumphant' p. 106. Heylyn wrote of the bitter 'clashing' between Cottington and Laud during 1635 when they had to execute together the Commission for the Treasury, thus leading Juxon to eventually occupy the place as a moderating individual who 'might better manage the Incomes of the *Treasury* to the King[']s advantage': idem, *Cyprianus*, p. 303. Wentworth had attempted to foster

Treasurer in 1635–6, Laud deliberately – and cautiously[693] – chose cipher to describe a meeting between Windebanke's 'sonne & secretary' with 'some other Company' at a drinking 'Taverne' in which

> they sayd 110 [Cottington], 27, 23, 15 [blanks?] would in one yeare Screw (that was the word) into 29, 19, 84 [the] 105 [Treasurer] that now are, and doe all things hee pleased, being most able … As for 102 [Laud], twas noe matter, they were peremptorye men but Could doe nothing.[694]

Cottington determinedly refused to write in 'Cipher',[695] but Wentworth continued apace.[696] He was prepared to complain in strong terms to the king, despite his opinions, of Windebanke's practices.[697] Laud did attempt a late form of reconciliation with Cottington in mid–1636 whom he 'walked most and entertain[e]d longest' upon a visit to Oxford,[698] but tensions between the pair were still rife.[699] Neither fully trusted the other, though Laud's isolation at court, after securing Juxon's apt appointment to the Lord Treasurer earlier in the same year, was not very acute at this stage. Charles Louis

much closer and better relations between Laud and Cottington during 1635–6 to no avail: WWM, Str P 3/220: Wentworth to Cottington, 11 Sept. 1635 ('I am very Sorry that there is noe better understanding betwixt my Lord of Canterbury & your Lo[rdshi]p') and WWM, Str P 3/225: Cottington to Wentworth, 30 Oct. 1635 ('I must convince your Lo[rdshi]p not to take Notice from me, that there is any dislike between us [Cottington and Laud]'). Laud was thoroughly determined in his pursuit of past corruption in the office to vindicate his feelings *post factum*: BL, Add. MS 28103, fo. 30r (treasury warrant to Robert Pye *et al.*, 18 May 1635) and WWM, Str P 15/38: Clifton to Wentworth, 28 Apr. 1635. Weston's death afforded Laud the prime opportunity of intruding himself into one of most important branches of civil administration. It did *not*, as many scholars have argued ever since Quintrell's essay, epitomize 'the waning of Laud's influence in secular affairs': Atherton, *Ambition and Failure*, p. 138. Indeed, he had not 'been absent from noe meeting [of the Commission] yet': WWM, Str P 6/191: Laud to Wentworth, 12 June 1635. For Juxon's role as a signifier of the Signet Office (dealing with ecclesiastical grants and so on) upon Laud's imprisonment, see Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 40. Stanhope was one of many to be suspicious of Cottington, who possessed the 'desier to become the kingdom[']s Carver': WWM, Str P 21/79: Stanhope to Wentworth, n.d. Oct. 1631. Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 289, argues that Cottington's resignation as Chancellor and Master of Wards (BL, Stowe MS 326, fo. 77r) in 1641 represented a chance for the King 'to tempt Parliamentary leaders with office.'

693 See, e.g., WWM, Str P 6/284: Laud to Wentworth, 30 Nov. 1635: 'I doe earnestly begg of you lesse Cypher'.

694 WWM, Str P 6/339: Laud to Wentworth, 8 Apr. 1636. This passage was included in an endnote or side paper.

695 The Lord Deputy nevertheless sent Cottington a 'Cipher', but they never used it to the extent as he did with Laud: WWM, Str P 3/140: Cottington to Wentworth, 29 Oct. 1634: 'I should take you for a witch'. See also WWM, Str P 3/142: Wentworth to Cottington, 18 Nov. 1634.

696 WWM, Str P 14/217: Cottington to Wentworth, 22 Nov. 1634. Cottington told Wentworth that it has been reported in England that the Lord Deputy did 'Galantear a certaine faire ladie ther[e]': ibid.

697 Haskell, 'Windebank', pp. 97–100. In late 1635, Wentworth accused Windebanke of passing an allegedly exorbitant grant of Irish land to the Earl of Arundel. He was surprised by Windebanke's procurement of royal letters supporting Arundel's claims and in a letter to the king Wentworth argued that Charles should be advised to direct Windebanke to use a little more 'animadversion in Private Suites' before they were submitted to the king: WWM, Str P 3/230: Wentworth to Charles I, 5 Dec. 1635. Windebanke's immediate service to Wentworth in warning him of the 'businesse' to remove him from the farm of the Irish customs in Jan. 1635–6 suggests that Charles kept such criticism from him: WWM, Str P 9/329: Windebanke to Wentworth, 28 Jan. 1635–6. Charles later admonished Wentworth 'not [to] thinke it odd, that I have, & shall use Windebanke[']s Pen in dispa[t]ches to you, sometimes of greatest consequence & secrecie; for I dare assure you, that he e[i]ther is, or shall bee your fr[i]end': WWM, Str P 40/29: Charles I to Wentworth, 28 Dec. 1638.

698 TNA, SP 16/331, fo. 26v: Garrard to Conway, 4 Sept. 1636.

699 Shepherd, 'Political Patronage, p. 129: 'Windebank proved to be no stooge of the archbishop'.

reported to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, that ‘the common people … procla[i]m[e]d him a Papist’, but had he been he would have left the church long ago and ‘gone beyaund seas.’ Compared to the time when ‘he had noe fr[i]end at court but the King’, his position was strengthened.[700] Unsure and uneasy of firm support, Wentworth asked for Cottington’s assistance in both the David Foulis[701] and Piers Crosby[702] cases. Laud knew especially of Wentworth’s own ties to Cottington.[703] He especially warned Wentworth that Cottington had double–crossed him through his attempt to gain Mountnorris’ posts for Adam Loftus in 1636. However, ‘Laud was obliged to live in

---

[700] NAL, V&A Museum, Forster MS 48 G 25, Item 7, fo. 1v: Charles Louis – ‘most humble and obedient sonne’ – to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 31 May 1636: Laud only sought ‘to maintaine the old orders of the churche’. Laud initiated an enquiry into Weston the previous year. He was no doubt disappointed to find little evidence of financial mismanagement

[701] WWM, Str P 21/97: Wentworth to Cottington, 11 Aug. 1632. Pogson suggests the date of 12 Aug. 1632 (idem, ‘Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40’, p. 68, n. 77 and p. 229, n. 133), but the letter clearly has 11 written on it. For Wentworth’s condemnation of David Foulis, see BL, Harl. MS 2233, fo. 174r. See, however, WWM, Str P 8/48: Wentworth to Earl of Arundel, 4 Nov. 1633 (‘desirouse of noe more, then the ordinary effects of your Justice in cases of like nature’) and SRO, D661/20/2, p. 10: ‘his knowen & professed Enemie.’ See also WWM, Str P 8/196–8, at 197: Wentworth to Coventry, 3 Mar. 1634–5 for Wentworth’s condemnation of Lord Keeper Coventry for his unwillingness (‘your Lo[rdshi]p[’]s favour or Regard’) to assist him in this case. It states that ‘this letter was not delivered’, however: ibid.

[702] WWM, Str P 10(b)/70–71: Wentworth to Cottington, 16 Apr. 1639: ‘who I thinke is the most wicked villaine’. For more on the Crosby case in 1639, see ch. 1.

[703] WWM, Str P 6/289: Laud to Wentworth, 30 Nov. 1635: ‘And if this be the third tyme you have been soe served by this waiting woman [Cottington], none is to be blamed but yourselfe, that would soe often trust her.’ Cottington remained a positive friend. His portrait was on the wall in Wentworth Woodhouse: O. Millar, ‘Strafford and Van Dyck’, in R. Ollard *et al.* (eds), *For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in Seventeenth–Century History* (1986), p. 122, n. 58. It is crippling irony, however, that the axe with which Wentworth was executed was the very one that Cottington had made while Constable of the Tower. See Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 152. Wentworth was, indeed, indebted to Cottington for persuading the king in mid–1631 to make him Lord Deputy of Ireland, although he eventually alienated Wentworth through his secret negotiations with Richard Weston and Arthur Ingram, the wealthy Yorkshire financier, which permitted him to collect recusant revenue at a handsome commission and thereby depriving Wentworth of income. A copy of the contract can be found in WYAS, WYL100/LA/8/4. Ingram was, indeed, ‘your [Wentworth’s] Minion, and one on whom you soe much doated’: WWM, Str P 3/111: Cottington to Wentworth, 3 Aug. 1634. Laud even ventured to suggest Ingram might follow Weston as Lord Treasurer, a view which Wentworth dismissed: WWM, Str P 6/239: Wentworth to Laud, 12 Sept. 1635 (misdated to 1634). Wentworth even accused Cottington of preferring Ingram over himself: WWM, Str P 3/112: Wentworth to Cottington, 22 Aug. 1634. The relationship between Wentworth and Ingram is discussed at some length in A.F. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* (Oxford, 1961), ch. 9. See, however, WWM, Str P 14/102: Garrard to Wentworth, 20 June 1634, for Garrard’s relation of Cottington’s trips to Ingram’s house in order to toast the Lord Deputy (‘we never fayl[e]d to drincke your L[or]dship’s health’) and WWM, Str P 14/119: Cottington to Wentworth, 2 July 1634, in which Cottington informed Wentworth that Ingram was ‘soe sensible of your displeasure, as he never comes to me butt he cries & weepes abundantly.’ He asked Wentworth to write to Ingram so that he would not be pestered with ‘his criing lamentations.’ For Radcliffe’s rather cordial relations with Ingram, see WYAS, WYL100/PO/7/II/16, 20 and 22: Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 Aug. 1634, 4 Nov. 1635 and 7 Aug. 1637. Radcliffe claimed he had little free time to do as Ingram wished, however: ‘In trueth I cannot say that I have had an ~~how~~ houer at my owne disposinge, this many weekes, the busines[s] of [the Irish] Parliament & councell board, & Kinge[’]s affaires have so overloaded me’: WYAS, WYL100/PO/7/II/16: Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 Aug. 1634. Wentworth had long enjoyed Ingram’s close friendship, requesting the use of his grand house in York to hold a dinner for supporters on election day in 1620: WWM, Str P 2/56–7: Wentworth to Ingram, 6 Dec. 1620. He would, however, give evidence against Wentworth at his trial in 1641: S. Healy, ‘Ingram, Sir Arthur (b. before 1571, d. 1642)’ *ODNB*. He was held in high esteem by Wentworth until his trial in 1641. See, e.g., ‘My L[or]d Deputy [Wentworth] writes very carefully to me concerning you’: Univ. of Nottingham, Pw 1/667: Laud to Ingram, 21 July 1633. See also BL, Harl. 6424, fo. 50r: ‘Arthur Ingram of the Commons[’] house in their name desired a Conference ag[ains]t Dr Cosens, the archB[isho]p of Cant[erbury] [Laud] … and the Dean and Prebends of Durham [Walter Balcanquhall and others]’ (16 Mar. 1640–1).

peace with Weston and Cottington'.[704] Cottington was included in the Committee of State – alternatively known as 'the Juncto'[705] – alongside Laud, Wentworth, Juxon, Windebanke and the Marquess of Hamilton, *inter alios*, who all decisively influenced policy during the Scottish crisis (1637–8). Wentworth tried his best to cool the tensions between each other,[706] but Cottington remained unmoved. He eventually became Lord Treasurer at Oxford in October 1643, but his appointment was a hollow tribute in the context of the times.'[707] Cottington remained an opponent from the very acquaintance of Laud with the Privy Council, though his correspondence with Wentworth at such an early stage had fleeting references to the likelihood of peace with Spain.[708] Laud's letter to Wentworth in early October 1635 contains mention of all his fears: the strength of the Queen's support for Cottington regarding the Treasury; his potential ability to persuade the king to halt the prosecution of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln; and his close friendship with the arch–deserter, Secretary Windebanke.[709] Windebanke often held talks about 'secret' negotiations with Cottington,[710] but Laud had already some unsure reservations as early as early autumn of 1632 about his capabilities;[711] Windebanke was already 'a member of the Portland [i.e. Weston] group' by this stage;[712] he loved to exercise his lively sense of humour and breezy Spanish tastes at

---

[704] Sharpe, 'Image of Virtue', p. 255.

[705] BL, Add. MS 15567, fo. 30v: 'where all things of privacy and consequence had been consulted and resolved'. Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 264: 'These persons [including the Earl of Northumberland] made up the committee of state, (which was reproachfully after called *the juncto*, and enviously then in the court *the cabinet council*,)'. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, pp. 198–9, at p. 198, argues that the powers of the Privy Council had been 'eclipsed' much earlier in the preceding decade by the court. It even began, he claims, with 'a milestone' that was the dissolution of Parliament in 1629: ibid. Cf. Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 268, as ever, puts forward the alternative case, which maintains that the 1630s saw the revival of the Privy Council 'as the principal organ of influence and government.' See also Forkan, 'Strafford's Irish Army', p. 47: 'Laud and Strafford both supported the king's stance [i.e. the dissolution of Parliament in May 1640].'

[706] WWM, Str P 3/37: Wentworth to Cottington, 24 Nov. 1633: 'I wishe you may rightly understand one another, and then I am perswaded you will like and valewe one another very much'. It was to little success, since only two years later Viscount Conway reported, 'Wee say here in Court that there is a mortall quarrell betweene the Archbishop and my Lord Cottington, but Cottington hath gained in the King[']s favour and the Bishop lost': WWM, Str P 8/329: Conway to Wentworth, 14 Nov. 1635.

[707] Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 204, n. 12.

[708] WWM, Str P 12/70: Cottington to Wentworth, 1 Aug. 1629.

[709] WWM, Str P 6/252–7: Laud to Wentworth, 4 Oct. 1635. See also Poynting, 'The King's Correspondence during the Period of Personal Rule', p. 75: 'the very small quantity of correspondence [of Windebanke's] surviving at all with both Laud and Coke may also indicate that those letters that were written were deliberately destroyed.'

[710] See, e.g., BL, Add. MS 36450, fo. 115r: Walter Aston to Windebanke, 7 Feb. 1636–7: the 'secret treatie that was set[t]led w[i]th my Lo[rd] Cottington' concerning a break with the Dutch, 'if his M[ajes]tie ~~were pleased~~ would proceed'.

[711] WWM, Str P 20/112: Laud to Wentworth, 1 Oct. 1632: 'But of all men mye Sec:[retary] Windebancke is noe fitt ma[n] to pull out the pinn, & lett downe the Waight.' This comment concerned the grievances being heard against Bishop John Williams. See also Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service: 705:73/14450/396/385: Windebanke to Coventry, 20 July 1635: in mid–1635, Charles I can be found holding up the issue of a 'Pattentee' for collecting fines on those convicted of swearing while he amended the terms of the grant to the benefit of 'Robert Lesley', one of the grooms of his 'Ma[jes[tie[']s Privie Chamber'.

[712] A.J. Cooper, 'The Political Career of Francis Cottington, 1605–52' (Univ. of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1966), p. 73.

the expense of the uncomprehending bishop. He had close and intimate involvement with most royal projects.[713] Indeed, Cottington, rather than William Juxon, appears to have been the impetus behind the king's desperate – and failed – attempts to raise adequate supply.[714] Although he had practical advantages coming from his position as Chancellor, his acquaintance with the king was somewhat frustrated.[715] His connection with Wentworth (of 'very little health') was rather close, though there were some signs of strain.[716] Cottington's experience in government was esteemed by Wentworth, who also appreciated that Cottington was well regarded by Charles I. Cottington seems to have escaped any profound censure over the Spanish silver incident in mid–1636.[717] To Cottington, however, the surrender of Charles I represented one betrayal too many by the Scots, and he made common cause with the long–established opponents of the Scots, the Richmond–Hertford faction. By the late summer of 1645, the factional battle–lines among the grandees had begun to harden. The heads of the foreign alliance faction were Digby, Jermyn and Culpeper – possibly even Cottington.

During the past forty years or so, scholars have paid increasing attention to the courts of early modern Europe as hubs of political activity.[718] There was, however, method behind some of Weston's court–induced madness – his attempt at handling the numerous accusations against him suggests that they may have contained a small amount of truth. He assembled various supporters after mid–1634,[719] a year before the dispute over the soap monopoly, and subsequently asked the king for his mercy. After

---

713 BL, Harl. MS 764, fos 10r–11v, 16r–v, 29r, 36r, 39v, 45r–v, 53r–v, 56r, 122r–4v and 135r–v: Cottington instructed officers such as the receivers–general, the sheriffs, the justices of the peace and the magistrates to investigate arrears in rents due from crown lands, i.e. level of fines levied upon licensed exploiters of royal forests, whether improvements made to crown property justified raising rents, and enterprises in which the crown had a vested interest but which no longer gave profit to the king.
714 NRS, GD406/1/1234: Wentworth to Hamilton, n.d.
715 WWM, Str P 13/219: Cottington to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4, immediately after the death of his wife, Cottington remarked rather bitterly that the king had not even bothered to send him a letter of condolence.
716 Ibid. Cottington was conscious of the need to cultivate Wentworth to obtain a political alliance as security against Weston's death.
717 Havran, *Caroline Court*ier, p. 135. See also TNA, SP 16/331, fo. 38r: Goring to Conway, 6 Sept. 1636: Goring informed Conway that he had heard that Cottington had tried to 'shove it [i.e. the blame] off' for the departure of the silver on to Northumberland.
718 See, esp., D. Starkey (ed.), *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987) and R. Asch and A.M. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age* (Oxford, 1991).
719 A few months before, Laud had pleasantly described Windebanke as 'the little Secretary': WWM, Str P 6/39: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Mar. 1633–4. Laud had much earlier referred to him as 'your L[ordshi]p[']s servant': WWM, Str P 20/112: Laud to Wentworth, 1 Oct. 1632. For much more on the soap monopoly, see McElroy, 'Laud', pp. 168–186. She contends that Laud's defence originated in his rather traditional views relating to industrial produce. The Westminster soap–makers did not conform to this vision; he was sure that the monopolists had employed bribery to persuade certain privy councillors, including Cottington, to support them.

much consideration, Charles granted Weston the continuance of royal favour and, despite creating a new Irish committee upon Laud's request, the Lord Treasurer's influence over Ireland was never reduced.

> to open any of their Eyes [i.e. the king's, in particular] to see their owne apparent and Certaine Good, thorow the Mist w[hi]ch those Jug[g]lers [Weston and Cottington] have Cast before them.[720]

Cottington was, of course, 'his [Weston's] man',[721] but much like Lionel Cranfield before him Weston was always a strong advocate of peace. All three of them, including Windebanke, were also determined supporters of the crown. Patricia Haskell includes them among the most active members of the Privy Council.[722] Wentworth also hoped that Cottington would assist him in a number of northern matters, one of these being what he regarded as his victimisation by the Attorney General, William Noy, concerning his lease of land in Galtres forest.[723] In late November 1635, Laud remarked to Wentworth that Cottington had recently toasted Coventry's health and reports were spreading at court of a developing friendship. Laud especially regarded this as a blow to his own position: 'Can you tell now 13 & 115 [Windebank] haveing slunk asside what will become of ... 102 [Laud]? Left alone Certainly.'[724] Cottington was, indeed, an important, even essential, link to the court.[725] It was to little success, since only two years later Viscount Conway reported,

> Wee say here in Court that there is a mortall quarrell betweene the Archbishop and my Lord Cottington, but Cottington hath gained in the King[']s favour and the Bishop lost.[726]

---

[720] WWM, Str P 6/231: Laud to Wentworth, 31 July 1635.

[721] Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 111. There were others, of course, including John Coke, who simply mentioned many issues rather quietly to Laud who either got Coke to remedy his mistake or excused him for it. Laud himself was willing to praise Coke's careful attention to Irish business. See, e.g., WWM, Str P 6/150–1: Wentworth to Laud, 10 Mar. 1634–5 and WWM, Str P 6/170: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635.

[722] Haskell, 'Windebank', pp. 89–90. She also includes Archbishop Laud, the Earl of Manchester (Lord Privy Seal), Lord Keeper Coventry and Lord Treasurer Weston and/or Juxon – Haskell fails to fully distinguish between them – in her list of those who 'attended over seventy–five and even eighty per cent of the meetings': ibid., p. 90. See also Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 143, n. 84.

[723] WWM, Str P 3/19: Wentworth to Cottington, 15 Sept. 1633 and Str P 3/32: Wentworth to Cottington, 4 Nov. 1633. See also W.J. Jones, '"The Great Gamaliel of the Law": Mr. Attorney Noye', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 40 (1977), pp. 218–19.

[724] WWM, Str P 6/286: Laud to Wentworth, 30 Nov. 1635.

[725] WWM, Str P 13/37: Cottington to Wentworth, 2 Sept. 1633, reporting that he had read a communication from Wentworth discussing Carlisle's Munster interests to the King. See also CUL, MS Add. 6863, p. 89: Roland appointed Attorney of the Court of Wards: without 'his suite or solicitat[i]on but on worthines[s] by the sole & principall desire of Lord Cottington, the M[aste]r of Wards'.

[726] WWM, Str P 8/329: Conway to Wentworth, 14 Nov. 1635.

Windebanke's experience in government and his particular knowledge of financial affairs were highly valued by the king. Windebanke would often write about rumours to the Lord Deputy, complaining about how Laud 'continews still in the old way' of non–negotiation at the Privy Council.[727] He was sufficiently familiar with the objectives of the Earl of Warwick and his friends to have a fairly accurate sense of what they were intending to achieve: the dismantlement of the structures of the Personal Rule – fiscal, religious and legal – through a newfound Parliament. Wentworth's correspondence with Windebank had an easy, somewhat friendly style and for the more important and sensitive business they used an extremely detailed cipher.[728] In November 1633, Charles I ordered Cottington, Weston and Windebanke to form a secret triumvirate to negotiate with the Spanish agent in London, Juan de Necolalde, for a naval and military alliance. Weston was most likely a party to the king's inner thoughts on foreign policy. On the domestic front he was also closely concerned with the forthcoming ship money writs and was not, therefore, dispensable. Charles must also have been aware of Laud's animosity towards his Treasurer and probably also understood that Weston had made less personal profit from the Treasurer's office than any of his recent predecessors. As John Pym implored his allies in the House of Lords to keep the Upper House in session, debate in the Commons turned to Windebanke: he was accused of failing to investigate evidence of preparations for an alleged rising by Catholics in England. The attack came from Thomas Coke, son of Windebanke's former rival, John Coke. As the figure who had also issued warrants for the searching of Warwick, Saye and Brooke, Windebanke fled from his house in Drury Lane in the early hours on 4 December 1640 to Paris – the same day that questioning of Windebanke by a Commons' committee was to begin. The day that 'George Radclif[f]e rend[e]red himselfe in Westminster' – that is, 4 December 1640 – was also 'the day that Windebanke ranne away.'[729] From Laud's own correspondence with Wentworth, it is clear that the archbishop and Windebanke often discussed Irish business and tried to coordinate their approaches to the king.[730] On hearing the news of Windebanke's appointment in 1632, Thomas Roe commented, that

[727] WWM, Str P 5/248: Windebanke to Wentworth, 11 July 1634: 'He complaines of want of witt and leisure, And yet hath abundantly enough of both, to abuse the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the poore Secretary.' See also WWM, Str P 5/235 (but labelled as 237 – 235 and 236 are absent): Windebanke to Wentworth, 14 May 1634: 'I know not how my Lord of Canterbury hath abused the poore puisne Secretary to the Lord Deputy of Ireland.'

[728] WWM, Str P 5/213: Windebanke to Wentworth, 20 Nov. 1633, commenting on Wentworth's habit of doodling 'ill faces' at 'the Councell Bo[a]rd'.

[729] BL, Add. MS 64921, fo. 136r [Coke to Coke, n.d. Dec. 1640].

[730] WWM, Str P 6/278–9: Laud to Wentworth, 26 Oct. 1635 and WWM, Str P 6/360: same to same, 12 Sept. 1636.

'there is a new Secretary brought out of the darke.'[731] He has been described alternately as 'able & honest' but also a 'near–papist'.[732] On 21 November 1640, almost a decade later, a correspondent from London reported that 'Windebank[e] stinkes, for shrewde matters are Come in against him'.[733] During the 1640s, the Junto presumed to nominate two of the great officers of State – typically regarded as only the king's terrain – and on 9 August 1641 a group of Commons–men (including Strode and Holles) proposed the Earl of Salisbury as Lord Treasurer.[734] Meanwhile, the Earl of Northumberland wished for a quick and speedy negotiated settlement with the Scots, but the hispanophiles (Windebanke and Cottington, among many others) were 'all earnest to putt the King upon a warre'.[735] 'Your fr[i]end' [Earl of Holland], Charles I told Windebanke, had been shown some of Arthur Hopton's dispatches 'to keepe je[a]lousies out of his head'.[736] There was a strictly moral tone to the Caroline court compared to the dalliance of the Jacobean. 'We keep all [of] our virginities at court still; at least we lose them not avowedly.'[737] Windebanke's defection over the soap monopoly was 'the unkindest cut of all',[738] however. 'During the Commission for the Treasury,' Laud recorded in his personal diary, 'my old friend, Sir F.W. [Francis Windebanke], forsook me, and joined with the L. Cottington; which put me to the exercise of a great deal of patience'.[739] It was also alleged that Windebanke as well as Laud and Wentworth fell victim to 'their close association with royal policy.'[740] Cottington was a man of substance; Wentworth appreciated the assistance he was willing to give to his Irish affairs.

Windebanke's time at St John's College, Oxford, was foundational for his career much

---

731 TNA, SP 81/38, fo. 312r: Roe to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 1 July 1632: 'is no newes professed by the L[or]d of London [Laud]'. Roe was, of course, a disappointed candidate for the office Windebanke had just procured. See also *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, ed. Questier, p. 101: Southcot to Biddulph, 22 June 1632: 'There is a new secretary lately sworne in Dorchester[']s place, whose name is Winnebanke … His promotion to this place came chiefly by my lord of London[']s [Laud's] meanes'. See, however, Shepherd, 'Political Patronage', p. 128: 'The circumstances surrounding this appointment [of Windebanke as Secretary] therefore provides good grounds for doubting the traditional role which Laud is usually assumed to have played in it'.

732 Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 63 and Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, p. 163.

733 Bristol Archives, AC/36074/136d: Baynam Throckmorton to Thomas Smyth, 21 Nov. 1640 ('Records of the Smyth family of Ashton Court').

734 BL, Sloane MS 1467, fo. 76r. He was Northumberland's father–in–law.

735 WWM, Str P 10(b)/1: Earl of Northumberland to Wentworth, 23 July 1638.

736 Bodl., MS Clarendon 7, fo. 35r: Charles to Windebanke, 6 Aug. 1635.

737 *CSPD, 1639–40*, p. 365: Robert Read to Windebanke, 23 Jan. 1639–40.

738 Trevor–Roper, *Lau*d, p. 223.

739 Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 224. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 303: 'his old Friend *Windebank*[e], who had received his preferment from him, forsook him in the open field, and joyned himself with *Cottington* and the rest of that Party.'

740 Poynting, 'The King's Correspondence during the Period of Personal Rule', p. 88.

like Laud's, although the archbishop was nine years older and was one of the patrons to whom Windebanke owed his secretarial appointment in 1632. Life at the crypto–Catholic college helped to crystallise many of his religious views and opinions. His sympathy for Catholicism makes it rather easy to label him as a death–bed papist. His leniency toward priests, Jesuits and recusants came in for some marked criticisms during the Long Parliament. The first sign of any rift between Windebanke and Laud came in May 1634, when Laud, accompanied by Coventry, was leading a determined campaign against Lord Treasurer Weston (backed apparently by Holland, Carlisle and Dorset), but, alas, the effort met with little, if not zero, sympathy from the king. Windebanke was unwilling to associate himself with this business, a year earlier than the conflict over the soap monopoly. Laud wrote to Wentworth about the struggle between his patrons. He recorded the 'soe many Spanish Tricks' that Cottington employed against him.[741] Although William Juxon attempted bravely to repair some of the damage, Laud remained unpersuaded and was still almost obsessively dwelling upon his emotional injuries three years after his complaint to Wentworth.[742] Windebanke, no doubt accustomed to hearing Laud's negative reviews of others, did not necessarily always associate himself with the archbishop. It was claimed at Laud's trial that he did 'burne' most of his correspondence.[743] Juxon, too, was 'commanded' by Charles I to 'advance the K[ing']s profit' at whatever cost.[744] Laud's own claim to responsibility is to be found in his diary entry for 15 June 1632: 'Mr. Francis Windebanke, my old friend, was sworn Secretary of State; which place I obtained for him of my gracious master King Charles.'[745] The councillors, including Windebanke, were all relatively colourless royal servants, often of mean birth, who had risen through their energy and single–minded devotion to royal policies. The Long Parliament prepared charges against Windebanke for aiding the Counter–Reformation, that is, for discharging 'Recusants' and issuing 'letters of Grace' to each of them.[746] Wentworth's letters to William Raylton, however, reveal something of his intriguing partnership with Cottington, including curt reminders – or rather complaints – that Raylton was required

---

[741] WWM, Str P 6/70: Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634.
[742] WWM, Str P 6/277–8: Laud to Wentworth, 21 Oct. 1635 and Str P 6/350: same to same, 22 Aug. 1636.
[743] Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 15: 'Secre[tary] Windebanke said the A[rch]B[ishop] tould him he did burne' most letters and Laud wrote in the margins that 'Windebanke then must answer it.'
[744] BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 30r: 'He [Juxon] denies he did any thing for his own gain' (24 Feb. 1640–1).
[745] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 215.
[746] Bodl., MS Tanner 65, fo. 226v: 'Twenty nyne discharged by a verball warr[an]t of Secretary Windebanke.'

to deliver: 'tell my Lord Cottington from mee …'[747] were coupled with direct orders to give Cottington 'humble thanks' for his care of recusancy 'businesses'.[748] Returning an unexpected gift from Bishop Bridgeman, Windebanke believed that he 'shalbe free from the suspition of corruption in Court aswell as I doubt not but you wilbe of that in the Country . . . the golden way is not myne, neither have I hitherto trod it, nor will I beginne in your L[ordshi]p[']s busines[s].'[749] Indeed, Laud brokered the power:

> that you [Laud] being told the King was resolved to make him Secretary … [were] wylled to take notyce of his Majesty[']s intention.[750]

One has tried to avoid endorsing the contemporary depiction of Weston, Cottington or Windebanke as quintessential politicians, toing and froing from one material gain to *provocateurs* in their pursuit of what they took to be the interests of the state. It is important in dealing with a subject as complex as the crypto–Catholics at the Caroline court to refuse the false choice between Machiavel and Saint with which some recent historical writing tends to confront us. We do ourselves little favour as historians if we attempt to suppress the multiple identities and their concomitant forms of activity in favour of a simple choice between Catholic or Protestant. Indeed, Weston belonged to all five of the standing committees of Privy Council[751] and, unlike Wentworth, never opposed royal policy.[752] They were not a 'faction' *per se*, crossing no rigid boundaries, but ably managing the shifting sands and changeable world of Caroline court politics. Working tirelessly for financial reward/s to improve the quality of central administration, historical judgements of Weston, Cottington and Windebanke have too

[747] WWM, Str P 21/107: Wentworth to Raylton, 11 Dec. 1633.
[748] WWM, Str P 21/138: same to same, 17 July 1635.
[749] SRO, D1287/18/2: Windebanke to Bridgeman, 23 Apr. 1633 (P/399/97).
[750] 'there is no good temper betweene my l[or]d Cottington & your Grace [Laud]': Somerset Heritage Centre, DD/PH/221, fo. 30r-v (n.d. 1635: Robert Phelips). Besides making his own observations on the strength of individual character, Charles I appears to have sounded a number of people for their opinion of Windebanke. They included Cottington who, alongside Weston, was to work very closely with Windebanke in their secret negotiations with Spain as well as Laud who, as an old friend and ex–tutor, knew his character better than most. Seeing Laud as one of the least self–interested members of the Caroline government, Robert Phelips wrote to him in 1635 stating how that 'in being in London I collate by severall wayes that Mr Secretary Windebank[e] was not so fast wytyted to your service as opinion dyd conceive he ought to have beeen', and that he had 'noted a dissent from you in all public occasions, and observed in him towards my Lord Cottington all respects and concurrency...' No longer so well acquainted with the Court as he had once been when Phelips had first been acquainted with this information, he had been informed that Laud was 'nothing less than that, for [']twas my Lord Cottington which then thus preferred him [&] that you [Laud] being told the king was resolved to make him secretary... [were] willed to take notice of his majesty's intention...': ibid.
[751] Trade, Irish affairs, the Ordnance, foreign plantations and foreign affairs.
[752] Wentworth's career during the early years of Charles I's reign (1625–9) is most difficult to comprehend, particularly the way in which senior members of the county gentry had to accommodate both the demands of the crown and the expectations of the electorate. For more on this, see Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 106–11.

often been coloured by the disparaging way in which Laud and Wentworth referred to them in their correspondence.

Chapter 4: 'A Greate Offendor in His Kind of Writinge'[753]: Laud and the Prosecution of William Prynne's *Histrio-mastix*, 1633–4

William Prynne's first experience at the Court of Star Chamber was a bruising affair, a story of victimhood and vindication in which he struck an immense performance. He has since been reassessed as a much less radical, arguably less revolutionary, figure. Anticipating the revisionist push of the 1970s, William Lamont's biography grounded him in Protestant orthodoxy as a conservative lawyer, a prime intellectual who challenged Archbishop Laud's *jure divino* innovations in the Church of England. Prynne's *Histrio-mastix* has been aptly described as a work of 'soured misanthropy',[754] but nevertheless in this original encounter Laud pursued him with the utmost tenacity.[755]An accurate assessment of William Laud's attitude to Puritan nonconformity is essential for a just understanding of the aims and achievements of his primacy.[756]

Yet Mark Kishlansky has made another *cri de coeur*, producing 'a thoroughly new account' of the trial of Prynne's *Histrio-mastix*[757] in which the 'personal vindictiveness' of Laud[758] is relegated to a debate between 'subsequent historians and literary critics', relying extensively – and almost exclusively – upon a manuscript at Harvard University. His claim, however, that 'its existence does not simply supplement other surviving accounts; it supplants them' fails to stand up to critical scrutiny. The manuscript records are indeed fulsome – the British Library, the Bodleian, Cambridge Univ. Library and Huntington Library – but Kishlansky reports that all of these are

---

753 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 51v. These are the words of William Laud.

754 W. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne, 1600–1669* (1963), p. 33. Ibid., p. 30: 'This attack upon stage plays revealed him at his worst.' As Erastian and staunchly predestinarian as he could be, Prynne emerges from this study as a figure committed to the norms of the common law and conservative ideology. See also T. Fitch, 'Caroline Puritanism as Exemplified in the Life and Work of William Prynne' (Univ. of Edinburgh, Ph.D. thesis, 1949), p. 53: 'the spirit it [*Histrio–mastix*] breathes is one of intolerable bigotry.' This pre–Revisionist work by Lamont has not received the recognition that it deserves ('the significance of which is not perhaps often enough recognised'): T. Cogswell, R. Cust and P. Lake, 'Revisionism and its Legacies: the Work of Conrad Russell', in eidem (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, p. 4. Cf. Orr, *Treason and the State*, p. 162: 'one of the most slippery political polemicists of the period'.

755 'Laud would not lose any opportunity to punish Prynne': Fitch, 'Caroline Puritanism', p. 53.

756 It is beyond the scope of this present work to consider how subversive Puritanism was, but there is some evidence to suggest that William Prynne harboured very radical views. According to Kevin Sharpe, Puritans were nothing short of being 'a small band who often felt themselves beleaguered outcasts': idem, *Personal Rule*, p. 757. The Puritan movement was chronically subject to ruptures and schisms of this nature. 'Puritanism had ceased to mean much of anything at all': P. Lake, 'From Revisionist to Royalist History; or, Was Charles I the First Whig Historian?', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 78 (2015), p. 658.

757 M. Kishlansky, ''A Whipper Whipped': The Sedition of William Prynne', *HJ*, 56 (2013), p. 603. One challenges Kishlansky at one's own peril, but his overblown article traverses much of the same ground as this chapter.

758 S. Foster, *Notes from the Caroline Underground* (Connecticut, 1978), p. 41.

derived from a single source and, unlike the 'unused' Harvard account, do not cover the entirety of the six sessions from the 24th of January, when the preliminary motions were heard, to the 17th February 1633–4, when sentencing occurred by Cottington. His argument also has important implications for Laud: he is presented again as a mistaken figure, simply citing – and trusting – the archbishop's contemporary rebuttal of the accusation in his diary and trial.[759] Kishlansky's article is designed to provoke a reappraisal of Prynne – a revision of Lamont's skewed picture that portrays Prynne as a figure worthy of our approval or at least sympathy.[760] He was, according to Kishlansky, 'an old school puritan who believed in the Manichean struggle between the saved and the damned.'[761] It is arguably far more pre–Revisionist than counter–Revisionist or post–Revisionist, containing a vaguely Whiggish scent of Puritanism as a schismatic body of beliefs – an endorsement of the authorities' view.[762]

The trial and punishment of William Prynne, a fierce enemy of the Caroline regime,[763] in 1633–4 has been variously described as a watershed in censorship, a 'turning point' and, somewhat teleologically, 'an irrevocable step toward civil war',[764] but the influence of Archbishop Laud, a looming figure that had 'noe voyce in the Sentence',[765] remains clouded by polemic. Prynne and Henry Burton, 'these two barking Libellers', already subjected Cosin to 'chastisem[en]t' as early as 1628,[766] but in November of the preceding year there was some discussion that 'There is yet one High Commission day appointed more, & thoughts of Mr Prynne the Lawyer … shalbe then censured'.[767] Both were summoned before the court only months later for violating the declaration against unlicensed books on religion; their erstwhile patrons at Lincoln's Inn obtained

---

759 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', pp. 608, 611, 603 and 609. See, e.g., Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 221.
760 See, e.g., Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 231: 'there is much to admire about a dedication to fearless writing'.
761 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 604: 'He was doctrinally rigid and morally upright'.
762 Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 149: 'By the 1620s, Puritanism was a socially respectable movement with deep roots and its leaders were among the … élite.' See also idem, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 356: Puritanism was 'a continuous act of worship'. See also Lamont, *Godly Rule*, p. 4: 'Prynne was as popular as he was prolific.'
763 LPL, MS 943, p. 97: 'Prinne will not sitt downe as an idle Spectator'. See also W. Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938), p. 235: Haller believes that 'the outpourings of Prynne and his fellows were but incidental currents, best ignored, in the running stream of the intellectual life of the time.'
764 R. Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Pennsylvania, 2009), p. 57; D. Cressy, 'Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36 (2005), p. 369; and A. Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Wisconsin, 1984), p. 107. See also C.S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 20: the 'trial of William Prynne for writing *Histriomastix* … reflect[s] censorship different in both kind and degree'.
765 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 188r: 'you alone'. Letter from William Prynne to Archbishop Laud sent on 11 June 1634.
766 TNA, SP 16/108, fo. 159r: John Cosin to Laud, n.d. June 1628. See as well Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 49/91 ('Mr Pryn ag[ains]t Cosens'), p. 1: 'Mr Cosen[']s Prayer Booke, our Articles & Homilies are all Established & [im]posed on our Church by Act of Parliam[e]nt'.
767 BL, Harl. MS 390, fo. 327r.

‘a *Prohibition* … to stay the Proceedings’.[768] In *Healthes Sicknesse*, Prynne claimed the drunken behaviour of subjects was ‘*a great affront, indignity & dishono*[u]*r*’ to the king – his ‘*greatest griefe*’ – but also provocatively made him ‘a party both to the guilt and punishment of all the sinne’.[769] ‘If we once begin to play with small and pettie Vices’, he wrote in the same year, ‘they will quickly draw us on to scandalous, great, and hainous sinnes … that we shall sooner sinke downe into Hell under their weight, and pressure, then shake off their bondage.’[770] In *Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Man’s Estate*, he called upon Archbishop Abbot to ‘execute, stirre up and act that place and power, which God and man have given to you’,[771] but Laud found the arguments reprehensible.[772] What was a quasi–profound recognition of the ‘*Right Reverend Fathers in God*, the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of the Church of England’ soon became ‘all Lordly Prelates and Bishops … fallen from … pietie, holinesse, humility, poverty, [and] zeale’.[773] He had suffered many of his tracts, though licensed by Archbishop Abbot’s chaplains, to be ‘called in and suppressed by this Bishop[’]s [Laud’s] meere Arbitrary Power’ and found heavy sentence in High Commission.[774] Laud continued his systematic assault upon Prynne as a representative of that Puritan tradition in the

[768] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 155: ‘Which *Prohibition* they tend[e]red to the Court in so rude a manner, that *Laud* was like to have laid them by the heels for their labour.’ On 7 Feb. 1632–3, Prynne was before High Commission but the Act Book does not explain the case against him, merely noting that ‘the Cause was continued in *statu quo* untill this Day. This day the Court for some reasons thought meete that this Cause shall rest as it is and be no further proceeded in till this Court shall give particular order therein’: CUL, MS Dd.2.21, fo. 129v.

[769] W. Prynne, *Healthes Sicknesse* (1628), sigs ¶2, ¶2v and ¶4v. This publication displayed a verbose and violent talent at criticizing such a ‘miserable spectacle’, p. 29, which became ever-present in his later works.

[770] W. Prynne, *The Unlovelinesse of Love-lockes* (1628), sig. A3. He continues to berate those who wear such an ‘effeminate fantastique Love-locke’ in *Histrio-mastix* (1633), ‘To the Christian Reader’, sig. ***2, seeing it as ‘a cord of vanity’. ‘There was cruel irony in the fact that the author of the tract, *The Unlovelinesse of Love-Locks* (1628) was later obliged to assume the fashion of wearing his hair long to hide his deformity’: P.R. Roberts, ‘William Prynne’s *Histrio-Mastix*: a Puritan Attack on the Court and Stage during the Personal Rule of Charles I’, in K. Malettke *et al.* (eds), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an Europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Münster, 2001), p. 450.

[771] W. Prynne, *The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Man’s Estate* (1627), sig. ¶4. S.M. Holland, ‘Archbishop George Abbot: A Study in Ecclesiastical Statesmanship’ (Univ. of London Ph.D. thesis, 1991), p. 149: ‘[Abbot was] overshadowed by Laud in both the religious and political sphere during the last years of his life’. The extremists of the Puritan movement like Prynne who had found themselves disarmed and enervated by Abbot’s moderation were stung into a renewed militancy by their first taste of Laudianism.

[772] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 132: ‘a great stickler in these troubles of the Church’. ‘If ever Arrius was condemned for heresie then this is heresie’: Univ. of Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 303v. Kishlansky mistakes the quotation as a reference to *Histrio-mastix* (idem, ‘Whipper Whipped’, p. 623, n. 118), but it was directed at ‘a booke of his [Prynne’s]’ from six years before, *The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Man’s Estate*: Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 303v. Unfortunately, the folios of this lengthy manuscript have never been numbered.

[773] W. Prynne, *The Church of England’s Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme* (1629), sig. ¶ and idem, *A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Prelates* (1636), p. 2.

[774] W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 159. See, e.g., K. Courtis, ‘The Tyrannical Nature of Archbishop Laud: Evidence from the Acts of the Court of High Commission’ (Univ. of Melbourne B.A. thesis, 2004), p. 34: ‘The conclusion reached is that accusations that Laud was a cruel, harsh, and autocratic individual have no foundation.’

church that was antithetical to clerical authority and power, upbraiding the godly as private spirits, sectaries and heretics.[775]

Prynne originally came under the influence of the godly preacher John Preston,[776] publishing works without licence. His indomitable spirit would eventually mature into *Histrio-mastix*, a thousand-page catalogue of the errors of plays, 'the greatest Pompes, and Vanities, that this World affords'.[777] It set 'new standards of vituperation'.[778] The public theatre, it declared, was 'a *Schoole of Vice*', 'not worthy of the name of *Christians*'; playhouse audiences would 'rather heare the most lascivious Comedy, then the best soule-searching Sermon'.[779] It sparked a debate about the morality of acting. While Laud considered plays to be 'things indifferent',[780] *adiaphora* in all but name,[781] *Histrio-mastix* still received a licence (compared to his tracts in 1637).[782] Prynne positioned the entire blame upon the magistrates, '*who should suppresse them*'[783] – 'the neglect of theire duty in the suppression of such vanityes, god will bring on them some fearfull judgement'[784] – and claimed to be telling only the 'bare, and naked *Trueth*'.[785] Prynne presented copies of his work to 'some Brothers of Lincolne[']s Inne' and to other 'especial friends' including Attorney General Noy.[786]

---

775 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 129: Puritans were 'secret … but nothing the less dangerous'.
776 W. Prynne, *Anti-Arminianisme* (1630), p. 212. See my 'A Reappraisal of the York House Conference (1626)' (Univ. of Oxford M.St. thesis, 2015), pp. 14–15, 17–18 and Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 156. See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 5: in Nov. 1631, 'Heylyn was made a prebend[ary] of Westm[inster], by procurem[en]t of the Arc[h]B[isho]p [Abbot].'
777 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, pp. 57–8.
778 Kishlansky, *Charles I*, p. 52.
779 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, pp. 172, 4 and 531. 'Can we then take God[']s time, God[']s treasure … and spend it wholly upon sinne? upon Satan? upon *our owne carnall lusts and pleasures*?': ibid., p. 303.
780 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 52r. See also BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 29v ('playes are in themselves indifferent, it maye plainlye Appeare'); Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 134r ('they are in his opinion *mala per se*. But I say, … they are things indifferent'); and Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 299v: 'I am persuaded, that plaies … are thinges in themselves, and theire own nature, indifferent.'
781 For the argument that adiaphorism was the predominant – and moderating – theology of England, see Bernard, 'Church of England', esp. pp. 187–90.
782 BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 17v: 'itt was not printed beyounde the Seas, nor in Corners, nor unlycensed, nor privatelye dispeirced'. Prynne emphasised this point because he believed that 'there were never any brought here in judgm[en]t but for Bookes unlycenced': ibid. According to Philip Hamburger, 'Prynne *deviously* obtained a license for his book': idem, 'The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press', *Stanford Law Review*, 37 (1985), p. 679 (italics mine). See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 13: 'His booke *Histrio* [–]*mastix* was Lycenced by the A[rch]B[isho]p[']s chaplaine.' (Second day of trial: 18 Mar. 1643–4).
783 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 787: 'That Playes, and Players, are suffered still … *it is onely the fault of Magistrates*'. Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 125r: 'That there is small hopes to reforme plaies, for the magistrates are the first at them.' These are the words of Holborne. It was alleged that Prynne went so far as to blame magistrates for provoking God into sending the visitation of the plague: Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 253v.
784 CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 25.
785 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 6.
786 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 195v. 'If his heart had been guiltie of these foule crimes … he woulde never surelie have presented Mr Attorney w[i]th the bookes': ibid., fo. 245v. These are the words of Holborne.

Laud initiated the case against Prynne[787] – it was a 'golden opportunity'[788] against his 'great nemesis',[789] though it was not long until his 'personal loathing … had grown out of all proportion'[790] – but Michael Sparke, the radical printer, 'much abused' anyone who told him to 'amend' the book.[791] Prynne has been unfavourably described by historians as 'a megalomaniac', 'a reckless bigot', 'dull and narrow–minded', 'hysterical', 'pedantic' and 'paranoid', [792] but he promised 'a fatall, if not finall, overthrow … to Playes, and Actors'[793] – a tremendous compilation of Puritanical extremity, the tiresome labour of countless years[794] of temper and brooding fanaticism – but Matthew Hale, a barrister who went on to counsel Laud, considered him a man of his word, 'very honest' and a 'good Scholar and Lawyer'.[795] *Histrio-mastix*, however, by common assent, 'went too far.'[796] Kishlansky has written that any 'moderate'[797] depiction of Prynne, an ardent anti–Catholic, 'relies upon a special meaning of moderate and a subtle reading of one of the least subtle of puritan controversialists.'[798]

---

787 *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 562: 'Laud was the instrument and abettor of this process against the Book and the Author'. See D. Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 2000), p. 218: 'The king himself was initially reluctant to proceed, but Laud was determined to bring the libeller down.'
788 K.M. Mattia, 'Crossing the Channel: Cultural Identity in the Court Entertainments of Queen Henrietta Maria, 1625–1640' (Duke Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 2007), p. 210.
789 C. Lane, *The Laudians and the Elizabethan Church: History, Conformity and Religious Identity in Post-Reformation England* (2013), p. 34. See also J–L. Kim, 'The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the Character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637', in M. Braddick and D. Smith (eds), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 24 ('Laud's greatest enemy'), James, 'Introduction', p. xiv ('Laud's nemesis') and Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 285: 'greatest enemy'. However, one would agree with Anthony Milton that 'Laud's *bête noire*' or 'preferred target' was Bishop John Williams: idem, 'The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach' in T. Cogswell *et al.* (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 173 and 175. Following on from a heated and full–scale assault upon *Histrio-mastix*, Laud turned his energies to a pointed and fierce campaign against Williams in Star Chamber in 1637.
790 L.A. Freeman, *Antitheatricality and the Body Public* (Pennsylvania, 2017), p. 67.
791 *CSPD, 1633–4*, p. 418. Laud was surprisingly indulgent toward Sparke, believing him to have been 'reduced to better order' and 'become more conformable' (CUL, MS Dd.6.23, pp. 26 and 39): 'how hee fell into this businesse I knowe not', for 'hee hath done some good service' (Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fos 261v and 297r). Several years later, however, Laud called him an 'enemy' to the church: Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 268. J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–1670* (1976), p. 25, n. 13: 'Like Prynne, he [Sparke] despised Laud'.
792 J. Barish, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley, 1981), p. 84; Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, p. 219; H. Martin, *Puritanism and Richard Baxter* (1954), p. 195, n. 10; W. Lamont, 'William Prynne, 1600–1669: '"The Mountainous Ice" of Puritanism', *History Today*, 11 (Mar. 1961), p. 200; D. Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 2006), p. 223; and C.H. and K. George, *Protestant Mind of the English Reformation*, p. 141, n. 73.
793 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 9.
794 The book had been in gestation for almost a full decade (at least eight years), since an early version was given an imprimatur on 31 May 1630 with a much fuller text entered by his co-defendant Sparke at the Stationers' Company on 16 Oct. 1632. It was immediately finished at the press a mere ten weeks later and published more than four weeks before the Queen's pastoral. Most of the work (approximately eight hundred and thirty leaves) had been printed by the Easter Term of 1632. Prynne had, however, inserted the offensive phrase, 'notorious whores', into the index at a very late stage of printing, i.e. when her pastoral was in rehearsal and her participation was common knowledge.
795 LPL, MS 3516, fo. 203v.
796 Lamont, 'Prynne, 1600–1669', p. 200.
797 Cf. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 13: 'In the period between 1626 and 1640 Prynne was a moderate.'
798 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 606. See also Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 732: 'revisionism has gone too far.'

Laud adopted this view, seeing Prynne as authoring a 'most wilfull commission of noe less then Treason.'[799] In theology an uncompromising Calvinist, Prynne's unstinting opposition to the Roman Antichrist stood at the very centre of his world view.

Laud's promoter, Peter Heylyn, 'the most vitriolic polemicist of the Stuart age'[800] yet one of 'your L[ordshi]p[']s charitable Agents',[801] was used to gather evidence of sedition[802] – he was assigned a fortnight to complete the task, although he completed it 'in less than four days'[803] – but he vigorously denied the archbishop's influence.[804] Anthony Milton claims that 'Laud in particular had not read his works but had relied on Heylyn's extracts',[805] but the only – and somewhat slightly dubious, even tenuous – evidence is a brief statement by Prynne to the archbishop:

> you should have read yourself [*Histrio-mastix*], before you did condemne … and not trusted onely to Dr Heylin[']s notes, which have deceived both yourself and others.[806]

Heylyn testified before a parliamentary committee in 1640 that it was his patron, John Coke, who first assigned him to the task – 'to peruse it & to draw out such passages as weere scandalous'[807] – but only four years earlier he was under no illusion as to whom he owed 'the greatest p[ar]t of my incouragem[en]ts',[808] a figure to whom he began to 'apply' himself when Laud was merely 'the Lord Bishop of *London*'.[809] The Earl of

---

799 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 49v. Cf. Quintrell, *Charles I*, p. 80: 'he was no dangerous radical.'
800 Lane, *Laudians and the Elizabethan Church*, p. 32. By the mid–1630s, the Laudians' complicity in the ambitious programme of clerical reform laid them open to Prynne's charge that they were no better than pontifical lordly prelates. See, e.g., Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists*, pp. 186–7 and 223–6.
801 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 187r.
802 W. Prynne, *A New Discovery* (1641), p. 8: 'the now *Archbishop* thereupon caused Doctor *Heylin* … to collect such passages out of the booke'.
803 G. Vernon, *Life of the Learned and Reverend Dr Peter Heylyn* (1682), pp. 50–1: 'he had learned from the wisest of men, That *diligence in busines*[s] and a quick dispatch of it would qualifie him for the service of Kings, and not *mean persons*.' See Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 170: he 'came up in record time with a vicious critique'. See also idem, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, p. 223: 'Heylyn had thrown in his lot with Archbishop Laud'.
804 Heylyn was instructed 'to draw out of it and digest such particular Passages as tended to the danger or dishonour of the King or State': Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 230. Cf. 'It was the king not Laud who asked him to write … the official replies to Prynne's *Histriomastix*': Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 33.
805 Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, p. 45: 'Prynne's complaint … was *probably* true' (italics mine).
806 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 188v.
807 BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 65r. This might be only half the story, however ('to collect such passages out of the booke … as might draw Master *Prynne* into Question for *supposed scandals therein* … Hereupon the Doctor drawes up such Collections … and delivers them in writing to Secretary *Coke*, and the *Arch-bishop*': Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 8).
808 WWM, Str P 15/350: Peter Heylyn to Wentworth, 19 Feb. 1635–6. This is a quote unused by Anthony Milton. Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 3: 'He commanded Dr Heylin to answere the booke, but did not command him to inject pure unfound things.'
809 P. Heylyn, *A Survey of the Estates of France* (1656), sig. a2. Laud certainly helped to crystallise his opinions.

xDanby, a man whom Laud claimed was responsible for Heylyn's rise,[810] also believed that 'the thankful Acknowledgments' ought to go to the archbishop.[811]

Upon Laud's direction, Heylyn discovered traces of sedition rather than heterodoxy in *Histrio-mastix*, reporting that Prynne should not come before the High Commission but Star Chamber.[812] Prynne 'seemed to breath nothing but Disgrace to the Nation, Infamy to the Church, Reproaches to the Court, Dishonour to the Queen, and some things which were thought to be tending to the destruction of his Majesties['] Person.'[813] Prynne complained of how Heylyn had selected 'scatter[e]d fragments' from his work, 'annexing such horrid[,] seditious, disloyall[,] false Glosses, applicac[i]ons, construc[i]ons and inferences … as none but Heads intoxicated w[i]th malice, disloyalty and private revenge could ever fancye'.[814] D'Ewes told Heylyn 'that if hee had proceeded with the spirit of Christian mansuetude hee might have prevented Mr Prinne['s] punishment by interpreting those places dexterouslie w[hic]h hee distorted sinisterlie'.[815] It was said that Noy had originally approved the work – '*he saw nothing in it that was scandalous or censurable in Star-Chamber*'[816] – but he was, in fact, horrified at its reception.[817] Laud found his testimony tiresome, but nonetheless pursued an extremely public denunciation, doing the Puritan firebrand much service in between; it proved to be a pyrrhic victory, a personal triumph which Prynne would reference in future publications as being definitive and longstanding.[818] Even his counsel hedged

---

810 Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 294. There might be some truth in this claim, however. See Heylyn's 1624 poem to Henry Danvers, the future Earl of Danby, in which he spoke rather highly of 'that worlde of duetie w[hi]ch I owe / unto your noble bounties' and told him to 'Accept not my performance but my minde'. He asked only for a 'small gratitude' which clearly meant nothing other than employment: BL, Add. MS 46885A, fo. 21r. See also Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, pp. 22–3. See also BL, Harl. MS 390, fo. 526r, for Danby's success against Edward Eure in the Star Chamber in the early 1630s for calling him 'a base Lord'. Heylyn had distorted the facts somewhat, assisting Laud at the consecration of St Katherine Cree church in 1630: idem, *Cyprianus*, pp. 212–13.

811 Vernon, *Life of ... Heylyn*, p. 36: '"That those thanks were not in the least due unto himself, but to the Lord Bishop of *London* [Laud], unto whose generous and active mind the whole of that Dignity was to be ascribed."' See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 3. See also BL, Add. MS 46885A, fo. 18r: indeed, Heylyn did write verses applauding Charles I and Buckingham's Spanish adventure in 1623 – 'Like Herc[u]les in the lyon[']s skinne'. Heylyn's views were quirky, unsystematic and often contingent: there was and is no standard template for their ideological formation. See also Parliamentary Archives, MS 8, p. 58: 'The E[arl] of danby prefer[r]ed Dr Heylyn.'

812 BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 65r.

813 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 230. See also Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions*, pp. 213–14: David Cressy rightly describes Prynne as having raised 'the rhetoric of provocation … into a fine political art.'

814 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 187r.

815 BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 65r (9 Dec. 1640).

816 Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 9: Noy 'had twice read over the said booke very seriously'. 'Prynne's assertion that Noy read the book twice strains credulity': Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 613, n. 64. Cf. BL, Add. MS 21935, fo. 45v: 'Master Noy himselfe … upon the first reading of it commended it, [and] thanked him for it.'

817 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 126r: 'Then they say that hee gave Mr Attorney one of the books when it came out, the more impudent fellow hee!'

818 Prynne, *New Discovery*, pp. 7–11.

their robust arguments within denunciatory statements,[819] although Laud himself overtly praised 'the defence of playes' in the universities.[820]

Of course, Laud claimed not to have taken a leading role in the 1634 Star Chamber case, but this was testimony at his trial and should be treated as *ex post facto*.[821] 'Wee all agreed', said the Committee for Prynne in 1640, 'that the now Archb[isho]pp of Canterburie had a hand in this prosecution … as deepelie as Dr He[y]lin.'[822] In spite of his counsel's attempts to prove otherwise,[823] Prynne was deemed 'a malignant man to the State and governm[en]t'[824] whose published work was considered 'most idle, conteyninge in itt most impertinent assertions'.[825] Justice Heath was astonished at its length: 'lybells are for the most p[ar]t short; comminge immediately from the breast, But this is soe long'.[826] Laud and Neile believed that it was impossible for anyone to digest so many authors[827] – although 'amongst many … he quotes himselfe'[828] – in such a short space of time; Laud thus believed, '<u>That my Histriomastix was compiled by Combinac[i]on</u>',[829] but Prynne was determined to prove that he was the sole author of the work.[830] John Herne's invitation 'to look upon him, as not writing these things out of perverseness of spirit, but out of the abundance of his heart transported with zeal

---

[819] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 8r: 'I doe not defend him'. These are the words of Holborne.
[820] Ibid., fo. 14r.
[821] Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 107: 'whatsoever was done there by common consent, was their act, not mine.' Laud considered Prynne to be 'full of bitterness', attempting 'to represent me as odious as he could, to the Lords and the hearers' in 1644–5: ibid. At his trial, Laud reframed events and policies in an attempt to save his own skin. However, Kishlansky believes 'the record … is on the side of the archbishop': idem, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 626.
[822] BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 80r (15 Dec. 1640).
[823] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 48v: 'I shall therefore desire your Lordshipps to consider of him as a man forgettinge a greate duty not as a scandalous p[er]son'. Laud later replied that 'another sayd he was like an astronomer who looked upto heaven, nay he rather looked downe to hell': CUL, MS Dd.6.23, pp. 23 and 39. 'And from thence', the archbishop added, 'fetched sure blooded Doctrine': Huntington Library, MS 80, fos 49v–50r.
[824] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 8v. The bishop of London, William Juxon, called *Histrio-mastix* a 'scurrilous, virrulent and inffamous Libell' (ibid., fo. 26v), describing 'the contempt of a man blowne up w[i]th popular applause' (Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 287r) and Weston meanwhile found Prynne to be 'a Man of noe partes, patchinge papers together, every leaffe full of falsitye and blunders': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 30v.
[825] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 9v. It was considered 'the most horrid deformed monstrous booke that ever was seene': BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 60v (the words of Richardson). Prynne told Laud that stage plays were Satan's project that 'had its birth and primary concepc[i]on from the very Devill himself (who is all and onely Evill) must needs be sinfull, pernicious, unseemly, yea alltogether unlawfull unto Xtians': BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 188v.
[826] Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 8r–v: 'He hath cast out a Libell, or rather a volume of Libells, consistinge of one hundreth sheets of paper; I knew never any such Libell brought into this Court.'
[827] Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 294r: 'you had other helpe'. These are the words of Neile.
[828] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 25v. These are the words of Chief Justice Heath. Edward Atkins summarized *Histrio-mastix* by saying that it was merely 'a collection of diverse arguments, authorities, and passages against common stage–plaies': Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 203v.
[829] BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 187v: 'you [Laud] have in private suggested to his Ma[jes]ty and others, and openly affirmed in Starr-Chamber before the Hearing'.
[830] Hampshire Record Office, Henry Sherfield papers: MS 44M69/L39/88 (Prynne to Sherfield, 12 Oct. 1633): 'the Booke was compiled by myselfe alone many yeares … w[it]hout the assistance or advice of any other'. Attorney General Noy believed him, saying 'this volume of Mr Prynn[e]'s is written by himself, without the help of any man': *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 566.

against the growing evils' failed to elicit any sympathy.[831] With a 'judicial tenor [that] was intemperate', it could hardly have been any different.[832] *Histrio-mastix* was described as being 'totally fraught with Schisme and Sedic[i]on',[833] but William Lamont's depiction of Prynne clearly differs from this contemporaneous caricature: he was, indeed, a conservative figure radicalized by Laudian innovations, all of which threatened royal supremacy itself.[834]

Laud found *Histrio-mastix* to be unprecedented in its condemnation of past-times. Prynne had written that playhouses are 'the ancient Divel[']s Chappels', teaching 'atheisme, heathenisme, prophanesse, inconsistency, voluptuousnesse, idleness, yea, of all kind of wickedness both in their Actor[']s and Spectator[']s hearts'.[835] Cottington led the way to his prosecution,[836] deeming the book to be 'against the whole kingdome, against the best sort of mankind as Kings, Queenes and Princes';[837] his highest aspiration would be 'a new government, a new Church, a new King'.[838] Unfettered puritanism would lead to disorder, perhaps even to the fall of the Church and the eerie fulfilment of the famous Jacobean dictum of 'No Bishop, No King'. The remarks about Queen Henrietta Maria, 'whose vertues noe Orator is able to displaye',[839] 'noe Poet

---

[831] Ibid., iii, p. 573.
[832] Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions,* p. 219.
[833] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 9v.
[834] Lamont, *Marginal Prynne,* esp. pp. 14–21. Despite the vehemence of his language, he possessed an impulse to defend a reformed, Calvinist and strongly episcopalian *status quo* – what could be taken to represent Protestant orthodoxy against the *jure divino* pretensions of Laud. Committed to the common law and the Jacobean Church, Prynne was only gradually converted to ecclesiastical reform by apparent 'innovations' pioneered by the Laudians.
[835] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix,* sigs *3v and **2v. Plays are 'the very Divel[']s pompes and snares, by which he captivates and inthralls men[']s soules': ibid., 'To The Christian Reader', p. 10. He calls on his readers '*to forsake the devill, and all his workes: of which these Stage-Playes*, are well nigh the chiefe': ibid., p. 15. Plays are '*scandalous and offensive* to God[']s Church', being the 'unprofitable spectacles of vanity, lewdnesse, [and] lasciviciousnesse:' ibid., pp. 960 and 992. His theology was Calvinism in its most inflexible and rigid form, containing an implacable and unflinching anti–popery. Anti–popery fused with Providentialism was not homogenous or univocal, however. Imbued with apocalyptic convictions, it became a discourse heavily divisive and employed to express unease with Arminianism in the 1620s and 1630s. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 156v: 'Fiery Calvinisme, once a darling in England, is at length accounted haeresy'. These are the words from a sermon by Henry Burton.
[836] Most members agreed with Cottington's conclusions, including Justice Richardson ('in all thinges') and William Juxon: BL, Stowe MS 159, fos 62r and 64v.
[837] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 54v: 'I cannott tell whether hee assisted the devill or the devill assisted him'. Laud, however, was utterly sure that 'Mr Prinne is the devill': Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 53v. 'But that which hath been more remarkable, is, his spleen against the Church and Government of it': *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials,* iii, p. 574. These are the words of Cottington.
[838] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 55r.
[839] Ibid., fo. 66v. Such words were spoken by the Earl of Dorset, who also said that the Queen held 'prayse, [which] it is impossible for a poett to fayne': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 27r.

able to sett out',[840] were considered highly controversial[841] – especially given that they were 'harmless Recreations'[842] – despite the fact that Robert Holborne, one of Prynne's counsel,[843] could not be 'p[er]suaded that hee had … thought of the Queene'.[844] He had no 'unbeseeminge thought' of her; when he 'inveigheth against the sex of woemen … shee is not liable to theyr vices.'[845] Edward Atkins also interjected that 'he doth not say all Ladies, but certaine frizzled Ladies, are the … incendiaries of lust.'[846] Laud found little time for these exceptions – 'his intentions you say were good' – and proclaimed that 'if all the malice in the world were infused into one Eye', then Prynne would be unrivalled.[847] Dorset considered the passages as 'vile censures' upon the Queen.[848] Prynne had stated, quite unequivocally, that the queen's dancing was '*a recreation more fit for Pagans, Whores, and Drunkards, than for Christians*'.[849] Even William Lamont, a scholar more sympathetic towards Puritanism,[850] writes that 'Prynne's objections cannot remove the suspicion that he had in mind the rehearsals of the performance'.[851] The situation retained elements of the libel – elements that, if fully

---

[840] Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 131r: 'I will praise her for herselfe. One soe sweetly disposed, that the sunne setts not upon her anger, a woman made for the redemption of all imperfections, which men unjustly cast uppon that sexe.' She had been 'practicing … a pastorall penned by Mr Walter Montague, wherein her Ma[jes]ty is pleased to acte a parte': BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 336r: John Pory to Thomas Puckering, 20 Sept. 1632.
[841] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 66v: 'hee hath scandalized the Queene[']s Ma[jes]tie'. These are the words of Dorset. BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 21v: 'Hee casteth a generall Aspertion uppon the Ladyes, speakinge of longe hayre'.
[842] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 230. See also BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 464v: 'Mr Prinne … Barrister of Lincoln[']s Inne is brought into the high commission court & star chamber for publisheing a booke (a lit[t]le before the Queene[']s actinge of her play) of the unlawfulness of plaies wherein in the Table of his booke & his briefe additions thereunto, he hath these words; woemen actors notorious whores; and that St Paule prohibites woemen to speake'.
[843] Prynne was represented by Edward Atkins, Thomas Byerley, John Herne and Robert Holborne.
[844] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 49r. See also BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 193v: 'soe longe written, lycensed & printed before [*The Shepherd's Paradise* was performed]'.
[845] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 49r. Richard Neile said he could not believe that 'all women are whores, if they dance': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 132v.
[846] CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 22.
[847] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 49r.
[848] Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 289r.
[849] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 236. 'Dorset hath sufficiently defended the Queen': Laud, *Works*, vi, pp. 234–5.
[850] Lamont's *Godly Rule* advances the novel claim that Laudianism was inspired by a millenarian impulse: ibid., pp. 67–73. Lamont feels his point is proved when he documents simply a Laudian concern with imposing true faith and discipline. His chapter on Laudianism is rather small and lackadaisical, mostly discussing the overall preoccupation with discipline and its wholehearted elevation of divine right episcopacy over the divine right of kings. Only a couple of pages are devoted to the Laudian interest in eschatology, and the evidence is *not* impressive *at all*. On this evidence (or lack thereof), one can only conclude that the Laudian concept of godly discipline owed little, if absolutely nothing, to millenarian beliefs. Laudianism was remarkable for its *lack* of eschatological interest. William M. Lamont much prefers Puritanism, it seems. On anti–Puritanism as a forceful and substantial dimension of anti–Calvinism (and its crude association with 'popularity'), see P. Lake, 'Anti–Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice', in Fincham *et al.* (eds), *Religious Politics*, pp. 80–97.
[851] Lamont, 'Prynne, 1600–1669', p. 200.

realised, could only have served to confirm the archbishop's vision of the monarchy besieged by a host of Puritan polemicists.[852]

Histrio-mastix was not novel in its criticism and censures. Alexander Leighton had called the Queen '*the Daughter of Heth*',[853] an idolatress, but years later Prynne attacked the allegation made by the deceased Noy, 'formarly a friend in appearance but an invetereate enemie in truth',[854] that *Histrio-mastix* had been 'principally written' against 'the Queenes Majesties['] Pastorall': 'This book was written 4 yeares, licenced almost three, printed fully off a quarter of a yeare, and published 6 weekes before'.[855] There is evidence to suggest that 'his booke was published the next day *after* the Queene[']s Pastorall at Somersett house',[856] but the entry, '*Women-Actors*, notorious whores', was nevertheless scandalous.[857] 'If this had been of the singular number', Laud said, 'it had been plaine, but surelie hee meant it to her Ma[jes]tie'.[858]

> Canterbury & the prelates … the next day after this pastorall acted, carrying Master *Prynne*[']*s* booke to his Majesty, shewed him some of those passages … and misinformed his *Highnesse* and the *Queene*, *that* Master *Prynne had purpostly written this booke against the Queene, & her pastorall*.[859]

Prynne claimed that Henrietta Maria 'earnestly interceded to his Majesty to remit its execution',[860] but such was Laud's 'power and malice' towards him that the sentence was 'fully executed with great rigour'.[861] He admitted writing 'some passages in this booke against *Women-actors*', but argued for 'the innocency of these misconstrued and perverted passages'.[862] Prynne said it was a mere compilation 'licensed for the presse' rather than an attack.[863] Nevertheless, such appeals for justice did not stop the

---

852 Arguably the most attendant characteristic of the term 'Puritan' is its multivalent ambiguity, its protean ability to shift meanings according to impending circumstances.
853 A. Leighton, *An Appeal to Parliament; or Sion's Plea Against the Prelacie* (1629), p. 172.
854 BL, Add. MS 21935, fo. 45v. Noy's death was much lamented by Laud: 'I have lost a dear friend of him, and the Church' (Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 221). See also ibid., vii, p. 107.
855 H. Burton, *A Divine Tragedy* (Amsterdam, 1636), p. 43. Noy said that 'they say the Booke was began nyne yeares agoe; and I say in soe manie yeares it growe[s] as greate as naught': Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 16r.
856 BL, Harl. MS 1026, fo. 44v: Justinian Pagitt to James Harrington, 28 Jan. 1632–3 (my italics).
857 BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 464v: George Gresley to Thomas Puckering, 31 Jan. 1632–3: 'it is thought by some [it] wil[l] cost hym his eares, or heavely punnysht & deepelie fined.'
858 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 230v.
859 Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 8.
860 Ibid., p. 11. No independent evidence exists to substantiate this claim, but Prynne repeats it again in his correspondence with Laud, 'of the Queen[']s most gracious Intercessions to his Ma[jes]ty for his most royall Grace and pardon': BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 187r.
861 Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 11.
862 Ibid., pp. 8 and 11. 'The authorities', however, 'construed the book to be both libelous and insulting to Queen Henrietta Maria': Cressy, 'Book Burning', p. 369.
863 Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 7.

prosecution believing it was composed to draw a dislike of the Caroline government. It has been argued that Laud was 'notorious for having discerned the threat of puritan populism in a whole range of political and religious beliefs' where others struggled to find anything remotely resembling sedition,[864] but Prynne proved the daring exception to that rule: here was an individual whose radicalism was overt and uncontested.

The claim that he compared the king to Nero was groundless, however – Prynne wrote '*that Monster* Nero, *who corrupted the Roman Nation … drew them on to all kinde of vice, of luxury and lewdenesse, by these accursed Stage-playes, to the publike ruine*', but never explicitly referenced Charles I.[865] Atkins even announced before the court, 'he doth not parallel our gratious soveraigne w[it]h Nero',[866] but Prynne did write that 'a prudent *Christian Prince* [must], *abandon Playes and Players from before his eyes*' and described it as 'an ignoble shamefull thing … for any Prince or Emperour to sing, to dance, or act upon a Stage.'[867] He 'indeavoured to infuse an opinyon into the people, that itt is lawfull to laye violent hands uppon Princes'.[868] Prynne added that it became a 'just occasion' for princes to pass away if they patronised events at the theatre,[869] although much later on Prynne denied any such 'seditious inference'.[870] 'I doe and did ever detest and renounce this Doctrine of the lawfulness of Subjects laying violent hands upon the sacred Persons of Princes for any cause whatsoever', he proclaimed to

---

[864] A. Milton, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *HJ*, 41 (1998), pp. 626–7. Puritanism's radical character was not simply the result of direct engagement with Laudian clerics, but rather a legacy of the militant Presbyterian movement of the 1580s and 1590s, which, far from dying a slow and lingering death completely by the end of the Elizabethan period, had survived underground

[865] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 451. Cf. 'More than once, explicit comparison was drawn between Charles I and Nero, and not to the benefit of the Stuart king': Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 610. Justice Richardson voiced opposition to the praise of 'Neroes[']s conspiratours' as 'noble, and worthie': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 23v.

[866] CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 23. *Histrio-mastix* references Nero on several occasions, but never explicitly 'parallel[s]' him with Charles I. See, e.g., Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, pp. 510–11, 555, 562, 737, 797 and 804–5. 'What hateful comparisons he bringeth with other princes? as Nero', said Noy: *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 569.

[867] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, pp. 736 and 852. 'Prynne accused Laud of poisoning the king's mind against him. The archbishop had the king's ear and no doubt took every opportunity to discredit his opponents, but Charles would have needed little persuasion to agree to the prosecution': Roberts, 'Prynne's *Histrio-Mastix*', p. 453. Laud believed Nero 'was killed for killing his mother': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 133v.

[868] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 8v. Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 258r: 'as it is applied to the person of the kinge, and queene, it exceedes all bounds'. These are the reluctant words of Herne. See also fo. 255v: 'hee confesseth this maie bee subject to a verie ill construction, and that these words (just judgment and just occasion) some men maie conceive there bee found just occasions of the death of Princes'. These are the words of Holborne.

[869] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 556: '*Stage-delights being thus the just occasions of their untimely deathes*'.

[870] BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 192r: 'warrants noe such seditious inference as your L[ordshi]p p[re]tended'.

Laud,[871] but Weston believed he did not, comparing 'the Best of Men, to the Worst of Tyrants'.[872] Prynne only mentions Charles by name once in his thousand-page polemic:

> our owne most gracious Soverainge Lord *King* CHARLES; who together with *the whole Court of Parliament*, in the first yeare of his Highnesse Raigne, enacted this most pious Play-condemning Law.[873]

In spite of the syntax, the emphasis is firmly placed on '*the whole Court of Parliament*' – on the other six occasions the statute is referenced, Prynne neglects to mention the king.[874] Charles I did not figure very prominently in the work at all.

The twenty-two members of Star Chamber unanimously found Prynne guilty in a session that lasted 'untill 3 in the afternoone'.[875] He was deemed 'an enimy to whole manKinde, a Schismemaker, a sheepe in cloathinge but a wolfe in nature'[876] and his books were burnt while he watched from the pillory, 'his eares cutt of[f], with a paper in his hatt as a seditious person'.[877] It was deemed 'the heaviest censure that this latter age hath knowne', but did not include the nose slitting or branding of Leighton's earlier sentence.[878] Prynne's authorial methods had been denigrated;[879] his objective/s misconstrued.[880] Archbishops Laud and Neile were among the last to speak, but their

---

871 Ibid., fo. 191r. Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 125r: 'it cannot be thought hee had any such meaning against the king'. These are the words of Holborne.

872 BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 30r.

873 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, p. 715.

874 Ibid., pp. 241, 243, 495, 506n, 715 and 781n.

875 WWM, Str P 13/207: Garrard to Wentworth, 27 Feb. 1633–4.

876 Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 16r. These are the words of the Earl of Dorset. BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 67r: 'I cannot tell wheather I should censure him to bee branded like Caine w[i]th a visible marke, to have his nose slitt, or a brand on the forehead, and his eares cutt'. These are also the words of the Earl of Dorset.

877 Ibid., fos 55v–56r. Sparke, Prynne's publisher and 'an audacious fellow' (Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 11v) – 'he sold the Booke with incouragement … hee is a notable cunninge companion' and 'printed and published this Booke w[i]th a desire of game' (Huntington Library, MS 80, fos 30v and 33r–v) – was also to stand by Prynne: BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 22v. Prynne had apparently 'shewed it to manie before Sparke sawe it' (Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 2r), but Laud still called Sparke 'a greate offendor in this kinde of printing' and 'a refractorie fellowe': ibid., fos 13r and 48r. Coke believed Sparke should be 'restrayned for selling Bookes' (ibid., fo. 32r), but Heath said that he found 'noe blame in the printers, But I would have Sparkes stand on a stoole lower then the pillorye with a booke in his hand, and to give the Hangman the first booke to bee burnt': BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 60v. Sparke was 'a common publisher of theis things': Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 20v.

878 Burton, *Divine Tragedy*, p. 44.

879 BL, Stowe MS 159, fos 57v–58r: 'what a multitude of authors hee hath … I am sure hee hath not half of them in his studdie'. Prynne's work was 'extraordinarily stufft w[i]th quotac[i]ons of old Authors, w[hi]ch (they say) are his only argum[en]ts': BL, Harl. MS 1026, fo. 44v. William Prynne had argued that he had assembled them over '7 yeares', 'recollecting those play-condemning passages which I had met with in the Fathers and other Authors', but he also adds 'many Moderne Authors of all sorts' to the list of those that 'indite our popular Enterludes': Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, sig. *3 and p. 68. In his letter to Laud, Prynne presumes 'your L[ordshi]p and other great Prelat[e]s … have not perused or read neare soe many, and ther[e]fore hate or envye such as are more studious or industrious then themselves': BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 188r.

880 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 64r: 'his booke from the beginninge to the endinge is noethinge else but sedition to draw the king[']s subjects from their allegiance'. These are the words of Henry Vane.

criticisms were nevertheless full–blooded. Richard Neile proclaimed that 'if Hen. the 8th had nowe bene livinge hee would have taken a shorter course with you, and not have brought you to the Starre-Chamber'[881] – he did not wish for Prynne to attain martyrdom and join ranks with 'holie[,] Religious Saints'[882] – while Laud expressed a feeling of sorrow but still found him guilty.[883] He argued that the author of anything 'that maye have a Treasonable exposic[i]on' is guilty of sedition: 'hee that wryteth cannott tell of what disposic[i]on his Reader wilbee.'[884] Prynne, 'whoe hath opened his mouth as wide as hell',[885] endured his fate like 'an harmlesse Lambe': 'hee not so much as once opened his mouth to let fal[l] any one word of discontent.'[886] Compared to his earlier foray into printed controversy – '*How many Novices and Youngsters have beene corrupted, debauched, and led away captive by the Divel, by their owne outragious lusts*, by Panderers, Players, Bawdes, Adulteresses, Whores, and other lewd companions[?]'[887] – this act was astonishing to witness. There were no more rhetorical questions – 'What a stupendious impietie, a desperate blasphemy and prophannesse is it, for men, for Christians, to turne the most *serious Oracles of God*[']*s Sacred Word into a Play*, a Jest, a Fable, a Sport, a May-game?'[888] – only a deadly silence. The Privy Council had already ordered that every copy of *Histrio-mastix* be recalled[889] and Laud had 'all my bookes and Papers' seized in Prynne's study.[890] There are still some unresolved disputes between Prynne and Laud about the origins of this action: whether the archbishop seized his papers, however, must remain an issue of some controversy.

Laud found the time to criticise *Histrio-mastix* as an unruly container of vice, but he also dissented from the mutilation of Prynne's ears ('I woulde not have my hand in his

---

[881] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 71v. He said, 'It is treason to say the King is an hereticke, had you in your studdy of the Law taken notice of this, you would not have so much inveighed against the K[ing]': CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 38.
[882] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 46v: 'Thus much I can tell you, that your Sort was growne soe stiff, that it was fayne to be styfeled at Tyborne and Cheapside with a halter.' See further Foster, 'Neile', p. 189: 'Neile willingly agreed with the harshest judgement demanded, because like Laud, he could not stomach Prynne's vitriolic humour.'
[883] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 73r: 'I am heartily sorry for him for indeede I hould him guiltie of high Treason'. Laud also said he is 'sorrye that a Man that hath been soe paynfull and had soe good Breedinge should soe ill bestowe his Labour to such haynous endes': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 28v.
[884] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 29r: 'an unexcuseable Cryme'. These are the words of Laud.
[885] BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 63r. These are the words of Francis Windebanke.
[886] Burton, *Divine Tragedy*, p. 44.
[887] Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, sigs **2v–**3. He reserved his heaviest censure for the Inns of Court, 'the chiefest guests' of the Players who are involved in gaming ('game inordinately'), drinking ('to drinke all Healths') and prostitution ('to dally with a Mistresse, and hunt after harlots'): ibid., sig. **3v.
[888] Ibid., p. 111.
[889] *Documents*, ed. Gardiner, pp. 58–60, at p. 58.
[890] W. Prynne, *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie* (1641), sig. ¶4v: 'I could neither have the use of pen, inke, writings nor Bookes to benefit myselfe or others.' See also idem, *New Discovery*, p. 11.

blood yet I professe I have as much Right to censure him heere as any man').[891] Richardson, however, proclaimed that 'this monster [Prynne] spitts nothinge but venome.'[892] Prynne's contention that the 'frequentors of Playes are all damned'[893] went too far: 'he labours to prove that this Play-adoring age is falling into Paganisme.'[894] Secretary Coke believed that the work 'quarrells w[i]th all Mankinde';[895] Richard Neile added that 'Mr Prinne would appeare like Ajax who contending w[i]th Ul[l]yses for Archilles his armour, & having lost falls distracted & whipps every man he meets'.[896] 'There was nothing moderate about Prynne's attacks upon his self-proclaimed enemies,' Mark Kishlansky has written, 'nothing moderate about his language or means by which he made his views known.'[897] The Earl of Dorset said that 'never did any pope in his *Cathedra* thunder out Excommunications more freely then Mr Prinne hath done'.[898] He did not forgive Prynne's 'zeale' – 'the tenderness of his conscience' would not allow him to 'putt on Woemen[']s Apparell';[899] he found Prynne to be 'an Enemie to whole mankinde'.[900] 'Mr Prinne[']s Ghost may walke after he is dead,' Dorset said, 'but rather then he should want a Remembrance of his name, I would have the Sentence of this Courte sent to the Librarye of S[tar] C[hamber] and there studdied.'[901] 'It is not Mr. Attorney [Noy] that calls for judgment against you,' the earl went on to say, 'but it is all mankind, they are the parties grieved, and they call for judgment',[902] but David

---

[891] Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fos 303v–304r. 'Concurres in his Sentence w[i]th the highest, saveinge in the croppinge of his eares': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 30r.
[892] Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 10v.
[893] Ibid., fo. 7r: 'That all that doe not concurre in his opinion are Divells incarnate'. These are the words of Cottington. 'He doth not speake this as a positive truth', his counsel said, 'but by way of Dehortation entreating that noe man would frequent them': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 123v.
[894] Ibid., fo. 132r.
[895] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 24v. The Earl of Dorset echoed the point: 'he doth, lyke madd Ajax, as Mr. Secretarye Cook hath said, takeinge occasion to fall out with stage players, whippe Kinge, Queene, magistrate, ladyes, and all that falls in his waye': CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 26.
[896] Ibid., p. 37: 'you are worse than Ajax, you have not spared King[,] Queene nor Prince'. Prynne eventually retaliated in 1641, writing that Neile was 'an enemy to puritie, Puritans, and the sincere practice of pietie' and that he had 'a chiefe hand and influence in the unjust and bloudy sentences against … *Mr. Pryn*[ne] in the Star-chamber': Prynne, *Antipathie*, p. 223.
[897] Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 606. He writes that historians such as William Lamont have been unwittingly led astray by Prynne's writing: idem, 'Martyrs' Tales', *Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), p. 340. Cf. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, ii, p. 100: 'Why, it is said, should they not have allowed an old man [Archbishop Laud] who, if not innocent, was at least harmless, to descend into the grave in peace?'
[898] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 35r. *Cathedra* is Latin for chair or seat. Laud also added that he might endorse 'the sentence of Excommunication against him', but 'the church will have soe much Charity, as to afford him her prayers; more than he hath deserved at her hands': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 134v.
[899] Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 36r–v: 'He is pastor, symbole, clarke, and church himselfe'.
[900] Ibid., fo. 37v. 'Here, my lords, we may observe the great prudence of this Prince of Darkness, a soul so fraught of malice, so void of humanity, that it gorgeth out all the filth, impiety and iniquity that the discontent of this age doth contract against the church and state': *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 583.
[901] Huntington Library, MS 80, fos 38v–39r.
[902] *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 584. Noy was reported as having said, 'he might as well prove all schollers rogues: for they act, & make plaies in the Universities': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 126r. He was once

Cressy refers to the trial as 'a legal mugging, a vengeful deployment of the prerogative, … [and] retaliation for previous affronts'.[903] Such statements by Dorset should not be viewed as individual affectations; 'these utterances cannot be treated as manifestations of a personal credo, but rather should be interpreted in the context of Dorset's wider concern to preserve order'.[904] Thomas Edmondes, the Treasurer of the Household, summed up Prynne's opposition succinctly: he 'doth denounce all that bee not of his opinyon to bee Reprobates, and lymbes of the Devill'.[905] Another added that he was amazed that 'any man should bee soe audacious'; that Prynne was 'fitt onlie for the company of monsters'; that *Histrio-mastix* had 'transgressed all bounds of moderation'; and that Prynne was, in short, 'like a madd man'.[906] Attorney General Noy said, 'the booke is the accuser; the booke is the witnesse; and by the booke he is to bee judged'.[907] Prynne had violently attacked altars in a most 'vile speech', labelled Christmas as 'the Devill[']s Masse' and had shown an 'uncharitable[ness] towards all that please not his humour.'[908] In writing *Histrio-mastix*, Prynne was assisted by the devil who held 'false spectacles to his nose', but the majority of the court were still 'sorrie, that any bearinge the name of Christian shoulde soe overshoote himselfe'.[909] Cottington, nevertheless, declared that 'all good men delight in his punishment.'[910] 'His Scandall proceeds not from the mouth of some poore Rogue' but a known scholar 'that maintaines it by Authors'.[911]

After submitting over one thousand pages of exhibits and providing illiterate witnesses to authenticate his Latin texts,[912] Prynne made a final attempt to lessen the sentence,

described by George Gresley as 'very strickt in prosecuteing': BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 464v. In the course of prosecuting Prynne in the case of *Histrio-mastix*, Noy fell ill 'in miserable torture … this his disease of voyding blood was then publikely knowne': Burton, *Divine Tragedy*, p. 45.

903 D. Cressy, 'The Blindness of Charles I', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), p. 654.

904 D.L. Smith, 'Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset, and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England', in D.B. Hamilton *et al.* (eds), *Religion, Literature and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 118. He opened his speech with the line, 'Adam had a power to impose names upon all creatures: but were he now living, he could not tell how to entitle this booke': Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 130v.

905 BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 26r.

906 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fos 277v (these are the words of Justice Richardson), 290r (these are the words of the Earl of Dorset: 'soe farr from beinge a sociable man'), 283v (these are the words of John Coke) and 282r (these are the words of Francis Windebanke). The Earl of Dorset also said, 'this pigmie gnawes a Gyant': ibid., fo. 289r.

907 Ibid., fo. 209v.

908 Ibid., fo. 209r.

909 Ibid., fos 288r (these are the words of the Earl of Dorset) and 285v (these are the words of Henry Vane).

910 CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 29.

911 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 18v. These are also the words of Cottington.

912 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 614.

offering 'all humble submission' to the Privy Council and seeking 'mitigation and pardon of his fine and corporall punishment'.[913] He claimed to possess no evil purpose or design and hoped Laud would 'recant it … both to his Ma[jes]ty and others who have been seduced by it',[914] but it was to no avail.[915] Prynne had already remarked that he was 'resolved … *to endure the crosse, and despise the hate, and shame*'. He had held nothing back upon writing *Histrio-mastix*, a tract that denounced plays as 'sinfull, unseemely, pernicious, and unlawfull' and playhouses as 'the Seminaries of all vice and mischiefe'.[916] He wondered '*how many Christian soules are there swallowed up in the whirlpoole of Devillish impudency*.'[917] He emphasised *Histrio-mastix*'*s* licence in the Star Chamber, but Justice Heath replied that it barely constituted an 'excuse': 'if it were, it cannott excuse him, for an Author whoe taketh uppon him to wryte ought to bee a man judicyous to understand whatt hee wrytes'.[918] 'I see noe light … in it at all', said Laud: *Histrio-mastix* 'hath in it such scrurrillitie, such scandall' that it deserved nothing better than contempt.[919] The archbishop even had some rather pleasant words to say about acting – 'an Art of speaking, a modest confidence of Behaviour, the strengthening of the Memory in the repeating of their parts, and the enriching [of] them with a stock of Latine Verses'– but restricted himself to the 'commendation of *Academical Enterludes*'.[920] He condemned Prynne's call to action – 'in a most inffamous, dangerous, and treasonable waye layeing d[es]truction uppon the kinge' – and criticised his reading of Roman history. Prynne had made 'himselfe a judge over the kinge',[921] an unassailable position of privilege and honour which was not open to mere subjects but God alone. As befitted a criminal, Laud ensured his condemnation of Prynne was truly damning; 'his intentions you say were good. I am sure that *ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*'.[922]

---

913 *Documents*, ed. Gardiner, p. 29: 'prostrates himselfe at your Lordships' feet, professing his unfained sorrow for the said offensive passages'. His case in Star Chamber had lasted for six sessions, however.
914 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 188v.
915 CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 27: 'Mr Prinne[']s counsaile began to entreate for mercy'.
916 Prynne, *Histrio-mastix*, pp. 5, 28 and 424.
917 Ibid., p. 440. To some spectators, plays have '*even sunke their soules to Hell*': ibid., p. 958.
918 BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 22r.
919 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 48v.
920 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 265.
921 BL, Add. MS 11764, fos 28v–29r, 29r and 30r. 'Judge over the kinge' comes from the raged mouth of Weston.
922 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 49r: 'Of the abundance of the heart, his mouth speaketh.'

‘Theare is nothinge (as I conceive) more ruinous to the state then the printinge of such Bookes’, Cottington said.[923] ‘The infallibility of spirit’, the Earl of Arundel remarked, emerges from his ‘zeale’.[924] Plays were neither condemned nor endorsed,[925] but ‘soe tart, & harsh’[926] was Prynne’s style of writing that his books were to be ‘burnt in the basest manner by the hands of the hangman.’[927] ‘I thinke the whole kingdome shall suffer, if he suffer not’, Justice Heath said[928] only to be followed by Justice Richardson’s image of Prynne sowing the ‘seeds of dissention amongst the people’.[929] There was some confusion surrounding the best place to deliver justice upon him – Justice Richardson suggested St Paul’s Churchyard,[930] but Laud insisted upon it being sacred ground, ‘a consecrated place’.[931] Cheapside was chosen as the venue,[932] with Henry Vane hoping that ‘this booke will be the last in this kind’.[933] Cottington said that Prynne’s ‘Imprisonm[en]t [was] at the Kinge[’]s pleasure’,[934] not by common law, but Richardson could not resist comparing it to the infamous disaster of Charles’ father, James’ reign: ‘The gunpowder Traitors would have blowne all upp into the aire; but he casts all downwards in damnation to the pitt of hell.’[935] Some contemporaries, too, were aghast at such a ‘voluminous invective against all man[n]er of enterludes and stage playes’, a libel against huge swathes of society, including noblemen who produced shows for their own entertainment, magistrates who failed to enforce the statutes against vagrant actors, and Sabbath breakers who would rather watch a play than attend

---

923 Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 8r.
924 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 131v: ‘I would have all men take notice by his Example.’
925 Ibid., fo. 128r: ‘I doe not commend, or discommend plaies; lett them rise or fall to themselves’. These are the words of Justice Heath.
926 Ibid., fo. 124r. The Earl of Dorset said, ‘Mr Prinne your sacke of iniquity is full & you are ripe for judgment’: CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 35. Holborne also said, ‘Hee is hartelye sorrye that his style hath been soe Tarte, Bitter, and Transported’: BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 17v. He added that ‘manye Laye Men, have also written against stage playes’: ibid., fo. 17r–v.
927 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 55v. Gone was the unifying and homogenizing undertow of the great Christian verities – e.g., pacifism and patience – in the quest to keep the populace from committing scandalous, even heinous, acts.
928 CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 30. ‘What is more than to sett the people against their soveraigne?’: ibid., p. 31. Heath also said, ‘it would have been noe strayne of Lawe to have him Arraigned for highe Treason’: BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 21v. The Earl of Manchester, however, replied that ‘you have studied the Lawe, and wee see the Lawe is, That an intention of Evill towards the King is Treason’: Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 292r.
929 CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 32.
930 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 62r: ‘I would have the books burnt in Paule[’]s Church yard though it bee a sacred place, I know Pareus[’] books to bee burnt there’.
931 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 127v. ‘I praie let it bee done elsewhere’: Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 271v. ‘I cry your grace’s mercy (said my lord Cottington)’: *Cobbett’s Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 577.
932 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 127v.
933 Ibid., fo. 130r: ‘& he the last author.’
934 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 57r.
935 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 129r. ‘He is not like those Powder–Traitors, they would have blown up all at once; this throweth all down at once to hell together, and delivereth them over to Satan’: *Cobbett’s Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 578. These are also the words of Justice Richardson.

an afternoon sermon.[936] Prynne stood in Cheapside while 'his Volumes were burnt, under his Nose, w[hi]ch had almost suffocated him.'[937] He suffered without any sign of sympathy.[938] The books were 'to be burnt by the hangman', an innovation that emphasised 'the strangeness and heinousness of the matter contained in it',[939] but Noy was reported to have laughed so much and so heavily while Prynne was suffering that he was 'strooke with an issue of blood in his privy part'.[940] This 'strayed sheepe', as Atkins referred to him, might be brought back 'into the fold againe'.[941] His 'hectoring style, hyperbolic language, and Manichean mentality', however, were simply too divisive.[942] The sentence was bloody and extravagant in its sheer brutality

> the Star-Chamber is a dangerous court
>
> And wiseman say, it much more credit beares
>
> To be held simply plaine without disgrace,
>
> Then to be counted wittie without eares[943]

but the execution was delayed for two months while Lincoln's Inn cast him from the bar and the University of Oxford stripped him of his degree.[944] Heath gave 'direccion to the Universitye and Innes of Co[ur]te to degrade him'[945] while Laud added, 'with a low voice … "I am sorry that ever Oxford bred such an evil member"'.[946] He argued

---

[936] BL, Harl. MS 7000, fo. 350r: Pory to Puckering, 24 Jan. 1632–3.
[937] WWM, Str P 14/90: Garrard to Wentworth, 3 June 1634.
[938] See Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 676, 759 and Roberts, 'Prynne's *Histrio-Mastix*', p. 453: 'the intemperate tone of the diatribe may well have … alienated potential sympathisers when it condemned traditional customs and pastimes'. Cf. Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions*, p. 214: 'Prynne gained notoriety and some sympathy for his ordeal in the pillory [in 1634]'.
[939] *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 576. These are the words of Cottington. BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 193v: 'martyring my Bookes before my face'.
[940] J. Bastwick, *A Briefe Relation of Certaine Speciall, and Most Materiall Passages* (Amsterdam, 1638), p. 6. 'Mr. Noy like a joyfull Spectator laughes at his sufferings': Burton, *Divine Tragedy*, p. 44.
[941] CUL, MS Dd.6.23, p. 23.
[942] Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 618. Cf. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 12: 'Prynne stands apart from his fellow Puritans by his lack of introspective curiosity.' See also A. McRae, 'Stigmatizing Prynne: Seditious Libel, Political Satire and the Construction of Opposition', in Atherton *et al.* (eds), *1630s*, p. 172: 'their arguments and styles of writing differed wildly: at the extremes, from Prynne's tendency towards a prolix and legalistic construction of argument, to Bastwick's populism and scurrility.'
[943] N. Breton, *The Mother's Blessing* (1621), sigs C3–4.
[944] BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 193v: 'you have allready ruyned me in my Body, Profession, Liberty, Estate & Reputac[i]on, by expelling me from the University of Oxford, and Degrading me there in the most disgracefull manner'. See *CSPD, 1633–4*, p. 575 and Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 270r: 'he bee disenfranchised of the universitie, and degraded of his degree in the Schooles'.
[945] BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 22v. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 128r: 'Others have beene hanged as Traytors that have not gone soe farre in this kind. What is more than to sett people against their Soveraigne?'
[946] *Cobbett's Collection of State Trials*, iii, p. 576: 'I do adjudge him, my lords, That the Society of Lincoln's-Inn do put him out of the society; and because he had his offspring from Oxford … there to be degraded.' These are the words of Cottington. See also Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 221.

that 'soe much [had been] saide alreadie in this cause, That I shall contract what I have to speake, and leave it all to your Lordshipp[']s judgment'.[947] Laud had already defended theatres, although he 'was never a play-ha[u]nter' himself,[948] and said that 'the universities are soe farr from condemning … the use of plaies'.[949] He claimed to feel some pity for Prynne – 'I am sorrie for him' – and professed forgiveness 'if hee hath done anythinge against mee',[950] but he agreed with the imposition of the heaviest, indeed longest, sentence.[951]

On 11 June 1634, Prynne sent a letter of protest to Laud against the sentence[952] – a libel which 'scandalized the whole courte' – which the archbishop, in turn, passed onto Attorney General William Noy. A week later Noy arrived at Prynne's chamber and 'asked if it was his, hee takenige upon him to reade it tore it all to smalle peeces & cast it out of the windowe.'[953] Prynne said that this writing 'should never rise in judgment against hime'.[954] It nevertheless survives from a copy in the hand of William Dell, secretary to Laud – it states Prynne's hatred of Laud categorically, 'that I have been ever factious & seditious since I came into the world', 'that in the memory of man there never arose such a pestilent, factious, seditious Person, both in Church and State'[955] and that it was 'unbeeseming an Archb[isho]p[']s sacred lippes, who should be ashamed to be a false accuser or slanderer of any man'.[956] He perverted the truth somewhat when he said that 'my life hath been soe innocent, blameles[s], peaceable and free from faction or Sedition': he raged against Laud's '<u>despitefull malice to me and my</u>

---

947 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 296v.
948 Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 133v.
949 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 262v: 'to my knowledge they approve them'. Even if it were true, 'by the same Reason hee maye condemyne Christian Religion, for that hath been condemyned by 40 heathen philosophers': BL, Add. MS 11764, fo. 29v. These are the words of Laud.
950 Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 315r. Cf. 'Such outspoken leniency is difficult to reconcile with 'Laud's Revenge'': Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 609. 'It was not the brutality of the Caroline regime that was on display … but its mercy': idem, 'Martyrs' Tales', p. 355.
951 Prynne, *New Discovery*, p. 10. On a high–raised platform in Cheapside on Saturday, 10 May 1634, Prynne shared his corporeal punishment with Michael Sparke, who stood on a stool separated from him and with a paper in his hat declaring himself to be the publisher of such a seditious and scandalous libel.
952 Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions*, p. 222: 'The letter was a remarkable performance, vintage Prynne'. See WWM, Str P 14/102: same to same, 20 June 1634: 'He writt a very scandaleus Letter to my L[or]d of Canterbury, abusing him very much'.
953 BL, Harl. MS 4022, fo. 44v. 'This Mr Attorney told me': Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 21r.
954 *Documents*, ed. Gardiner, p. 57.
955 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 187r: 'Certainly did your L[ordshi]p knowe what a good <u>opinion the whole Kingdome hath</u> of your owne Innocency in these Particulars you object to me w[i]thout proofe or truth'.
956 Ibid., fo. 187v: 'especially in a publike Court of Justice, as a Judge, where no thing should be affirmed, but what is undoubtedly true'. 'Some saye <u>(*I made Will Lau*) is your L[ordshi]p[']s Anagram</u>, who oft tymes make your will (not Laws or Canons) the onely rule of many Actions': ibid., fo. 194v. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 719 ('Annagram: WILLIAM LAUDE WELL AM A DIVIL'), followed by Laud's own poem upon this 'weary' libel.

Profession', accusing him even of being 'more licentious and farr worse then Pagans' and 'make[ing] me guilty of sedic[i]on and disloyalty by mere implications'. 'You are noted of most men', he said, 'to be of an exceeding fiery, insolent, virulent, implacable, malicious and revengefull spirit in all your proceedings'.[957] Prynne longed for the tables to turn violently – 'who knowes how soone you may be yet a more contemptible Spectacle of misery and justice then myself'[958] – and he suspected the archbishop, 'growe[ing] more strangely violent and exorbitant every daye', might soon falter.[959] He urged Laud to 'purge out all the venome, malice, and violence of your heart against myself' or, as he proposed, it 'will certainly end in misery, ruyne, if not in hell itself.' 'Is this your L[ordshi]p[']s Arch-Charity, piety, clemencye, or Justice', Prynne sarcastically asked, 'to racke your wittes, your power, my wordes and meaning, thus to make me culpable and disloyall[?]'[960] Prynne later in the year begged the king to restore him to 'princely favour', admitting the occasional 'involuntary oversights or offences'.[961] He professed 'his own unfeigned sorrow for the offensive passages'. He had been a prisoner for over thirty weeks, confessing that he was a man subject to passion but nevertheless a fine subject. The execution of his sentence, however, did not prove 'his utter overthrow and ruin';[962] he was found only a few years later writing 'a Notoriouse libell' against Laud for patronising 'prophane playes at Oxford',[963] although Laud 'was never [a] Playhaunter' himself.[964] The archbishop, however, proved a vindictive judge, a man without patience or placidity who desired nothing less than the complete and utter silence of opponents and critics. Laud had acquired a distrust of polemic, attempting to preserve the *arcana imperii* from the prying eyes of the populace up until his imprisonment, especially from Prynne and his 'company of factious men'.[965]

William Prynne was, above all, an unrestrained polemicist – 'a master of vituperation, of unqualified condemnation and unadulterated contempt'[966] – and was to return to Star

---

957 BL, Add. MS 5994, fos 187v, 188r, 189r, 192r and 193r.
958 Ibid., fo. 194r. Laud's 'overgrowne Spleen … [had] exasperated his M[ajes]ty against me': ibid., fo. 187r.
959 Ibid., fo. 194r: 'Every man supposed that the loss of my Eares and effusion of my bloud would have quenched (at least allayed) the furye of your rage against me.'
960 Ibid., fos 195r, 195r and 192r.
961 *CSPD, 1633–4*, p. 225.
962 Ibid., pp. 477, 225 and 477. The Information charged that Prynne had attempted to move and stir up the people 'to disobedience, discontent, and sedition': Harvard, Houghton Library, MS 1359, fo. 183v. An Information was the civil law equivalent of an indictment at common law. There were technically no formal trials in Star Chamber.
963 WWM, Str P 7/5: Laud to Wentworth, 5 Dec. 1636.
964 BL, Stowe MS 159, fo. 75r: 'yett I have not forborne them'. These are the words of Laud.
965 SRO, D1287/18/2: Richard Neile, Archbishop of York, to Bridgeman, 16 Nov. 1637 (P/399/158).
966 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', p. 605. Spurred on by conscience, Prynne seldom considered consequences.

Chamber alongside Henry Burton and John Bastwick in 1637.[967] It has been deemed 'Laud's greatest mistake' to participate in that trial,[968] but the *Histrio-mastix* case has passed into history without a murmur. The punishments in 1637 were indeed large but Prynne 'never moved, nor stirred for it.'[969] Laud and his cadre of bishops were 'disgracers … Traitors, & invaders of your Ma[jes]tie[']s Prerogative';[970] Richard Neile, Matthew Wren and Richard Montague, *inter alios*,

> having long envyed & maligned your royall prerogatives, praeminences, priviledges, & jurisdictions in matters & causes Ecclesiasticall; & intending, as much as in them lies, utterly to deprive, & disinherit your Ma[jes]tie of the same, & to sett upp forreigne power & jurisdiction of their owne … & meanfully doe they usurpe your said Ecclesiasticall royalties, & prerogatives to themselves … out of disloyall affection to your Ma[jes]tie & schismaticall ambition, & seditious humo[u]r.[971]

Although Bastwick, Burton and Prynne's professions were diverse – physician, minister and lawyer – all three were committed to overt forms of criticism which transgressed the official and the orthodox. William Lamont and Stephen Foster argue that Prynne avoided any oppositional stance,[972] but his invocations of popular dissent were especially loud to Laud's ears. The court proceeded *pro confesso* in the case, finding none of the men co-operative, though Laud's assimilation of monarchy and episcopacy was critical: 'no man can *Libell* against our *Calling* (as these men doe) bee it in *Pulpit*, *print*, or otherwise, but hee *Libels* against the *King* and the *State*'.[973] The archbishop was determined this time around to silence Prynne and prove collusion between all three, arranging for extracts to be made from Burton's works in order to

[967] WWM, Str P 7/28: Laud to Wentworth, 5 Apr. 1637: 'There is a necessity that somewhat more be done. And a proceeding will be against them in the Starr Chamber … for my part I thanke God I desire noe blood.' See also BL, Add. MS 70002, fo. 138r: Earl of Conway to Robert Harley, 21 Apr. 1637: 'there will be noe warre but betwe[e]ne the Bishops and the Puritans whi~~t~~ch growes very hot by bookes written by Bastweeke and Burton'. See J. Mawdesley, 'Laudianism in the Diocese of Chester: Revisiting the Episcopate of John Bridgeman', *Transactions of the History Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 162 (2013), p. 227: 'Bridgeman was in regular contact with both Laud and Neile throughout this crisis [of 1637]'.
[968] Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 83: 'There can be little doubt'.
[969] Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 142v.
[970] Ibid., fo. 147r. All three 'malitiouslye, and falsfulie affirmed that the Archbi[sho]pp of Canterburye his Grace, the bi[sho]pp of London [and] Lord High Thre[asure]r of England [Juxon], and the bishopp of Elye [Wren,] three of the most learned, and worthie prelates of the kingedome are disgraced': BL, Add. MS 11308, fo. 100r–v. All three had published 'libellous passages against the established government and settled discipline of the Church': ibid., fo. 100v.
[971] Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 149r–v.
[972] Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, esp. pp. 13–17 and Foster, *Notes from the Caroline Underground: Alexander Leighton, the Puritan Triumvirate, and the Laudian Reaction to Nonconformity* (Hamden, Conn., 1979), esp. pp. 45–6.
[973] W. Laud, *A Speech Delivered in the Starr-Chamber* (1637), pp. 8–9.

substantiate his claim that Prynne 'had a hand in' their composition.[974] *Histrio-mastix*, it seems, proved only the appetizer – more clearly radical works issued from their three pens within a few years, to which Laud fiercely responded with great zeal and severity.[975] Such undesirable behaviour registered in Laud's mind as a subversive attack upon the *status quo*: '*not Wee onely, that is the* Bishops, *that are strucke at, but through our sides*, Your Majesty, Your Hono[u]r, Your Safety, Your Religion, *is impeached*.'[976] Few historians have defended Prynne from these charges,[977] but he resists nevertheless an easy definition of his own religious mindset.

While Laud questioned the importance of entering again the public domain in 1637 – '*but* Your Majesty *commands it, and* I obey'[978] – Viscount Scudamore, a leading lay supporter, translated the speech into French on his behalf, publishing it in Paris.[979] Instigating a counter-propaganda campaign, the rash archbishop spoke for two hours 'out of a note booke prepar[e]d for that purpose'.[980] Yet his early assault upon Prynne in 1633–4 has received much less attention and interest, owing perhaps to the fact that *Histrio-mastix* is such an unabsorbing and repetitive, though substantial, argument.[981] Although nineteenth-century Tractarians absolved Laud of some guilt and liability,[982] he cannot escape the judgement that he was, in fact, determined to bring Prynne to punishment. He found 'many things amisse in the passage of the Lycensing [of] this Booke', [983] but it was not until 1637 when the pens of Peter Heylyn, Francis White and Christopher Dow would mobilize in an effort to prevent 'rebellion and sedition, into the Church and the State.'[984] It is not surprising, therefore, to find Kevin Sharpe, one

---

974 *CSPD, 1637*, p. 48.
975 See, e.g., Tyacke and Fincham, *Altars Restored*, p. 153. What Laud particularly despised about Prynne's *Histrio-mastix* was the way in which it assumed divine authority, 'take[ing] upon him to deside all Controversies': Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 20v. Since modern plays can be abused much like the 'Xtian [Christian] Religion' itself, according to the archbishop, that proposition – i.e. to rule them 'unlawfull' – cannot possibly stand: ibid., fo. 21r.
976 Laud, *Speech*, sig. A4.
977 See, e.g., Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 4. Cf. P. Lake, 'From Revisionist to Royalist History; or, Was Charles I the First Whig Historian', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), p. 678: 'I don't even think that the people who found him guilty of seditious libel thought that he was guilty either of treason or, as Laud apparently claimed at his trial, of Arianism.'
978 Laud, *Speech*, sig. A3.
979 W. Laud, *Harangue Prononcee en la Chambre de l'Estoille* (Paris, 1637). See further I. Atherton, *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, first Viscount Scudamore* (Manchester, 1999), p. 75.
980 *Documents*, ed. Gardiner, p. 75. WWM, Str P 7/41: same to same, 28 June 1637: 'I was driven to speake long.'
981 Hallam, *Constitutional History*, i, p. 493: 'a book much more tiresome than seditious.'
982 See, e.g., W.F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (12 vols, 1860–76), xi, p. 212: 'Laud, then Archbishop of Canterbury, took no part in the proceedings, and did not, *except perhaps by his vote*, further the condemnation of Prynne' (my italics). Cf. J.R.H. Moorman, 'In Commemoration of Archbishop Laud', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 29 (1945–6), p. 119: 'he [Laud] makes no attempt to pay them back in their own coin.'
983 Huntington Library, MS 80, fo. 48r.
984 F. White, *An Examination and Confutation of a Lawlesse Pamphlet* (1637), p. 133.

of the most hyper–revisionist of historians, regarding Prynne's later trial in 1637 as the defining crisis of the Personal Rule, 'the dawn of its collapse'.[985] On his way to imprisonment in Carnarvon castle, Prynne had five portraits of himself commissioned – Laud received information from Neile that 'they [the High Commission in York] have Sentenc'd them to be burnt.'[986] However, the *Histrio-mastix* trial remains in the shadows as a sorry prelude to events of three years later. It has yet to claim attention in its own right and Laud's role has been questioned, even disputed, in recent years,[987] despite the fact that he 'almost invariably recommended the severest sentence'.[988] One must attend to 'what the likes of Laud and his clients and creatures did as well as what they said they were doing',[989] not simply their words but also their actions. Notwithstanding the uneven nature of polemic, Laud was deemed 'a blessed man, & a great freind of theirs [papists] … he is of their religion, but he dares not yett publickly professe it, for then he could be noe longer ArchB[ishop] of Cant[erbury].'[990] He was vilified as the most cunning politician of the Personal Rule, 'the Pope of Canterbury': 'if the Presses were as open to us as formerly they have beene, we would shatter his kingdome about his eares'.[991] Laud told Wentworth, however, 'these men doe but beginn w[i]th the Church that they might after have the freer accesse to the State.' He added that it was against his opinion 'that Prinn[e] and his Fellowes should be suffered to talke what they pleased while they stoode in the Pillory, and winn acclamations from the People', but Laud was 'soe exercised w[i]th … Starr Chamber Businesse' that he neither had the time nor energy to do much about it. [992] Thomas Martin, an attorney at Barnard's Inn, sent to the attorney general a borrowed copy of

---

[985] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. xix. See also ibid., pp. 953–4 for 1637 marking 'a turn of the tide.' This year was wearisome for Laud: 'I protest I was never soe tyeed out in all my life. And the Businesse in all kinds is as unpleasing as heavy' (WWM, Str P 7/80: same to same, 19 Dec. 1637).
[986] SRO, D1287/18/2: Laud to Bridgeman, 21 Nov. 1637 (P/399/159): 'And I make noe Doubt, but they meane publickly. And for my part, I think 'tis fittest, it should bee soe.' Originally Bishop Bridgeman had privately burned them before a notary public. Following on from this event, the High Commission ordered on the 12 Dec. that a much greater crowd was necessary – over a thousand attendees. Archbishop Neile had even suggested that the burning should proceed whether Bridgeman would 'bee willing to be at it or not': ibid., Neile to Bridgeman, 16 Nov. 1637 (P/399/158).
[987] Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped', esp. p. 609: 'This is an interpretation [of his leading role in the proceedings] difficult to reconcile with the surviving contemporary evidence.'
[988] Quintrell, *Charles I*, p. 80. 1637, on the other hand, remains 'a banner year for the conduct of both anti–puritan and of anti–Laudian polemic': P. Lake and I. Stephens, *Scandal and Religious Identity in Early Stuart England: A Northamptonshire Maid's Tragedy* (Woodbridge, 2015), p. 36. See also ibid., p. 375: 'the history of English Protestantism … is not best conceived as a largely changeless continuum of consensual Protestant–ness, but rather as a dialogic, even dialectical process of challenge and response'.
[989] Lake, 'From Revisionist to Royalist History', p. 680.
[990] Bodl., MS Tanner 299, fo. 156r.
[991] Bastwick, *Briefe Relation*, p. 17.
[992] WWM, Str P 7/47, 46 and 45v: Laud to Wentworth, 28 Aug. 1637.

Histrio-mastix in November 1637, once he realised that Prynne was the writer – 'uppon the readinge of two or three pages and noe more, they called to minde the author' – and after having kept it locked away for the fear of harm that it might do.[993] 'If this *Court* find not a way to *stop* these *Libeller*[']*s mouthes*', Laud proclaimed, 'for *me* they shall *rayle on* till they be *weary*.'[994] It was sweetly ironic that Laud would receive his final and devastating judgement in court at the behest of prosecutorial Prynne, but it all began with the publication of *Histrio-mastix* and an accompanying Star Chamber trial which would have sweeping repercussions. Prynne proved an indefatigably harsh opponent, as 'relater, and prompter, and all, never weary of anything, so he might do me mischief.'[995] His 'no–holds–barred partisanship' made Laud's trial, almost inevitably, a foregone conclusion,[996] but the decade of the 1630s witnessed a concerted campaign that proved instrumental in reducing him to a position of destitution and even desperation. Prynne, of course, has been correctly identified as one of 'the most uncompromising defenders of reformed orthodoxy'[997] – he would not condemn episcopacy wholesale, however, until 1641, declaring bishops then to be 'neither Divine nor Apostolicall; but rather Antichristian and Diabolical'[998] – but it suddenly became expedient, even 'necessary', for the government of the 1630s 'to retaine licentiouse spiritts w[i]thin the sober boundes of humility and feare.'[999]

On 20 August 1637, much later in the middle of the controversy surrounding Prynne's entertainment at Chester, Bishop Bridgeman informed Richard Neile that he suspected that 'purtianicall bookes' were already in circulation in the city.[1000] He also claimed that one of Prynne's entertainers, Calvin Bruen, 'a silly but very Seditious fellow', had recently bought a copy of Alexander Leighton's *Sions Plea*. Upon investigation, Neile

---

[993] Bodl., MS Bankes 63, fo. 42r.
[994] Laud, *Speech*, p. 73. '*There have of late beene divers*[e] Libells *spread against the* Prelates *of this* Church. *And they have not beene more* bitter': ibid., sig. A4. Laud believed his 'life is aymed at' (they 'have increased their violence & their Rayling in such sort as would weary Patience itselfe'): WWM, Str P 7/33v–4: Laud to Wentworth, 26 Apr. 1637. As aforementioned, 1637 was considered even at the time to be the setting for 'the civill warres amongst the Clergy whose pennes are their pikes and so they fight dayly between the Table and the Altar': Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 309: Robert Leeke to Clifton, 3 May 1637.
[995] Laud, *Works*, iv, pp. 47–8: 'it will not be the greatest honour to these proceedings, that he … should now be thought the only fit and indifferent man to be trusted with the witnesses and the evidence against me'.
[996] D. Shuger, 'The Prison Diaries of Archbishop Laud', in D. Beecher *et al.* (eds), *Taking Exception to the Law: Materializing Injustice in Early Modern English Literature* (Toronto, 2015), p. 123: Ibid., p. 122: 'a busy beaver'. See also Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, p. 219: 'His [Prynne's] egoism was nothing less than pathological in its excess'.
[997] Lake and Stephens, *Scandal and Religious Identity*, p. 72.
[998] Prynne, *Antipathie*, p. 308.
[999] NAL, V&A Museum, Forster MS 48 G 23, Item 4, fo. 2r: Wentworth to Earl of Carlisle, 24 Sept. 1632.
[1000] SRO, D1287/18/2 (P/399/5B): Bridgeman to Neile, 20 August 1637.

later informed Bridgeman on 16 November 1637 that it ‘hath been made manifest to us by their owne confessions, that they had seene some of the seditious libells, and that they did know how Prin had been punished, & sensured by the State for them.’[1001] There is a neat circularity, therefore, linking lay and clerical puritanism, when Bishop Bridgeman, for example, complained to Archbishop Neile in November 1637 that a lawyer named Bostock, who he suspected of involvement in Prynne’s entertainment in Chester, has been ‘a great expounder of Scripture in private familyes & a follower of seditious Ministers at (exercises), as they call them.’[1002] One time Daniel Featley, a leading Calvinist disputant of the previous decade, claimed that he ‘couragious[ly]’ ‘lookt the *Lyon* [the archbishop of Canterbury] in the very face’ — a reference to an encounter with Laud himself — ‘nay when he ror’d, he trembled not’. Further, he claimed that ‘when all turn’d *Altars*, [he] was *not moveable*’.[1003]

Whether one would label Prynne licentious or not is beyond the purview of this thesis – Kishlansky and Sharpe, on the other hand, are not so reserved in their shared verdict – but the fact remains that the animosity between the archbishop and himself was profound. In his *Histrio-mastix* trial, Prynne effectively managed his first taste of degradation, though his later foray into national controversy in 1637 would maximize the publicity even further.[1004] Laud’s activities in the Star Chamber admittedly still ‘need far closer investigation than has been conducted in the past’, but this does not mean that the archbishop ‘played the discreet and cautious go-between’ compared to ‘the more adversarial line advocated by Neile’ in this episode as well as others.[1005] Kishlansky’s reliance upon ‘a well–nigh verbatim transcription of the proceedings’[1006] as well as John Rushworth’s omission of Laud’s speech has the unintended effect of subverting the religious grounds of his condemnation. Laud appears as little else other than ‘a merciless hypocrite’[1007] who used his seat at the court as ‘his pulpit’ from which

[1001] SRO, D1287/9/8 (A/93): Neile to Bridgeman, 16 Nov. 1637.
[1002] SRO, D1287/18/2 (P/399/6B): Brideman to Neile, 10 Nov. 1637.
[1003] D. Featley, *The Gentle Lash, or, The Vindication of Dr. Featley, a Knowne Champion of the Protestant Religion* (1644), sig. A3v.
[1004] WWM, Str P 17/137: Garrard to Wentworth, 24 July 1637: ‘The Place was full of People [at the punishment], who cryed and houled terribly’. For the case against William Gouge and Richard Sibbes, members of the London Feoffees for Impropriations, see London Metropolitan Archives, DL/C/343, fo. 102r: 5 Feb. 1630–1.
[1005] Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 81, 109 and 109.
[1006] Roberts, ‘Prynne’s *Histrio-Mastix*’, p. 449.
[1007] Ibid., p. 451.

to ominously demand justice, whatever that may be.[1008] For some reason not yet fully explored, still less explained, Prynne emerges as a truly orthodox Protestant, 'the most published author of the seventeenth century'.[1009] At a time when the future of Protestant ascendancy seemed desperately insecure, his contentious and insubordinate expression of deeply held convictions undoubtedly held political reverberations. There was, indeed, no more telling a symbol of early Stuart absolutism than the power to imprison without cause shown. Contrary to Mark Kishlansky's styling of William Prynne as a radical Puritan, who painted a victimised account of his own trial in 1633–4, Prynne emerges in this trial as a figure (not too dissimilar to Daniel Featley) who was determined to foster an Elizabethan or even a Whitgiftian vision of the English Church, one that was neither radical nor excessively Puritanical. If the elusive and intangible term 'Puritan' is to retain any substantial meaning at all – a term of perception and vicious stigmatization, not of inherent quality and identity[1010] – then it must be strictly avoided in the pursuit of a phenomenon that we have recently learnt was close to the centre of English Protestantism, less a disruptive force and a tangible oppositional element in society.[1011] Even Kevin Sharpe, who has argued that there was absolutely ***nothing*** revolutionary about Laud's policies, deems the later trial of 1637 'a governmental act of folly'– that is, a major turning point in early Stuart history which unleashed political and religious opposition to the Crown.[1012] Prynne advocated his unimpeachably pro–Calvinist convictions with the absolute and glum ferocity of a strict

[1008] C. John Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (New York, 1992), p. 102.

[1009] W.K. George, 'Lame Jack his Haultings: J.H. Hexter, the "middle group" and William Prynne', *Historical Research*, 89 (2016), p. 295: 'it would be unwise, whatever his eccentricities, to assume that he is not representative of a significant section of the nation.' Cf. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 3: 'Prynne posed as a truly orthodox Anglican.'

[1010] The historiographical consensus seems to now position Puritanism as a positive and dynamic brand of Christian evangelism. It remains particularly difficult, though, to write the internal history of so transient, inconsistent and recurrent a phenomenon as English Puritanism.

[1011] G.R. Elton, *The Parliament of England, 1559–1581* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 199: 'turned out to be less a movement than a confusion.' See also p. 216: 'there was no concerted puritan programme moved in Parliament by a coherent party'. See Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 11–16, for an attempt to characterise the shifting positions of this phenomenon. Far from pushing ever closer to conflict with the established authorities, it indeed appeared as a political force of order, a crucial bulwark of the post–Elizabethan Protestant state. Lake's understanding of Puritanism is perhaps the best understanding for this thesis chapter, in that 'Puritanism' consisted of margins of behaviour that could otherwise be found within broader Protestant culture. Puritanism, therefore, is more appropriately defined in terms of such zealous Protestantism as Prynne's, recognisable rather than by simply box–ticking nonconformists who refused to wear the surplice or sign the cross at baptism (though the historian, including myself, often has to turn to such an exercise in the absence of other evidence for judging the strength of Protestant zeal). It was a phenomenon very close to the centre of the English Protestant settlement, suggesting 'the godly' were less a disruptive force than previous accounts once maintained.

[1012] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 757. Sharpe further believes that 'the radical potential of puritanism' has been 'wrongly downplayed in recent years': ibid., p. 694.

pedant. If Ann Hughes is correct when she says that 'comprehending past societies means taking their polemical classifications seriously',[1013] then we must look again at the *Histrio–mastix* trial in 1633–4 as *the* moment when the Calvinists, with all of their many doctrinaire views on predestination, sought the opportunity to account themselves as *not* heretical, that is, *not* outside the pale of contemporary public opinion.[1014] Detailed analysis of the 1633–4 Star Chamber trial reveals a radicalism far beyond that which William Lamont attributes. The futility of Puritan efforts to restructure the Church of England had become very apparent: 'that it was fitter to bee called *Anthropomastix*; then *Historiomastix*, the Scourge of mankinde rather then the Players Scourge'.[1015] With the full and unvarnished facts before us one concludes that a staunch predestinarian such as Prynne faced an unbelievably rigorous attack upon 'his immense, unignorable encylopaedia of complaint.'[1016] Laud had disinterred the great corpse of Puritanism and brought it back to life with electric shock–treatment in 1633–4 and then next in 1637. He 'would neither brook opposition nor shrink from a challenge.'[1017] Laudianism, in its pursuit of a united national church, sought to critically undermine the godly's – in this case, Prynne's – idealistic self–perception of there being a small minority of true believers within an imperfect national church.

[1013] A. Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2004), p. 11. See, however, eadem, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire 1620–166*0 (Cambridge, 1987), p. 99: 'It remains impossible to make definitive pronouncements about the nature of political life during the 1630s or to answer questions concerning provincial attitudes to Charles I's government during that enigmatic decade.'

[1014] SRO, D1287/18/2: Laud to Bridgeman, 24 Feb. 1638–9 (P/399/182): 'The seditious Pamphlets, you mention, are spre[a]d every where'. See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 13: 'I doubt he [Prynne] had his hand in all these pamphletts abroad' and LPL, MS 2686, fo. 37r: Laud to William Boswell, 8 Feb. 1638–9: 'fierce Faction at Amsterdam … extremely full of very base fals[e]hood … chiefe Venome be att mee.' Laud did annotate some literary pieces. At his trial in 1643–4, Laud admitted that he had personally 'altered' some works. He confessed, however, that certain pieces were passed to him having already been annotated ('w[i]th alterac[i]on') by the king for the press: Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 53. Cf. Lamont, *Godly Rule*, p. 65: 'the whole concept of Predestination has been overworked.'

[1015] Bodl., MS Douce 173, fo. 14r–v: 'Secretary Cooke observed well'. These are the words of the Earl of Dorset. Prynne's mind would be better characterized as dogmatic or restricted rather than 'infertile', *pace* Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, p. 369. The fulminations of Prynne, incidental to a modern reader, were powerful because of their due excess, their dramatic distortions and, of course, their inflamed passions.

[1016] P.W. Thomas, 'Two Cultures? Court and Country under Charles I', in Russell (ed.), *Origins*, p. 179: 'It was into this dream world that William Prynne, defying censorship, came crashing'. Kevin Sharpe attempts to rescue the 'court versus country' aesthetic from oppositional politics, a thesis strongly associated with Thomas' work: idem, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 11–22.

[1017] Kishlansky, *Monarchy Transformed*, p. 129.

Conclusion: 'Both Papist shunne, & Puritan'[1018]

This thesis has given tremendous thought and weight towards Laud's detailed and extensive correspondence, particularly those letters contained within the Strafford Papers. The dual working partnership maintained through various endnotes between Archbishop Laud and Lord Deputy Wentworth was cemented and crystallised by the idea of *Thorough* in both of their minds. Laud's co–harassment of the earl of Cork sheds new light on a grubby tale of money–laundering and his priorities as an ecclesiastical reformer. The third chapter discusses at some length the development of Wentworth (in the company of the much–criticized prelate) and Weston during the formative years of the 1630s until the latter's death in 1635. *Lady Mora*, the agent of delay, clouded much – if not all – of Laud's judgements. Overt discussions are frequently made in disapproving terms of both of their Hispanic and Roman Catholic leanings. Another gentleman of similar, if not directly identical, affections was Michael Sparke who had been joined in the pillory in 1634 by William Prynne, formerly of Oxford University and Lincoln's Inn, but not degraded and expelled from both. This chapters assumes, and reaffirms, the historiographical importance of older literature, while rebutting later claims to the contrary as pioneered by Mark Kishlansky, that Laud consciously distanced himself and others from confessional conflicts on the continent.

The 1630s was a period which began a year earlier when the character of the government was laid bare only to be further strengthened in 1632 with the decision against involving the kingdoms in a Protestant alliance on the continent which saw an increasing resort to exclusive government, conspiracy theories and dissent at home. It has not been my purpose to paint a full–length portrait of pre–Caroline society, though it would be idle to speculate how James I might have dealt with the politico–religious difficulties which beset his son. The first few years were thus ones of transition, dependent, as indeed most things were, on the power struggle at court between a Calvinist war party (led by such members as earl of Holland and the earl of Pembroke) and a pro–Spanish, anti–parliamentary clique led by Laud.

[1018] BL, Harl. MS 4931, fo. 39v. On the occasion of the Short Parliament, n.d. Apr. 1640. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 269: 'Betwixt them both [Papists and Calvinists], the Church of *England* was so lost'.

There are clearly advantages to be reaped from further investigation into an area so often abandoned to the clerical elite. It has not always been sufficiently noted that Laud did see the overall importance of Parliaments. One cannot offer the results of any prolonged research or mature reflection, but Charles I did conversely expect quite *a lot* – to follow his own wishes and steamroll particular lines of counsel.[1019]

It has become a critical commonplace to assert that Laud's works are *terra incognita*. What less provocative historians might consider benign neglect, Kevin Sharpe finds pregnant with conspiracy. In his revisionist leviathan, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, we encounter an emollient administrator unjustly howled down by William Prynne. Virtually every detail of Sharpe's portrait is intended to counter images of a vindictive and censorious archbishop – images that built on, deepened and developed those caricatures found in satirical pamphlets designed to ridicule his fears and to anathematise his doctrines. Here Laud is 'the executor rather than deviser of royal policy', an ingenuous bureaucrat whose own writings and sermons eschewed matters of controversy. Central to this account is a view of 'theological wrangles' as a mere breakdown in communication, as another case of false alarm or mistaken identity.[1020]

Since Laud was seldom desirous of having his principles on record for posterity, the modern scholar may be forgiven for mistaking the archbishop for a mild–mannered administrator, an introvert who sought the corridor's shadows rather than the pulpit's stage. But Laud was no stranger to controversy; as tends to be forgotten, he was a fierce intellectual.

The claim that Laud was 'the greatest calamity ever visited upon the English Church'[1021] has recently been vigorously denied and the archbishop has, like so many

---

[1019] L.J. Reeve, 'Sir Robert Heath's Advice for Charles I in 1629', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 59 (1986), pp. 220–1.
[1020] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 292–301.
[1021] Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 90. Collinson held Archbishop Laud guilty of eroding away the Grindalian tradition that he revered so much. See also Stieg, *Laud's Laboratory*, p. 314: 'Laud's policies destroyed the Church of England as he had known it.' However, Collinson once expressed some doubts about Laud before Tyacke's Arminian thesis appeared in print: 'It is not the historian's place to condemn the ends pursued by ... Laud, but he may feel bound to declare them unattainable' (idem, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* [1983], p. 188). The secularist hermeneutic disappeared in the scholarship of the period with the researches of Tyacke and Morrill. Whereas Puritanism was the subject of intense and detailed study (see, e.g., C. Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* [1958]), Laudianism was overlooked by the vast majority of academic historians. Morrill proved the mobilising power of religious conviction.

royalists,[1022] been stripped of the convenient labels with which he was once associated. Indeed, it is now being said that he was not an anti–Calvinist at all.[1023] Complicit in this rehabilitation has been the work of historians as diverse as Kevin Sharpe and Johann Sommerville who, unsatisfied with the insufficiently nuanced emphasis on doctrinal divisions, have sought to downplay or even deny the importance of religion *qua* religion to the conflicts between and within each of the Stuart kingdoms.[1024] Their accounts of the crisis of 1637–42 have offered a view of Laudianism which bears only a scant relation to that proposed by Nicholas Tyacke, writing almost fifty years ago, in the Ur–text of revisionism, *The Origins of the English Civil War*. That generation which dwelt heavily on the innovatory ritualism and rampant clericalism of the 1630s[1025] has gradually given way to an acute recognition that Laud's theology was an outgrowth of the existing 'conformist' position, characterised by the exploitation of ambiguities in the Jacobean consensus rather than 'the importation of totally new doctrines'.[1026] Indeed, Archbishop Laud has been extolled by some as a divine miracle of piety and beneficence, of learning and wisdom, while stigmatised by others, not least Prynne, as an exemplification of everything that is inhuman in tyranny and despicable in superstition.[1027] He, indeed, was '*agent provocateur* to England's fracturing politics',[1028] whose energy was insatiable and for whom no detail was too

---

1022 See, e.g., McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, esp. chs 1, 3, 4 and 6.

1023 This avowedly 'surprising conclusion' has been reached by Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 86. Claims such as these echo Edward Dering's condemnation not of the purpose of Laud's reforms so much as the manner in which he pursued them: idem, *Collection of Speeches*, pp. 4–5. See R. Ashton, *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution, 1603–1649* (1978), p. 110: 'Laud was more than any other person responsible for irrevocably closing the door on reconciliation with the moderate Puritans'. This still prevailing attitude is best exemplified by Nicholas Tyacke, who, in an article of 1973 ('Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter–Revolution'), argued that the 'Calvinist consensus' in religion was eroded away in the mid–to–late 1620s. See also P. Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (1987), pp. 74 and 33: Laud's 'rabid anti–Calvinist and anti–puritan paranoia' and 'Calvinists … were the dominant force in the Jacobean church'.

1024 Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, ch. 6 and Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots*, pp. 205–14, esp. pp. 212–13.

1025 By resting his principles on legality Laud handed down no mere body of traditional belief but a complete system of ritual and discipline.

1026 Central here is Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, but the quotation is lifted from idem, 'The Church of England, Rome and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus', in Fincham (ed.), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 210.

1027 It would be naïve, however, to conclude that merely because Archbishop Laud had a personal stake in the protection of the church's property rights, his avowals of Protestant principle were merely a dubious front. On the contrary, it was completely natural that as a highly successful cleric self–interest and Protestant principle should have become inextricably linked for Laud. It is perhaps ironic that a man like Laud, whose commitment to the Royal Supremacy was so heightened, should have spent so much time as well as energy fending off the assaults of lay society upon the patrimony of the church.

1028 L.A. Ferrell, 'Preaching and English Parliaments in the 1620s', *Parliamentary History*, 34 (2015), p. 143. See, however, Trevor–Roper, 'Crisis of the Seventeenth Century', p. 68: 'if we are to seek an explanation of the general European crisis of the 1640s, we must not confine ourselves to the preceding decade, ascribing all the responsibility (though we must undoubtedly ascribe some) to Archbishop Laud in England'.

insignificant. A collection of tracts likened almost all of the episcopate to frightening beasts of prey. Laud's enemies called him 'an Arch–Tyrant'.[1029]

Valuable and invigorating as these new perspectives are, more remains to be explored about the character and significance of Laud's anti–Puritanism. Certainly we should welcome the move away from the Gardinerian view of Laud as 'clearly frightened', 'paranoid' and even 'self–possessed',[1030] but the effect of all this has been to refocus the explanatory spotlight, more sharply than ever before, on the hotter sort of Protestants,[1031] as a means to challenge again the consensual and conservative picture of early Stuart politics. Of course, one can no longer deny the radical import of Puritanism[1032] – a point that emerges provocatively from Kishlansky's latest research on William Prynne,[1033] immersing and immuring himself in contemporary terms so as to become a *de facto* apologist for the Caroline regime – but a more nuanced picture needs to be developed, in which there are several important figures and forces at work.[1034] Laud was, indeed, compelled by the impending pressure of the Puritan argument to come to terms with both Calvin's theological legacy and the Genevan experiment in government.[1035] Of course Laud's religious uniformity did reflect his own theological position. He was always vigorously opposed to religious radicalism. He faced his greatest challenge when confronted by the prospect of having to establish

---

1029 CUL, MS Mm. I. 45, p. 30.

1030 Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 177; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policies', p. 45; and T. Cogswell, 'Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture', in S.D. Amussen *et al.* (eds), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe: Essays Presented to David Underdown* (Manchester, 1995). p. 277. See also Carlton, *Laud*, pp. 112 ('paranoia got worse') and 56: 'a man worried to the point of neurosis.'

1031 See, e.g., N. Tyacke, 'The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642', *HJ*, 53 (2010), pp. 527–50 and M. Winship, 'Freeborn (Puritan) Englishmen and Slavish Subjection: Popish Tyranny and Puritan Constitutionalism, c.1570–1606', *EHR*, 124 (2009), pp. 1050–74.

1032 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 214: 'The political power of puritanism lay unquestionably in the support it received from within the governing classes'. Building upon Collinson's work, Peter Lake has carefully developed the idea of 'moderate Puritans' – that is, those who may have wished to have seen the Church purged of crypto–Catholic ceremonies and who also found themselves attending supplementary meetings and sermons in separate churches as well as the required services in their own parish, but who nonetheless remained fundamentally committed to the Church of England. See idem, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*.

1033 Kishlansky, 'Whipper Whipped'.

1034 Cf. Carlton, *Laud*, p. 229: 'He had been promoted far beyond his capabilities.'

1035 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 52: during both the late Elizabethan and Jacobean eras, 'the Books of *Calvin* [were] made the Rule by which all men were to square their Writings'. As redefined by Laudians and/or 'avant–garde' conformists, the boundaries of Puritanism were extended to encompass rather large numbers of moderate individuals whose religious views had hitherto been considered conventionally orthodox. What John S. Coolidge has identified as a distinctively Puritan 'process of edification' (ch. 2 of idem, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* [Oxford, 1970]), where true religion would be built solely around a great fear of popery as a principle of impurity, mere contact with which could threaten the entire status of the English Church as a true church. There was a clearly deepening influence of Paul on English separatism and congregationalism, but conformist defenders did not understand the notion of edification in the strict Pauline sense: ibid., ch. 3.

order and unity across the cultural limits of Charles I's imperfectly glued triple monarchy[1036] – Scotland and Ireland as well as England.[1037] However, 'Laud was [more than] willing to trample on those who got in the way.'[1038]

The difficulty of analysis is of Laud's own making. Throughout the course of history, few men have left behind such large deposits of correspondence and official state papers that reveal so little about private life and inner convictions.[1039] Historians have had little to say about Laud until very recently, leaving the hagiographers to fill the gap with accounts of Laud's domestic virtues and private pieties. His roles as preacher, patron and administrator have not been studied in any significant depth.[1040] Everywhere one looks, whether in the primary sources or academic texts, conflicting images and opinions abound when it comes to Laud(ianism). This dissertation has mostly dealt with his courtly relationships,[1041] but more work needs to be done on his formative time at St John's College, Oxford, 'somewhere of which a hardline papist could entertain a favourable impression',[1042] and his gradual rise to ecclesiastical power at Durham

---

[1036] St John's College, Cambridge, MS L.12, p. 16 (Laud's annotated order for Charles I's coronation, n.d. Feb. 1625–6). Before the parliament of 1626, when organising the coronation, Laud found much wrong with Abbot's conduct. He noted that in doing the investiture, the archbishop failed to turn in the right direction, beginning 'att the north, soe to the south, the East & West' when 'He should have gone East, South, West, & Northe': ibid., p. 35. Laud also took issue with Abbot's decision to swear homage on behalf of all the bishops rather than allowing them to swear 'severally' as the majority of the temporal peers did. See also S.M. Holland, 'Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of 'Puritanism'', *HJ*, 37 (1994), p. 29: 'Abbot deeply disapproved of Laud's new policy which left no room for the toleration of even very moderate and occasional nonconformity.' See also P. Clark, 'Thomas Scott and the Growth of Opposition to the Early Stuart Regime', *HJ*, 21 (1978), p. 9: 'Archbishop Abbot was sympathetic to the puritan cause'. See also TNA, SP 16/20, fo. 20v: John Bradshaw recounted the coronation in which Laud, 'hallowing the Crowne setteth it on the King[']s head with a Speciall prayer ... Then his Ma[jes]tie thus Anonynted[,] Invested and Crowned riseth from the Chaire', in the Great Hall of Westminster Palace, as king.
Anonynted[,] Invested and Crowned riseth from the Chaire', in the Great Hall of Westminster Palace, as king.
[1037] Russell, *Causes*, p. 208: Russell claims that Charles' inability 'to read the political map' prevented him from reaping the political dividend from peace and prosperity of the 1630s. J. Morrill, 'Ecclesiastical Imperialism', p. 218, meanwhile, sees it as 'increasingly sloppy' when Laud's determining each church's individual autonomy. Charles I could not 'so long abode in Scotland' because of 'the many & weighty affa[i]rres of the Kingdome of England': Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle, Sy: Y.I.47 (15 Mar. 1640–1). See also CUL, MS Mm. I. 45, p. 107: the North Riding 'insolent Puritan', Henry Darley, allegedly uttered in 1640 'foule words ... in favour of the Scotts.'
[1038] Kishlansky, *Monarchy Transformed*, p. 129.
[1039] Hill, *Economic Problems*, p. 343: 'Protestantism, patriotism, parliamentarianism, and property all worked together against Laud's attempt to reverse history'.
[1040] See, however, my 'The Sermons of William Laud: A Critical Reappraisal' (Univ. of Oxford B.A. thesis, 2014). The Library of Anglo–Catholic Theology calls his sermons unexciting, though, believing his thinking to have been devoid of any substantial doctrinal import.
[1041] Dering, *Collection of Speeches*, p. 5: 'the roughnesse of his [Laud's] uncourtly nature sent most men discontented from him' but he could make positive amends 'when they least looked for it.'
[1042] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 78. St John's College, Oxford was 'where I was bred up': Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 253. It was here where Laud was able to develop his love of ritual, reverence of forms, meticulous attention to detail and determination to stand upon the letter of the law. He never completely lost those virtues – and the many vices – that his experience at Oxford had embedded in him so deeply. From its foundation, the college possessed many writings of the Greek Fathers: J.F. Fuggles, 'A History of the Library of S. John's College, Oxford: From the Foundation of the College to 1660' (Univ. of Oxford M.Litt. thesis, 1975), pp. 16–17. Cf. Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 35: 'we cannot say what he was doing [at St John's, Oxford], but can be fairly sure that it was nothing either interesting or amiable.'

House.[1043] If Laud is still 'that much misunderstood figure',[1044] someone who subjugated principle to preferment, then the sheer length of time he spent at St John's – over thirty years – should offer a rough guide as to how he became 'a theologian of some significance'.[1045] His appointment in 1630 to the Chancellorship of Oxford, an institution 'extremely sunk from all discipline, and fallen into all licentiousness',[1046] kept that association alive, but how far this 'close–knit' community shaped (and was, in turn, shaped by) Laud is virtually unknown,[1047] despite the promise of an answer to that incredulous question posed by Christopher Haigh: 'Where, in the integrated and stable Jacobean Church, can Laud have come from?'[1048]

In light of these considerations, the claim that Laudianism was a theology 'thrashed out in a sequence of publications' looks decidedly questionable.[1049] Its doctrinal beliefs were reinforced by (and resolved into) a set of gestures and habits, these being, in

---

See also LPL, MS 943, p. 59, for Richard Neile's role ('Lichfield', 1610–14) in approaching James I to secure the position of President of St John's, Oxford for Laud in 1611. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 223: 'He [Laud] had received his breeding and first Preferments in St. *John*l']s Colledge'. His experience/s at Oxford ensured that Laud was no stranger to theological quarrels.

1043 Raymer, 'Durham House', p. 8: 'Durham House incorporated individuals who shared in varying and growing degrees in the theological reaction to later Calvinism'.

1044 Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 333. So far from being an unmitigated disaster, 'his efforts to preserve the church' merely 'exposed differences and dissensions that were of long duration': ibid., p. 292. See also ibid., p. 334: 'Laud's position has been misunderstood'. Richard Ollard proclaims Sharpe's portrait of Laud to be 'outstanding' (idem, 'Tyrant With a Limited Thirst for Power', *The Independent*, 12 Dec. 1992, p. 29), but Milton claims that 'this is the very area in which his revisionism seems least persuasive': idem, 'The Personal Rule of Charles I', *History Today*, 44 (Feb., 1994), p. 58. See also Durston, *Charles I*, p. 35: 'It is, however, in his treatment of the religious developments of the personal rule that [Kevin] Sharpe is most misleading.' Cromartie's enterprising new interpretation emphasises 'the non–Puritan mainstream' to which Laud appealed (idem, 'Laud', p. 76), but Laudianism, in fact, emerged from latent tensions and divisions in the Jacobean 'consensus' as a stage in a resurgent clericalism and cannot, therefore, be aptly mixed.

1045 Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 99. See also Warwick, *Memoirs*, p. 80: 'Laud was a man of an upright heart and a pious soul, but of too warm blood and too positive a nature towards asserting what he believed a truth to be a good courtier; and his education fitted him as little for it as his nature: which having been most in the university, and among books and scholars, where oft canvassing affairs that are agitated in that province, and prevailing in it, rather gave him wrong than right measures of a court.'

1046 Laud, *Works*, v, p. 13. See also ibid., pp. 16 ('the outward and visible face of the university, are in a manner utterly decayed') and 82: 'that divers[e] things concerning form, especially in the younger sort, are not in so good order'.

1047 Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 80. 'Even in his own College of St John's Oxford, Laud remained a divisive figure': Fincham, '*Laud: A Study in Failure?*', pp. 3–4. Following the dismissal of Williams, Laud became Visitor to all but seven colleges.

1048 C. Haigh, [Review of P. Collinson's *Religion of Protestants* and *Godly People*], *EHR*, 50 (1985), p. 842. Richard Neile Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, secured the presidency for Laud in 'a stormy and contested election' (Trevor–Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, p. 57), beating John Rawlinson, the Principal of St Edmund Hall and 'a strange fellowe that will not yett leave the Colledge … he doth like himself … [he is] w[it]hout modesty & honesty': LPL, MS 943, p. 59. See Bodl., MS Tanner 338, fo. 328r: the Laudians were involved in 'a foule cryme' to secure Laud's election, which could have merited 'even expulsion'. However, the king considered his election as no further corrupt than most democracies, regarding Laud as innocent due to him being 'absent and sicke': TNA, SP 14/66, fo. 27r: James I to Thomas Bilson, bishop of Winchester, 23 Sept. 1611. James I was described in glorious terms a decade later. See, e.g., Bodl., MS Add. D.111, fo. 186r: George Montaigne to the Duke of Buckingham, 29 Jan. 1621–2. Christopher Haigh rather emphasises the strength and endurance of Catholicism.

1049 J. Newman, 'Laudian Literature and the Interpretation of Caroline Churches in London', in D. Howarth (ed.), *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 171.

Laud's words, 'the Hedge that fence the Substance of Religion from all the Indignities, which Prophanenesse and Sacriledge too Commonly put upon it'.[1050] Choreographed by the Prayer Book but performed at the promptings of the priest, it was a materially compelling style of divinity designed to bring a fresh liturgical awareness to bear on the communal experience of the parish. If we see Laudianism (as Anthony Milton has done) as being 'a *process*'[1051] through which clergymen of all shades of opinion interacted at varying points, the timings of the positive interactions of their parishes with innovations, such as the railing of communion tables, could influence the ways in which they as individuals were perceived by other clergymen.

The origins of Puritanism seem fairly simple to explain – there is, for example, an established typology of conversion whereby individuals are spiritually reborn – but Laudianism (or even Arminianism) resist/s this definition.[1052] In their determination to delineate the multiple 'discourses' of the commonwealth, scholars have also paid insufficient attention to the rivalries – often temperamental as much as ideological – sparked by Laud's brazen interference with the courts during the fragile harmony of the 1630s.[1053] This dissertation has sought to offer new insight/s into the structure of adversarial politics in the pivotal but still poorly understood Personal Rule. Without this wider juridical dimension, any 'purely theological' account of Laud's career remains incomplete and necessarily flawed.[1054] Owing to such a narrow focus ('not on his actions, but his writings'),[1055] Cromartie's conclusions also threaten to unbalance

---

[1050] Quoted in Atherton, 'Viscount Scudamore's 'Laudianism'', p. 569, n. 9.
[1051] Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 183 (italics not mine).
[1052] As stated in the introduction, Anglicanism remains an anachronistic nineteenth–century term that fails to capture the staunchly Reformed character of the Church of England before the Laudian ascendancy, despite various attempts to rehabilitate its use. See, e.g., Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 277: 'it is evident that the Church of England, even an Anglican piety, was established in the affections of the nation by the end of the [sixteenth] century.' Sharpe has chosen to take at face value the highly polemical constructions of one side, i.e. the Laudians, well–organised and well–served, against which the majority of people can be presented as sensibly assenting. However, they were a political grouping far removed from the more widespread popular imagination. The term 'Laudian' – or even 'Arminian' – was not employed in Caroline times as routinely as scholars have tended to use it. In so far as it does appear in the record, it signifies a specific type of religious, even 'avant–garde', conformity.
[1053] One does not think it too problematic to both accept that Archbishop Laud and significant clerical others such as the militant figures of Matthew Wren and Richard Neile perceived a subversive threat within Puritan activities, but also that Puritanism, as an inherent form or mentality at least, received slight reinvigoration in response to the imposition of the Laudian policies during the 1630s.
[1054] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 97. Here scholars may find a solipsistic irony in the fact that Cromartie's debut monograph examined the career of Matthew Hale, since his own arguments are often as subtle, the caveats and qualifiers as many ('unlikely to be accidental', 'quite possible', 'reasonable to suppose', 'makes it likely', pp. 77, 86, 87 and 87) as those of Laud's legal counsel in 1643–4. Cautious language suggests his overall case is tenuous. As Michael Mendle has written, 'Friend and foe judged William Laud more by his deeds than his words': idem, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public's 'Privado'* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 137.
[1055] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 76.

our understanding.[1056] The claim that his writings were 'actually quite traditional' needs to be tested against the evidence of action: by what was done, not merely by what was said – or suspected – to have been done.[1057] Indeed, Cromartie's 'purely theological perspective' should be paired with an understanding of the atmosphere of mutual recrimination in which Laud hammered out his ideas.[1058]

Laud's enjoyment of the fruits of success never tipped into excess. It has been argued that Laud could 'only … place implicit faith' in Neile and Juxon, [1059] but his close and abiding relationship with Wentworth, as the first chapter has shown, reveals a far greater spirit of cooperation between these two men.[1060] Wentworth had a keen eye for arresting possibilities, such as his desire to become Lord Treasurer in 1635–6;[1061] Laud, meanwhile, assumed various administrative roles, serving on many committees.[1062] The shared ethos of *Thorough* – 'personal banter, disdain for some fellow councillors, fear that letters would fall into the wrong hands, expressions of esteem and commitment to serve the king'[1063] – made their vast streams of correspondence coherent and the scope, even audacity, of their reforms intelligible. Charles I deeply regretted sacrificing Wentworth at the altar of convenience in 1641 – 'so faithefull & able a Servant as you

---

[1056] See also A. Cromartie, 'The Testimony of the Spirit, the Decline of Calvinism, and the Origins of Restoration Rational Religion', *JEH*, 72 (2020), p. 81: Laud was 'a very careful thinker … mindful of a Calvinistic framework even when he was venturing beyond it.'
[1057] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 89. Laud's views were not as 'mainstream' at Oxford as Cromartie would like to suggest: ibid., pp. 81–6, at p. 82. As early as October 1606, Laud was involved in a 'quarrel ... about my Sermon' with Dr Ayray, the Vice Chancellor (Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 133); he was rescued not by any homegrown help at the Univ. of Oxford but 'some 2 or 3 very learned men about the Court': Bodl., MS Rawl. A.289, fo. 78r, by the Earl of Dorset. William Paddy, James I's own physician, suggested that the Chancellor could rescue Laud without causing Ayray to lose face by reserving the case to himself. Dorset wrote that he was pleased at the mild manner in which Ayray was dealing with Laud: 'some scandall', he said, 'might fall upon our Universitie', though: ibid., fo. 80r. Admitting his own 'sup[er]ficiall judgement', Chancellor Buckhurst left the entire conduct of the affair to Ayray, although he undertook to inform him that William Paddy, a colleague of Laud's at St John's College, spoke highly of him and had not heard any reasonable cause for offence in the disputed sermon: ibid., fo. 78r.
[1058] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 97.
[1059] Foster, 'Neile', p. 186.
[1060] Cf. Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', p. 119, claims that 'the emotive scene created by Wentworth and Laud's brief, final conversation on 12 May 1641 gives a false impression of their relationship', but this dismissive – and sweeping – statement on the close intimacy between the two figures ignores the important fact that Laud had remained Wentworth's primary access to the monarch throughout much of the previous decade. We still await an in-depth study of the clerical politics of the Caroline court, but Laud – and, to a lesser extent, Wentworth – will certainly play a disproportionately large role in its evolution and character. See also BL, Add. MS 14828, fo. 4v: Laud was, in fact, 'a man more dangerous [to] the king except my Lord of Strafforde.' See as well Donagan, 'A Courtier's Progress', p. 320: 'It is clearly inappropriate to call Laud or Wentworth courtiers in the conventional sense'.
[1061] However, see WWM, Str P 8/92: Wentworth to George Wentworth, 22 Mar. 1633–4: 'In any Case I would not advise you to seeme to importune my Lord Treasurour [Weston]'. Weston had already departed by this time.
[1062] Ford, '"That Bugbear Arminianism"', p. 135: 'Laud's ecclesiastical and political energy has left historians gasping behind him.' Wentworth, meanwhile, had to pursue friendships through letters and 'finde sum pathes open for my thankfullnesse to walke inn': BL, Egerton MS 2597, fo. 76v: Wentworth to Earl of Carlisle, 12 Aug. 1632.
[1063] Fincham, 'Introduction', p. xl.

have showed yourselfe to bee'[1064] – but there is scarcely any doubt that the king spared little time over the destiny of his archbishop.[1065] There have also been some rather dubious assessments of Laud's ambition and pride, alleging that he 'no doubt felt the pull of power for its own sake.'[1066] It has not, however, been the purpose of this dissertation to speculate as to whether Laud failed or succeeded in his efforts to propagate the positive aspects of his view of the church, the Christian community and true religion,[1067] but it remains the overwhelming case that his reforms were allayed and discredited by a vocal and violent minority of MPs. But Laud *was* a vigorous defender of the English faith, attempting to demonstrate the antiquity of the Church and show that it had a distinct identity from the Catholic Church, one that could be identified and, indeed, articulated. There can be no doubting the strength of Laud's allegiance to the early Stuart church.

According to a popular interpretation of the early 1990s, Laud was 'the executor rather than deviser of royal policy', [1068] often attempting to soften, if not subvert, directives on preaching, the Sabbath and the altar. He made no attempt at his trial, however, to clear up misunderstandings about the theology of grace, including critical remarks made against the Lambeth Articles in 1595 and the canons of Dort in 1619.[1069] Laud's

---

1064 WWM, Str P 40/41: Charles I to Wentworth, 23 Apr. 1641. Cf. Pogson, 'Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40', p. 47 ('he never enjoyed a warm relationship with the King') and Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 196: 'Wentworth … was a man whom Charles never liked.' See SRO, D661/20/2, p. 100: 'very resolute'. P. Zagorin, *The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution* (New York, 1970), pp. 245–6, argues that the king's behaviour in mid–1641 justified the mistrust of the parliamentary leaders such as John Pym. Whether or not Charles I was fully serious or, more importantly, whether he had the slimmest chance of success could only be seen in a rosy and retrospective hindsight. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 21v: John Pym called on the 16 Feb. 1640–1 for haste with regard to Wentworth in particular, adding 'that when this Triall is past, other Co[u]nsells for the Good of the King and Kingdom may take place.'

1065 Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, p. 107: 'What Laud may not have predicted was the speed with which Charles himself seems to have withdrawn his support from his archbishop.' However, the king did say that due to 'this last Crying Bloode being totally theirs … his [God's] hand of Justice will be h[e]avier upon them [Parliament], & lighter upon us': Parliamentary Archives, HL/PO/JO/10/1/183/13: Charles I to Henrietta Maria, 14 Jan. 1644–5. His support for the archbishop was not as 'unflinching' as scholars assume, certainly not in Laud's remaining years: cf. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 64.

1066 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 295.

1067 Cf. Fincham, '*Laud: A Study in Failure?*', p. 14: 'its [Laudianism's] persistence means that I, for one, do not regard Laud as 'a study in failure'.'

1068 Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 285. See also Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, chs 4–6. See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 38: 'Bowing was not to altars but to God almighty'.

1069 Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 246 (Lambeth Articles: 'how little they agreed with the practice of piety and obedience to all government'; the Synod of Dort 'can be of no authority in any other national Church'). Laud persistently shifted the blame onto his subordinates in the Church. See, e.g., Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 52: 'These *Instructions* [*Considerations for the Better Settling of Church Governm*ent (1629)] were [illegible] by B[isho]p Harsnet[t] … written w[i]th his owne hand'. In the aftermath of the Lambeth Articles, Archbishop Matthew Hutton can be found lamenting 'that the Court should boil at the doctrine of predestination': BL, Harl. MS 7029, fo. 51v. For the shadow cast by the Lambeth Articles, see Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 67–8. See also Orr, *Treason and the State*, pp. 114–40: Laud's attempts to excuse himself by citing/blaming others for the content of his affirmative action programme was principally to restore some of the wealth plundered from the church in the 1630s. But the history of doctrine must also be rooted in a broader grasp of the context in which it developed – the pastoral preoccupations, academic influences and factional politics of the early Stuart Church over which Laud 'undeniably presided.'[1070] One has argued elsewhere that, at least in the pulpit, Laud came to see the value of anti–popery as a means to match and stem the rhetoric of radical Puritan preachers[1071] – Laud's insinuation that the Puritans, as a dangerously nominalistic category,[1072] were impelled by revolutionary motives and the doctrines of disobedience promulgated by Calvin – but his supine neutrality towards Rome and Spain, specifically his failure to observe the standard lines of Protestant defence in the *Conference with Fisher*, still requires further explanation.[1073] The halfway houses of nominal conformity and compromise made up the conduct, if not the consciousness, of church popery.[1074] Both gestures were seized upon by Laud during the mid–late 1630s, even though he sincerely believed Rome to be materially a corrupt church.[1075] Presbyterianism, even Puritanism, was considered a more urgent and pressing threat, as a subversive variety of popularity inimical to order in the church and state;[1076] it was

---

written attacks on the institution of Parliament are a permanent (and recurring) feature of his conduct at his trial in 1644.

1070 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 62, n. 27. See Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, p. 60: Laud 'enjoyed an almost unchallenged control over religious policy'.

1071 See ch. 2 of my 'Sermons of William Laud', esp. p. 18: 'Setting out to bend this vernacular to his will, Laud developed a taste and a talent which was quite alien to his instincts.'

1072 In 1654 the antinomian Robert Towne claimed that Laud had preached 'a Sermon on *Ashwednesday* before the King', denouncing antinomianism as a clear threat to order in both the church and state and Antinomians as 'a pestilential sect': idem, *A Reassertion of Grace* (1654), p. 67.

1073 However, one disagrees with the work of Alexandra Walsham ('Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited'), that Laud and his allies were merely seeking the approval of a 'potential constituency of support', the Catholic community, initiating what may be deemed 'a kind of Counter–Reformation by stealth': ibid., p. 621. See also ibid., p. 651: 'the possibility that the Laudian Church had parochial, if not 'popish', foundations and roots.' Certainly, Laud believed semi–popish trappings might prevent waverers from defecting to Catholicism – it was 'a handy polemical weapon' (Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 79) and some Laudians believed they could win over recusants by restoring the 'beauty of holiness' – but 'church papist' is a malleable term and its promiscuity cannot hope to describe the shifting middle of opinion. Christopher Haigh offers a different, though equally flawed, model: he defines Protestant as Puritan, leaving 'conservatism' or, even more loosely, 'the people' as a unifying term under which the remaining members of the English Church – characterized, above all, by their 'ignorance, indifference or downright antipathy' to Puritan preaching – may be gathered. They are the remaining leftovers of the church, the ideological centre of gravity in the Church: idem, 'The Church of England, the Catholics and the People', in idem (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke, 1984), pp. 195–219, at p. 209. It is, nonetheless, still interesting to consider Laudianism to have emerged from the ranks of those unreconciled to the English Reformation. See idem, 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation', in idem (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 176–208, esp. pp. 207–8. See also H.R. Trevor–Roper, 'Archbishop Laud', *Friends of Lambeth Palace Library: Annual Report* (1978), p. 13: 'he [Laud] was never, except by necessity, a writer.'

1074 A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), p. 4: early modern England existed within 'a kind of confessional limbo' until, at least, the end of the sixteenth century. See as well eadem, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 71.

1075 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 148. Laud believed that she was 'true' in substance, i.e. in her outward form.

1076 Bodl., MS Eng. Hist. e. 28, p. 577: Charles I was apt to espy 'Puritan'(ism) and popularity wherever he gazed. See also J. Guy, 'Introduction: The 1590s: The Second Reign of Elizabeth I?' in idem (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I:*

an ingredient in the aggressive conformist tradition to which Laud firmly belonged.[1077] Hence Laud espied an 'opportunitye' to 'constantlye goe on in the waye that God hath open[e]d', to reorganize the kingdom without the interference of government critics.[1078] Laudianism as a cultural force and as a factor in the English Civil War is one of the staples of modern historical discourse.[1079]

Part of the difficulty in assessing such opportunities lies in the personality of Laud himself, not least in his efforts to ensure 'that the blame may not be cast upon me.'[1080] While wise historians have erred in concentrating on the doctrine of predestination to the exclusion of Laud's ecclesiological and other views,[1081] emphasis on 'political cultures' and 'the public sphere' has tied scholarship to an intractable debate over perception.[1082] Even here, however, Laud's construction of an extensive anti–Puritan network of apologists remains relatively unexamined, despite valuable studies by Milton that suggest more complex trajectories of forced compromise and naked opportunism.[1083] That this community was maintained through Laud's tightening grip over patronage, especially given Abbot's impotence at Lambeth Palace,[1084] however,

---

Court and Culture in the Last Decade (Cambridge, 1995), p. 1, where Guy identifies the origins of the obsessional threat from 'popularity' in the 1590s. All ideologies, by their very nature, are contradictory and unstable. As Patrick Collinson has pointed out, the way in which the tensions within even moderate Puritanism played themselves out was a function of any number of contingencies: idem, 'Sects and the Evolution of Puritanism', in F.J. Bremer (ed.) *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth–Century Anglo–American Faith* (Boston, 1993). The semi–public debates and disputations through which the godly tried to regulate their own affairs, policing the boundary between mainstream Puritanism and 'schism', were divisive.

[1077] See, e.g., R. Cosin, *Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation* (1592), p. 25 (radical Puritans were driven by a 'cunning counterfaiting of so much holinesse, pietie, zeale and religion') and O. Ormerod, *The Picture of a Puritane* (1605), sig. D2: Puritans used 'pretences and cloakes to shadow their contentions'.

[1078] WWM, Str P 12/184: Laud to Wentworth, 28 Dec. 1630: 'if this … be not followed[,] I will not hope to see another'. Wentworth's letters from this period – pre–1633 – appear not to have survived

[1079] Many scholars and other practitioners can be found travelling along the trails blazed after 'the cultural turn' in the historiography.

[1080] Laud, *Works*, v, p. 206. As a result, the assumptions often underlying his actions were seldom exposed in public.

[1081] See the debate between Tyacke and White in *Past and Present*. Laud was sympathetic to, if not embracive of, Arminianism. He much preferred to leave aside the deep points of divinity and rarefied elements of soteriology, believing them to be 'unmasterable in this life': Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 292. The many and varied assessments of his character and purpose are testament to this.

[1082] See, e.g., P. Lake *et al.* (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007). Once a perilously dangerous battlefield, early Stuart studies stand at something of an entrenched impasse. The questions posed by 'post–revisionists' have been answered – or, at least, sufficiently acknowledged – but have also led to the framing of new problems about publicity and subjectivity which are only beginning to be explored.

[1083] See, e.g., Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', pp. 65–68 ('The Return of Laudianism?'): the return to the limelight, after the sudden demise of the king's hopes of a French military alliance in the summer of 1643, of many of the figures who had been members of Laud's circle.

[1084] Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 104: 'Abbot … was in complete eclipse [in the last four and half years of his life].' Cf. Holland, 'Abbot', p. 309: 'Laud was the churchman who had most influence with the king'. In mid–1636, Secretary Coke lavishly praised Laud by emphasizing all of 'those preferments w[hi]ch the able men of our University dayly received by his power at the court': Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 73: Cheynell to Clifton, n.d. July 1636. See also Trevor–Roper, *Laud*, p. 41: Abbot can in no sense be considered a Puritan, as Trevor–Roper implies when he argues that he preached Puritan doctrines but altogether rejected their dangerous 'implications' and that he was sometimes deserves the sense of ambition required of the nomenclature of a movement, not simply a moment.[1085] Laud's entire programme of reform – the revival of the church courts, the renewal of sacramentalism, the reinvigoration of the divine right of bishops and the repositioning of the confessional relationship away from the foreign Reformed churches (that is, an insularity and indifference to those foreign churches) – has never been fully grasped before:[1086] his ceremonial and jurisdictional innovations may have been more divisive than his theological proclivities, but his order and vision of the church remained paramount. Christopher Hill, Kevin Sharpe, Peter White and others have argued that Laud was merely following in his Elizabethan predecessors'

---

identified with the leaders of advanced Protestant opinion in the Univ. of Oxford. See also idem, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 16: 'The villain, in his eyes [Laud's,] was Abbot; for it was Abbot who had allowed the work of Bancroft to crumble, Abbot who had pushed Andrewes and Overall aside, Abbot who had aligned the Church of England with the puritans at home and the Calvinists abroad. However, he did not despair. He was ambitious, determined and active.' See also A. Kucharski, 'Archbishop William Laud's Dreams: Their Personal and Political Significance', *Journal of Psychohistory*, 46 (2019), p. 225: '1636 has been considered the highpoint of Laud's career.' Even Abbot's biographer, P.A. Welsby, cannot ignore overly negative constructions. See, e.g., idem, *George Abbot: The Unwanted Archbishop 1562–1633* (1962): he was a 'mistake', neither possessing 'the statesmanship and capacity of Cranmer, the scholarship and wisdom of Parker, nor the administrative ability and vision of Whitgift, Bancroft, and Laud' (idem, pp. 1 and 3). By 1628, Laud had all the power he needed. It only required Abbot's death, Calvinist and virtually powerless, to take him to Canterbury: ibid., pp. 121–2. Archbishop Abbot tried to banish Laud from High Commission, but Laud appealed to Buckingham who secured his inclusion: Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 243 and Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 117.

1085 Cf., 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 183: 'a process and an experience'. The positions espoused in a propaganda effort by, *inter alios*, Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, John Overall and the courtly connections of the Durham House group *were* remarkably coherent and sound, not as 'inconsistent' or 'unstable' as Milton argues: ibid., p. 180. It was a very dynamic and sometimes unstable process. Milton conveys Laudianism *not* ideologically; it was not a systematic way of thought but 'a process', a bricolage of attitudes and glosses constructed over time by lots of individuals with differing motives and ambitions. Indeed, these arguments were adopted and pursued with varying degrees of intensity or enthusiasm by their clerical advocates, but there was a marked degree of collaboration, all singing from the same hymn sheet. One agrees with Peter Lake that it 'constitutes not a "moment," but the crescendo of a "movement."' Laudianism represented the extension of a viewpoint first espoused by late Elizabethan authors: Lake, 'From Revisionist to Royalist History', p. 665, n. 30. It was not *only* a polemical construct; it was a distinct and fully inhabited identity. The recognition of complex narratives of faith, alongside the increasingly attenuated chronological span of 'the long Reformation', show that Laudianism is no longer seen as a moment but a movement, a 'process' neither predictable nor predetermined. Milton once argued that the writings of Laudian apologists in the 1630s were also shaped by '*functional* radicalization'; once a work was in circulation, that is, 'others had to match it or beat it to gain the same applause': ibid., idem, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 177. His close focus upon the junior clergy wrong–foots his argument. Bishop Henry Leslie made claims directly in his published essays and Archbishop Laud himself in his censure of Burton, Bastwick and Prynne in 1637.

1086 An excellent job has been done by Lake, 'Laudian Style', but inevitably differences of emphasis and opinion are neglected. What is presented is a mish–mash of ideas which make up an aesthetic rather than a stable position, admittedly 'more rounded and coherent than anything to be found': ibid., pp. 162–4, at p. 162. Milton attempts to qualify this somewhat static picture, presenting a collection of polemical standpoints constructed over time by individuals with differing ambitions and objectives: idem, 'Creation of Laudianism', *passim*, esp. p. 164, n. 4. Broadly defined from court, it was given specific shape and flavour by others. Through defensive articulations in printed sermons and tracts, Peter Heylyn sought to anticipate Laud's next move. While Milton's claim that there was no overarching orthodoxy to Laudianism is questionable, there is no doubt that 'many people emerged out on the other side, transformed into more tactful forms of conformist': ibid., p. 183. Unlike their Puritan counterparts, there was no standard template for a Laudian's ideological formation.

footsteps[1087] – 'Whitgift and Bancroft on speed,'[1088] to borrow Peter Lake's description – but he was determined to establish his power by deviating from the settled course in the church established by his predecessors, overstepping his authority and abusing it. His conduct over the 1630s contributed to a growing yet distinct impression that Laud could not be trusted to govern according to the established laws of the land. The academic bloodletting between Nicholas Tyacke and Peter White, a controversy of remarkable length and vehemence, might have given way to a period of quiet amiability in ecclesiastical history but there are still many questions left unanswered. This dissertation has not explored his relationships with the early patron, the Duke of Buckingham,[1089] the intimate suffragan, John Bridgeman, the bishop of Chester, the bishop of Lincoln and 'Laud's *bête noire*', John Williams[1090] or even the reigning monarch, Charles I,[1091] but it has offered an appetizing taste of his connections, both positive and negative, with the leading members and antagonists of the court.

[1087] See, esp., C. Hill, 'From Grindal to Laud', in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill: Religion and Politics in Seventeenth–Century England* (3 vols, Brighton, 1985–6), ii, esp. p. 80; K. Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud', *History Today*, 33 (Aug., 1983), p. 28; and White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, pp. 276–7 and *passim*.

[1088] P. Lake, 'The Historiography of Puritanism', in J. Coffey *et al.* (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 359. Laudian reforms took a different shape than the Whitgiftian subscription campaigns. Nor will it quite do to deny the originality of Laudianism by finding elements of its programme deeply entrenched in conformist thought as early as the 1590s. See also Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 246–7: 'in the long run, the Whitgiftian policy, continued in their generations by Bancroft and the Laudians, was as much responsible as any puritan excess for destroying the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and its national character.'

[1089] When reading Prynne's disparaging views on his service to Buckingham, Laud wrote, 'What sin of mine was it to pray often for an Hon[oura]ble p[er]son to whom I was much bound[?]': Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 18r. See also Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 208 and TNA, SP 16/114, fo. 19r for his statement that the assassination in 1628 was 'the saddest Accident that ever befell mee & should be soe to all good Christians': Laud to Conway, 26 Aug. 1628. See also M. Parry, 'Bishop William Laud and the Parliament of 1626', *Historical Research*, 88 (2015), p. 233: 'That Buckingham trusted Laud personally is beyond doubt.' See also Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, p. 8: Laud was 'a sworn Vassall to the Duke' and 'his fee'd Advocate in sundry particulars'. Laud refuted any such notion that the monarch was in thrall to his starry–eyed favourite, since 'what doth it make us to all our people, while it proclaims that we can be led up and down by Buckingham … doth it mean to persuade our people we have lost our judgment, or have none to lose?' Laud, *Works*, vii, p. 636. Two months after Buckingham's sudden death, Laud was still referring to it in his correspondence: 'Mortuus est, cui ego, tuque multum debuimus': Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 255: Laud to G.J. Vossius, 25 Oct. 1628. As early as June 1622 Laud entered in his diary that Buckingham had 'enter[ed] upon a near respect to me', then added, 'The particulars are not for paper': Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 139.

[1090] Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 173.

[1091] Despite the work Julian Davies, no author has placed enough attention on the ecclesiastical role played by the king. White describes Charles I as 'more cleric than king' (idem, '*Via Media*', p. 230), a point modified by Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, esp. pp. 12 and 302–3, but while the king firmly believed in the supremacy of his ecclesiastical powers he was neither intimately nor closely involved in the theological minutiae of doctrinal debates. Charles congratulated him on his 'Translation' to Canterbury: LPL, MS 943, p. 225: Charles I to Laud, 8 Sept. 1633. The king when making appointments was 'very secrett & retired in discovering which way hee inclineth': BL, Add. MS 33936, fo. 15r: P. Moreton to T. Morton, 12 Mar. 1632–3. On 3rd November 1640, when the Long Parliament rose, Westminster's public climate was fierce – the king was consciously aware of this and so '[di]d not ride' through the streets of London 'but went by [w]ater': Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 238.. He did little, in at least ecclesiastical terms, without the support of the archbishop of Canterbury. See, e.g., Bodl., MS Clarendon 16, fo. 88r: Charles wrote in his own hand to his secretary with a new proclamation 'to be Printed with all speede & secrecie (my Lo[rd] of Cant[erbury] onlie excepted …)': 20 Apr. 1639. See also Sears McGee, *Godly Man*, p. 255: 'In Laud, the king had found a man fully as tenacious as they [the Puritans].' See, however, Bodl., MS Tanner 314, fo. 152v: in Sept. 1633, Charles 'commanded' Matthew Wren, then Clerk of the Closet, to inform Laud that 'his Ma[jes]tie held it fitting' to reduce

Other historians have favoured the view that Laud had no stomach for a fight, but was merely a pliant tool of the Crown. He has been characterised as mild, even a gentle, pious man, weak but well–intentioned, irresolute, a somewhat colourless personality or, more harshly, as timeserving. It cannot be denied that Laud was easy–going to the point of complaisance; but it should not be inferred from this that he was spiritlessly subservient to the government, a mere figurehead incapable of playing any effective part in the history of the period. It is true that Laud had shown himself not unprepared to be accommodating to the royal government. It is improbable that the Crown would ever have nominated him for the primacy if it had not been sure that such was his disposition.

That so much attention has focused on William Laud is understandable, for he was by far the most visible element of the Caroline government, almost to the exclusion of all of his alleged partners in crime (read: government officials). It has been said that 'only a few critics of the Church had been seriously harassed' by the late 1630s,[1092] but it would be too premature to arrive at this positive conclusion. Apart from my analysis of Prynne's *Histrio–mastix* trial *in extenso*, Laud's direct involvement in the courts has been neither subject to close nor detailed examination. Star Chamber, of course, had long been held as a forum for redress of grievances – James I was effusive in his praise of its origins, describing it in 'glorious' terms[1093] – but it was subject to a reorientation during Laud's tenure, relegating private business to the margins and focusing on the defence of the state against those who sought to malign it.[1094] There was no doubt in Charles I's mind of the subordinate status of the common law judges, as for in 1638

---

the prayers before the sermon in the Chapel Royal. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 314, fo. 180v: in Norwich, for instance, some defended Wren against the charge of innovation in the late 1630s by claiming that Dr Norton had preached in scarlet before (Mapletoft's defence). The 'respective responsibilities' of Charles I and Laud have been forever debated, but Russell is best taken as conclusive when he writes of 'the difficulty of disentangling the respective responsibilities of the King and Laud … it is perhaps best to assume they were jointly responsible except where there is concrete evidence to the contrary': idem, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 136, n. 203. No king, or queen for that matter, had questioned both the parliamentary and populist origins of the Reformation Church as much as Charles I. It would be unwise to ignore Charles I's own shrewd judgment, sharpened, as it were, by his father's passionate interest in theology. See also Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, p. 169: 'the catastrophic nature of the alliance between Charles and Laud'. See aslso NRS, GD406/1/167: Charles I to Hamilton, 2 Dec. 1642: 'I cannot but tell you, that I have sett up my rest upon the justice of my Cause, being resolved the no extreamitie or misfortune shall make me yeald; for I will eather bee a glori[o]us King or a patient Martir'.

1092 C. Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570–1640* (Oxford, 2007), p. 214: 'there was some popular support for the bishops' campaign to silence the godly'.

1093 'It hath a name from heaven, a Starre placed in it; and a Starre is a glorious creature, and seated in a glorious place, next unto the Angels': *The Political Works of James I*, ed. C.H. McIlwain (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), p. 335.

1094 David Como has shown Laud's skill in concealing himself from the judicial record: see, e.g., idem, 'Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud's London', *HJ*, 46 (2003), pp. 263–94, at p. 265: 'a systematic (if careful and delicate) policy to shut down Calvinist discourse'.

Laud was informed to 'demande there helpe' in dealing with separatists: 'if they refuse, I shall make them assist you.'[1095] Charles had already revealed his disinclination for debate: Chief Baron Walter was suspended[1096] and much later on Chief Justice Heath was similarly dismissed[1097] in the same year that saw Chief Justice Richardson demoted to the 'meanest' of the Assize courts.[1098] What had been merely theoretical in his father's reign – the common law as 'kept within her owne limits', ensuring that the judges did not 'invade other jurisdictions' – Charles enforced in practice. He strictly believed along with his father that 'the absolute Prerogative of the Crowne … is no Subject for the tongue of a Lawyer'.[1099] Charles' harsh attitude towards the courts was aided and abetted by his archbishop. Where James had simply berated common lawyers in the strict form of words only, Charles wished to display to all concerned that he was in charge of juridical powers.[1100] Laud's trial proved a peripheral distraction – 'the charge ag[ains]t the Arch–Bishop now at the Barr we find to be made up'[1101] – even if the moderate member of the Commons, Harbottle Grimston, urged the House

1095 Laud, *Works*, v, p. 355. The Archbishop's Account of His Province to the King, For the Year 1638: 'without some temporal assistance from the judges we know not what to do' (ibid.). Charles I's extravagant demands of unswerving loyalty were difficult to accept by many judges. Over the disposal of benefices to candidates he did not know, Charles I relied almost exclusively upon his archbishop. In September 1633, for instance, Charles was attempting to choose between two nominees, Richard Walcher and Thomas Yates, for the crown living of Middleton Cheyney. Charles I and Laud privately met at Denmark House. The archbishop 'declared to his ma[jes]tie what he conceived of the state of the busines[s] and his opinion of Mr Yates to whom his ma[jes]tie had passed a bill for a presentation to this living w[hi]ch I stay[e]d att the greate seale [']till his ma[jes]tie declared his pleasure and thereupon his ma[jes]tie … commanded that … the presentation for Mr Yates should passe': Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service, 705:73/14450/406/470: Thomas Yates, 9 Sept. 1633.

1096 TNA, SP 16/150, fo. 70r: Lord Keeper Coventry to Charles I, 12 Oct. 1629: 'Spoken w[i]th the Lord Chief Baron … and propounded to him that he should … petytione … to be disburdened of that place. I found him much troubled w[i]th the sense of your displeasure … protesting that it afflicted him more then the losse of any place'.

1097 Heath begged 'gratious p[ar]don for any error past, which he hath neather wickedly nor wilfully committed' (BL, Egerton MS 2978, fo. 48r), but Laud's personal animus was most apparent in his downfall.

1098 The Chief Justice was 'so shaken up by the Archbishop, that coming very dejectedly with tears in his eyes out of the Councel Chamber, the Earle of *Dorset* seeing him in such a sad condition, and demaunding him how he did? he answered, *Very ill my Lord for I am like to bee choaked with the Archbishop*[']*s Lawn–sleeves*': Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 148. The Lamontian deconstruction of 'revolutionary Puritanism' is much welcome: idem, *Marginal Prynne*, *passim*.

1099 *Political Works of James I*, ed. McIlwain, pp. 331, 333 and 333. However, he also asserted that prominent members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy were held 'too much … in contempt': ibid., p. 330. Derek Hirst describes James I's son, Charles I, as 'authoritarian'. See, e.g., Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, p. 375.

1100 One agrees with Clive Holmes in finding Sharpe's treatment of Star Chamber unconvincing: idem, 'Debate: Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', *Past and Present*, 205 (2009), p. 183, n. 30. See, e.g., Sharpe's remarks upon 'the fastidious scrupulousness of the judges at all stages': idem, *Personal Rule*, p. 677. James I, however, detested English Parliaments but entertained no such distaste for the Scottish Parliament: M. Lee Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (1990), p. 94

1101 LPL, MS 943, p. 1: 'The Defense made in the howse of Lords by John Herne Esq. on the behalf of Will[ia]m Laud, Arch–Bishop of Canterbury.' See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 464: Laud informed Peter Heylyn that the very worst that he expected from the trial was to be 'sequest[e]red from his Majesties['] Councils' and 'confin'd to his Dioces[e]' (much like Archbishop George Abbot in 1627). See as well Bodl., MS Tanner 61, fo. 240v: 'Mr [John] Herne', Laud's solicitor, advised dropping 'Traytors' against the Houses of Parliament in the scaffold speech the day before the execution so it would not hazard royal negotiations with the institution. See also Forward, 'Arrest and Trial of Laud', p. 170: 'There was an understanding at the time that posterity would make its own judgment on whether Laud died a traitor or a martyr.'

‘to strike whilst the Iron is hot’.[1102] The Earl of Strafford’s trial dominated the headlines, producing endless stories of dishonour and debasement.[1103] Laud’s trial was promptly relegated to secondary status; from primate to prisoner, he was turned into an object of ill–concealed contempt rather than the subject of sharp analysis.[1104] The authority and power of the church were scornfully disregarded.[1105] Laudians recognized, quite correctly, that they had much, if not the most, to lose from the Puritan movement and the fears expressed in 1629 about religious and constitutional change were increasingly submerged in the 1630s only to be then born out by events over the febrile decade of the 1640s.[1106] The Laudians denigrated the Elizabethan moderate Puritan tradition represented by, *inter alios*, John Foxe,[1107] William Perkins and Andrew Willet. Such negativity has ensured that existing discussions of Laudianism are far too narrow in scope and far too negative in emphasis, with scant attention paid to what Christopher Marsh has called ‘the view from the pew’.[1108]

What amounted to success is difficult to discern, however – Laud was perhaps hated so much because he *was* effective; his very success made Laudianism so divisive,[1109] but ‘it may be that it was an illusion [of strength] caused by the *decline* of Calvinism’.[1110] The pursuit of the ideals of unity, order and obedience were emphasised with renewed vigour in the 1630s – an effect of the zealous anti–Popery and Puritan zeal unleashed by the Thirty Years’ War and a Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria[1111] – but it was an inherent propensity of the archbishop to cast doubt upon the sincerity of his critics.[1112] Just as Charles said of his adversaries that they threatened universal peace under

---

1102 *Mr. Grymston’s Speech in Parliament*, p. 5: ‘we know what we did in the Earle of *Strafforde*[’]*s* case.’
1103 Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 219: ‘the highly public nature of the trial … took on a gladiatorial aspect’.
1104 See, e.g., Worcester College, Clarke MS 71.
1105 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 6r: ‘There is no Church, but where the faithfull are’ (16 Jan. 1640–1).
1106 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, ch. 9. Cf. J.R. Mawdesley, ‘Clerical Politics in Lancashire and Cheshire during the Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649’ (Univ. of Sheffield Ph.D. thesis, 2014), p. 278: ‘It cannot now be assumed that puritans were resolutely opposed to Laudianism.’ The usurpation performed by Laud was of Charles I’s *imperium* as it extended to governing the church in England.
1107 D. Nussbaum, ‘Laudian Foxe–hunting? William Laud and the Status of John Foxe in the 1630s’, *Studies in Church History*, 33 (1997), pp. 329–342. In contrast, White has suggested that ‘neither Prynne nor Heylyn found exactly what he wanted when they combed the works of the early English Reformers’: idem, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 39.
1108 C. Marsh, ‘Sacred Space in England, 1560-1640: The View from the Pew’, *JEH*, 53 (2002), pp. 286–311.
1109 See the astute and very perceptive comments in Harris, ‘Revisiting the Causes of the English Civil War’, p. 627.
1110 G. Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603–1642* (1992), p. 183 (Burgess’ italics).
1111 Bernard, ‘Church of England’, p. 187; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 842–6; and White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, esp. pp. ix and 10.
1112 Tarrying was certainly *not* a conspicuous habit of the archbishop.

pretence of religion and conscience,[1113] Laud saw his predicament in the Tower in 1641–5 in entirely secular terms, viewing the 'several ambitions of the great men' as 'the true cause of these troubles'.[1114] Sharpe and White also argue that Puritan antagonists such as William Prynne were a socially and theologically distinct minority – his allegiance to the church being conditional at best[1115] – but, in truth, there existed a variety of attitudes, beliefs and/or opinions that operated within, if not subsumed by, much wider bodies of Reformed thought.[1116] Used as a term of popular abuse, Puritanism 'by its latitude … strikes generally, by its contraction … pierces deeply, by its confused application … deceives invisibly';[1117] it cannot be assumed that the majority were extremists intent upon removing the ambiguity and moderation embedded in the Thirty–Nine Articles,[1118] the Prayer Book and the Homilies of the Church of England. The 'great men' behind Laud's imprisonment – Bedford, Hertford, Pembroke[1119] and Northumberland – were neither revolutionaries nor radicals but individuals who desired compromise or a deal; these 'four Earls of great [power] … resolved *only* to se[quester] me from the King's Coun[cil, and] to put me from my [arch]bishopric.'[1120] With this message of mitigation, there was some – albeit small – hope for the future. Contrary to much secondary literature,[1121] Laud was *not* stridently opposed to parliaments in the 1630s,[1122] despite the fact that 'hee should bee assured

[1113] *Eikon Basilike,* ed. P.A. Knachel (New York, 1966), p. 165: 'private men's covetous and ambitious designs'. See also Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies,* pp. 347–8 and at p. 527, for it was only 'Charles I himself' who divided the secular from the spiritual.
[1114] Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 298.
[1115] Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, ch. 12, esp. pp. 732–3 and White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic,* pp. 3–6 and 282.
[1116] Puritanism was at once composed of different – and arguably competing – strands that contained the potential to undermine both religious unity and the social order. See, e.g., London Metropolitan Archives, DL/A/A/007/MS09531/015, fos 21v–2r and 23v. See fo. 22r: 'all thinges that bee not Sinnes are willed by God.' Abraham Grame ('A. Grame') was accused in an article lodged against him of underwriting statements made by his brother, Samuel, against the use of the surplice in 1633. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 114, fo. 115v: 'the tayle of the great beast'. Laud's estrangement of moderate opinion had been so complete by the early 1640s that scarcely anyone spoke in favour of the church as currently established
[1117] H. Parker, *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* (1641), p. 9. It is important for historians to remember, however, that there could *never* have existed such a thing as a single, coherent 'non–Puritan identity' in early Stuart England: A. Milton, 'Religion and Community in Pre–Civil War England', in Tyacke (ed.), *English Revolution,* pp. 71–3. Its character and identity were, indeed, subversive.
[1118] See St John's College, Oxford, MS 166, fo. 1v, for 'Puritan … Exceptions' and 'Reasons against Subscription to the Booke of Articles.' (In Laud's own hand.)
[1119] See Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists*, ch. 7, esp. p. 168 for the earl of Pembroke's construction of an extensive Calvinist clientele and his influence evident in the 1630s, backing figures such as John Preston and Joseph Hall.
[1120] Laud, *Works*, iii, pp. 239–40 (my italics). See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 464.
[1121] M. Parry, 'William Laud and the Parliamentary Politics of 1628–9', *Parliamentary History,* 36 (2017), p. 145: 'he was suggesting that parliaments were far from being an essential part of the polity.' Parry writes in n. 38 that 'he appears to have been more extreme than his future ally at court and on the council, Thomas Wentworth.'
[1122] BL, Add. MS 11045, fo. 81r: Rossingham to Scudamore, 9 Dec. 1639: 'My Lords[,] Grace of Canterbury, and my Lord Deputy [Wentworth] did both of them propose to his Ma[jes]tie to call his Parliament'. See also *CSPV, 1632–6*, p. 225: Laud was in favour, with Lord Keeper Coventry, of parliaments. It is important to remember that Laud was one of the most active of the spiritual lords in Parliament in the 1620s: M. Parry, 'Laud and the … Politics

[that] hee should bee distroyed the verie first daye of their sitting'.[1123] One should be wary, however, of disassociating the figure from the wider movement, analyzing his ideas and opinions divorced of all context. Neither did he publish much – any attempt/s to take 'a fresh look at Laud himself' must account for this almost deafening silence.[1124] While the 'ism' has been examined in some detail – 1637, for instance, emerges as *the* height of anti-Calvinist aggression[1125] – apart from Cromartie, there have been very few, if any, recent studies of the archbishop and his thinking. Droll, sometimes dangerous, cartoons were published against Laud in 1641, showing him constantly suffering nightmares, in a deserted shipwreck, in a halter, eating his victims' ears or even vomiting the recent Canons of 1640.[1126] His obsession with conformity was combined with a deep fear of popularity, 'of rayling tongues', 'blasphemous mouthes' and 'violent handes'.[1127] Although a few advocates went much further than Laud in denouncing the Puritans as 'a most pernicious sect & dangerous to monarcks, as bad as Jesuites in their opinions',[1128] the archbishop endured the most ridicule as 'the cheife cause', however mistaken it may have been, 'of breaking the Parliam[en]t [of early 1640]'.[1129] Such hostile derision ushered in his prolonged impeachment much later in that year,[1130] removing at once his 'considerable freedom of action' and 'discretion'.[1131] Indeed, the transformation of the English Church had been 'essentially the work of two

---

of 1628–9', esp. p. 138 ('a serious and engaged parliamentarian with a highly–developed political ideology') and idem, 'Laud and the Parliament of 1626', p. 248: '[he was] a skilled and informed parliamentarian.'

1123 BL, Add. MS 11045, fo. 82v: same to same, 17 Dec. 1639: 'had good reason to beleive there were such intentions against him'.

1124 Cromartie attempts 'the unpretentious task of using *all* the volumes of his nineteenth-century *Works* to sketch his theological opinions', but fails to provide much, if any, background to the bitter opposition which they sparked: idem, 'Laud', pp. 75–6, quotes at p. 76.

1125 See Lake and Stephens, *Scandal and Religious Identity*, p. 166: 'the triumph of Laudianism at the centre' by the summer of 1637. However, a recent collection of essays laments the regretful fact that 'there is no separate chapter on Laudianism': A. Milton, 'Introduction: Reformation, Identity, and 'Anglicanism', c.1520–1662', in idem (ed.) *Oxford History of Anglicanism*, p. 9. Laudianism was both an ideological *renversement* and a factional *coup d'état*.

1126 *Canterburies Amazement* (1641); T. Stirry, *A Rot Among the Bishops* (1641); *The Bishops Mittimus to Goe to Bedlam* (1641); *The Bishops Potion* (1641) and *New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot; The Black Box of Roome* (1641).

1127 LPL, MS 943, p. 899: William Chillingworth to Laud, n.d.: 'Consider the bloodye efforts of …'

1128 BL, Harl. MS 390, fo. 442v: Mead to Stuteville, 11 Oct. 1628: 'all their whole doctrine & practise tendeth to anarchie.' These were the words of Matthew Wren, then dean of Windsor and Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

1129 BL, Add. MS 28000, fo. 16r: Thomas Peyton to Oxinden, 14 May 1640: 'it is indeed reported'. See also BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 77r (for '500 apprentices assembled and wente unto Lambeth Howse' on 11 May 1640); Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 22v ('This passage of my diary was burnt [11 May 1640] while it was in Mr Pryn[ne]'s hands … namely my deliverance was great. God make me thankfull for it'); and Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 284 ('five hundred of them came about my house at Lambeth, to offer it and me violence'). See also Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 129: 'The root of Charles's concern is perhaps shown by his decision to place an extra guard on his children [after the Lambeth riot/s].' See also I. Green, 'Career Prospects and Clerical Conformity in the Early Stuart Church', *Past and Present*, 90 (1981), p. 113: 'A certain proportion of ministers may have acquiesced [with the reforms] through fear of Laud's wrath or through concern over their future careers.'

1130 New College, MS 9502: 26 Dec. 1640 ('the Archb[isho]p [of] Cant[erbury] [is] under the black rod').

1131 Cust, *Charles I*, p. 136.

men' over the previous decade – Charles and Laud[1132] – but was now increasingly subject to a fearsome Parliament with dismantling and, even arguably, dissident intentions: episcopacy was abolished in 1646;[1133] the Book of Common Prayer was outlawed in 1644–5; and deans, chapters and cathedrals were finally eliminated in 1649 long after the rigid hierarchy of ecclesiastical courts such as High Commission in 1641.[1134]

The interpretations advanced by second–wave revisionists do not bear acute scrutiny. The vision of an inherently English – or, indeed, Anglican[1135] – mainstream besieged by a minority of extreme Puritans is difficult to reconcile with the surviving evidence. Puritans were, in fact, forced into adopting an increasingly militant stance *vis–à–vis* the church and crown. While Laud may not have written or preached much of any

1132 Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 64. Laud, with his capacity for detail and his power of imagination, complemented his master, Charles I. No man was better fitted to carry through a complicated and duly slow programme with undying persistence to an ultimately triumphant conclusion at the Restoration. See also Capern, 'Ussher', p. 68: 'Laud believed he could manipulate decisions made by the king without too much difficulty when he wanted to.'

1133 See, however, Univ. of Nottingham, PW2/HY/173: petition from Shropshire for episcopacy and the liturgy. Authenticated by Parliament, conformists saw the main role of the episcopate as protection – and, indeed, policing – of the reformation by statute. Bishops were honoured for their stewardship of the Protestant tradition – it was a tradition which Shropshire petitioners said they had 'bin bredd up in' thanks to 'severall acts of Parliament'. See also NRS, GD406/1/569: Hamilton to Laud, 22 Oct. 1638: the Covenanters wanted 'the totall overthrow of Episcopacie'. See H. Hammond, *A Vindication of Episcopacie* (1644), p. 33: Hammond felt absolutely zero need to concede that bishops had recently entrenched on subjects' liberties, 'beene enemies to the purity and power of religion' and had been guilty of popish innovation/s. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 70r: 'After 3 days [of] debate, It is voted That the B[isho]ps shall sit & vote in Parliam[en]t' (24 May 1641).

1134 See CUL, MS Kk. 6. 38, fo. 23r: 'Petitions did crowde in from severall counties & places'. See also CUL, MS Add. 44/6, p. 1: 'Some further considerations about common prayer' and 'whether God under the New Testament, since Christ assended on high & gave gifts unto men, ever commanded, or required, or spoke a word of such a thing, or whether ever it came into his mind, or heart'. See as well Bristol Archives, AC/36074/137b: Charles Howard to Smyth, 7 Jan. 1640–1: 'they[']re ar[e] divers[e] petitions alreadye come upp and more ar[e] daylye expected, earnestlye prayeing that episcopacye may bee utterlye abolished and heare will bee the fountayne of goode or evill for I am crediblye informed his magestye can never consent too it and then it must necessarylie putt us all upon desperate courses…'

1135 These claims find their most exaggerated expression in Bernard, 'Church of England', where religious diversity was sacrificed in the name of political stability for 'the preferences, intentions and compromises' of the monarch: ibid., p. 187. The article is focused upon proving 'the virtues of the mean', the existence of an Anglican *via media* in other words with the accompanying concept of *adiaphora*: ibid., p. 188. Once again, Bernard falls back upon a residuum of conservative, arguably quasi–Catholic, opinion 'in the parishes' to support his interpretation that Calvinism was an alien and obscure force in England in the early seventeenth century: ibid., pp. 195–6. Elsewhere Bernard resurrects a Dickensian view of the Henrician Reformation as 'an idiosyncratic hybrid' of 'ambiguity', one which preserved moderation and rejected confessionalism: idem, 'Henry VIII: "Catholicism without the Pope?"', *History*, 101 (2016), p. 221. See also A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (1989), p. 205: 'we [the English] have tended to avoid the peaks and the abysses of both [Catholicism and Protestantism]'. It is remarkably similar to the opinion advocated in White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, esp. p. ix ('doctrinal evolution was above all monarchical') which presents 'a relatively unsophisticated Protestantism' in the beginning (ibid., p. 44) only to be further strengthened by 'studiously moderate' Elizabethan advisers (ibid., p. 62) who accommodated – or even welcomed – conscientious Catholics at one extreme and Puritans desirous of religious reform at the other. The breadth and diversity of Reformed thought is, therefore, altogether ignored, as are the contributions of France and the Rhineland. Bernard concludes thus that Charles I's government merely followed that of his father: idem, 'Church of England', p. 189. The English Reformation remains politically motivated and driven.

intellectual weight à la Hooker and Andrewes,[1136] he worked tirelessly to impose his own 'avant–garde' notions of reformation upon his fellow countrymen. He had little time for those who esteemed Catholicism,[1137] even in its most rabid and noxious forms as 'but a painted Atheisme'.[1138] It has been said that 'a man like Laud at the 'high' end of the court religious spectrum nonetheless understood himself as a Reformed divine',[1139] but he felt little, if any, solidarity with continental reformers in the Holy Roman Empire or the Netherlands.[1140] With a significant degree of satisfaction, Laud referred to the distinctive features of the church's practice and, indeed, severed ties with non–conforming ministers abroad. Laud was a figure of formidable intellectual and clerical power who was also aggressive, irritable and, at times, depressive. 'The rashness and insensitive execution of his policies', however, created a dilemma for many conforming members of the church, a moral choice that divided loyalties and split communities.[1141] Adopting and adapting the practice of the Roman Church, Laud acquired a self–identity of moderation that detached itself from the dogmatizing and divisive force of Puritanism.[1142] Inimical to zealous evangelism and Puritan nonconformity,[1143] Laud pursued strictly 'avant–garde' concerns.[1144] The 'avant-garde' conformists identified by Peter Lake, who, from the turn of the seventeenth century, had prefigured the Laudian policies of the 1630s in their attitudes towards the positioning of the communion table[1145] or the promotion of church music, for example.

[1136] Lake, 'Laudian Style', p. 181, thinks Hooker invented Laudianism singlehandedly whilst D. MacCulloch, 'The Impact of the English Reformation', *HJ*, 38 (1995), p. 152, considers Lancelot Andrewes, over everybody else including Laud and Neile, as the 'the most significant figure in launching the catholic sacramentalist adventure'. See also Bourne, *Anglicanism of William Laud*, p. 71: 'Laud had a keen realization of the value, and indeed the necessity, of the Sacraments for a full Christian life.'

[1137] Bodl., MS Rawl. B.158, p. 170: '[William] Chillingworth [a Catholic convert] … turning Catholique [and] went beyond [the] sea … the B[isho]p [Laud] for his purpose [recovery of Chillingworth] made Choice of a Dr. Wedderburne[,] a Scottishman[, and a] prebendary of Ely'. Cf. LPL, MS 943, p. 729.

[1138] *The Works of … William Perkins* (3 vols, 1631), iii, p. 578. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 358: 'It is not to be thought that the Papists were all this while asleep, and that neither the disquiets in *England*, nor the tumults in *Scotland* were husbanded to the best advantage of the Catholick Cause.'

[1139] Cromartie, 'Laud', p. 88, albeit one with a 'romantic vision of the clergy': ibid., p. 93.

[1140] For his unfavourable attitude towards Dutch separatists, see, e.g., K.L. Sprunger, 'Archbishop Laud's Campaign Against Puritanism at the Hague', *Church History*, 44 (1975), pp. 308–20, esp. pp. 318–19.

[1141] D. MacCulloch, 'But Half–Reformed?', *History Today*, 38 (May, 1988), p. 62.

[1142] Milton, 'Sacrilege and Compromise', p. 136: 'they [the bishops and chaplains of the 1640s] could not aspire to the sort of influence on daily policy which Laud had exercised'.

[1143] SRO, D1287/9/8 (A/92): 'professed Non–conformists.'

[1144] See, esp., P. Lake, 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant–Garde Conformity at the Court of James I', in L.L. Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 113–33. See also Raymer, 'Durham House', p. 154: John Buckeridge, the Bishop of Rochester and an 'avant–garde' forefather, was *not* promoting alternative theories of election, but attempting to discourage a 'kind of soul–searching'. He 'openly read' aloud *The Admonition of the Bishops* at Charles I's coronation in 1625–6: St John's College, Cambridge, MS L. 12, p. 21.

[1145] On Christmas day in Tadlow in the diocese of Ely in 1638, there was a striking incident: LPL, MS 943, p. 617: 'for that in the sermon time, the dog of William Staple came to the Communion table (w[hi]ch stood without any

He never even had to satisfy his conscience, as did many divines and chaplains, with 'that w[hi]ch we could not avoid', namely the abolition of episcopacy a year after his execution.[1146] Laud might have been more attendant to the legal basis of his reforms than the vast majority of his subordinates, but he presided over a movement that had little or no concern for the secular tastes and iconoclastic excesses of the Reformation. Through instruments of the prerogative, Laud enforced and imposed many ecclesiastical reforms in Ireland as well as Scotland as policies of enhanced conformity:[1147]

> little Laud will pay for his fraud / And cunning Innovation: /
>
> For Service–booke, & the eares that hee tooke /
>
> And the Scottish Proclamation[1148]

Many of the elements of Laudianism were canvassed far earlier in the 1590s by Andrewes, Harsnett,[1149] Howson and Overall;[1150] the seeds of attitudes were to be found in the 'avant–garde' conformist dawn of 1590s, the province of a few distinctive but

---

raile or inclosure before it) & leaping up, took the loaf of bread, prepared for the Sacrament & ran away with it in his mouth: w[hi]ch allthough some of the Parishioners took from the dog, and set it againe upon the table yet the vicar … thought not meet to consecrate that Bread'.

1146 LPL, MS 943, p. 763: Brian Duppa to Gilbert Sheldon, 10 Oct. 1648. Although some bishops such as Griffith Williams were complaining as early as 1643 that the monarch should not 'purchase the *peace* of the Common–wealth with the *ruine* of God[']s Church' (i.e. abolition of episcopacy), some divines and far more lay Royalists were prepared to sacrifice, however temporarily, its existence: idem, *The Discovery of Mysteries* (1643), p. 104. The 'preferred option' of leading lords such as Bedford and even Warwick was, in fact, 'modified episcopacy', following closely Archbishop Ussher's model – a scheme which found the king's ostensible support, but seriously reduced the influence of the clerical elite: Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 168. However, the Earl of Warwick was considered 'the temporall head of the <u>Puritanes</u>': LPL, MS 943, p. 698: Conway to Laud, 8 June 1640. Warwick's views have not undergone the same level/s of deep scrutiny as most other Parliamentarians such as John Pym, William Brereton and Thomas Fairfax. See also Lancashire Archives, DDHu/46/21: John Pym to William Jessop, 3 Sept. 1640 for the printing instructions for the Petition: two of the most wanted suspects – the 'lo[rd] of Warwick' and 'John Clotworthy' – were to be found at an Essex country house, situated just a little beyond the end of Chelmsford Road in Leighs. Clotworthy helped in distributing early copies ('3 orr 4 copyes') of the famous petition of the peers in 1640: 'it is now resolved, that the copyes w[hi]ch I intreated you to write shalbe published'. Distribution had been entrusted to Clotworthy *and* Mr Stirry, perhaps Dr Peter Stirry, chaplain to Lord Brooke.

1147 Although it was incarnated in bishops and coterie politics in all three realms, enhanced conformity soon became earmarked as an easily dispensable item.

1148 Bodl., MS Rawl. Poet 26, fo. 123v. See also *CSPD, 1638–9*, p. 633, 'Desierin your Hines to pardon my pen, Cary Laude to the Scots and hang up [W]Ren.'

1149 K. Fincham, '"So potent, crafty and violent an adversary": Samuel Harsnett, Master of Pembroke and Archbishop of York', *Pembroke College Cambridge Society Annual Gazette*, 80 (2006), p. 39: 'Harsnett is conventionally, if rather inelegantly, described as an anti–Calvinist.'

1150 For an organised movement aiming at further reform of the Church of England, and one which contemporaries christened 'Laudian', it is traceable from the *fin de siècle* of Queen Elizabeth's age. For Laud's christening of 'Prince Charles [I] at St James', see St John's College, Oxford, MS 317, fo. 1v: 'I had the hono[u]r as Deane of the Chappell (my L[or]d Gr[ace] of Cant[erbury] being infirme) to Christen'. Anthony Milton portrays Overall as a transitional figure: that is, between the strident ecclesiology of the 1590s, when a sense of the specific content of theological Anglicanism as being separate from Calvinism was starting to develop, and the Laudian period of the 1630s, when those early anti–Calvinist impulses were taken a lot further.

marginalized ecclesiastics at court. The intensely politicized atmosphere of the 1620s and 1630s[1151] – the Spanish Match,[1152] parliamentary failure followed by abolition[1153] and, of course, a susceptible monarch – furnished the leaders of this minority tradition with a key set of favourable conditions in which to advocate their ideological agenda. Laud might have been more 'naturally cautious' in orchestrating the pace of change,[1154] but his role as chief of this 'avant-garde' faction at the Caroline court required patience, custom and a time–honoured mentality – he was highly skilled in protecting clerical privileges, resources, incomes and honour.[1155] Informed by a highly glorified reappraisal of the Elizabethan religious enterprise[1156] and influenced by recent shifts in patristic theology,[1157] Laud sought to re–appropriate, if not re–imagine, a repudiated Catholic past of ministerial authority and power. The Scottish Covenanters[1158] and more besides, nevertheless, mistook 'the hearts and souls of the[se] prelates of England', confusing Laud's Catholic church with Rome itself.[1159] As many historians have warned, however, the Scottish crisis should *not* be viewed as a 'bolt from the blue',[1160] a tranquil nation torn asunder by a small minority of Puritan radicals,[1161] but rather as a dense and determined reaction to the perceived threat of crypto-Catholicism – an erroneous extreme of duplicity, blasphemy and idolatry that gave shape to many

---

1151 See further M. Parry, 'The Episcopate and Westminster Politics, 1621–29' (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 2011).

1152 One poet portrayed the authors of the libels against the Spanish Match as 'irreligious' troublemakers who cast 'foule asp[er]sions 'mongst the Acts of Kings, / Adders & Serpents whose envenom'd stings / Blystor the tender Palme of Quiett Sway': Bodl., MS Eng. Poetry e. 14, fo. 53v.

1153 C. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979), ch. 7.

1154 Raymer, 'Durham House', p. 82.

1155 N. Tyacke, 'Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War', *Journal of British Studies*, 35 (1996), p. 161: 'The cautiousness — even the statesmanlike qualities — of Laud's handling of religious matters during the 1630s are not in question.'

1156 See, e.g., Lane, *Laudians and the Elizabethan Church*, esp. ch. 2. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 364: 'Queen *Elizabeth* beheld the Pope as her greatest Enemy'. The Elizabethan Church as the site of the 'Puritan ethos' is a well–known scholarly convention.

1157 J.–L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009).

1158 NRS, GD406/1/10550: Charles I to Hamilton, 10 May 1639: 'to force Them [the Covenanters] to Obedience, (in tyme) … w[hi]ch rather then not doe, I shall first sell my self to my Shirt'.

1159 Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 381.

1160 See, e.g., Tyacke, 'Anglican Attitudes', p. 167.

1161 Cf. Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 797 ('most Englishmen knew nothing of the Covenanters' cause or still viewed them with the contempt the English had long felt for the Scots') and M. Kishlansky, 'A Lesson in Loyalty: Charles I and the Short Parliament', in McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism*, p. 22: 'Anti–Scottish sentiment, [was] never far below the surface in England'. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 655: Laud to the bishops of his Province, 17 Oct. 1639: 'the Violence w[hi]ch hath beene used in [Scottish] Church Businesses … the Indignityes w[hi]ch have beene putt upon such grave and orderly Church–men'. It is dated incorrectly 13 Oct. 1639 in Laud, *Works*, vi, pp. 570–1. See also Bodl., MS Carte 1, fo. 197r: 'unhappy dissolution of [the Short] Parl[i]ament': Wandesford to the Earl of Ormond, 26 May 1640. In the later 1630s, too, a number of complaint tracts were produced that attacked evil counsel and expressed sympathy with the Covenanters. The writer of one tract criticised the king's government and even went to the trouble of secreting it in his private chambers ('A Letter to His Majesty'): BL, Add. MS 69886, fos 120r–121r, at fo 120r: 'misguided and ill advised att home', 'the common adversaries' who have 'a tolerac[i]on of superstition and Idolatrye'.

popular expositions of Protestant divinity in Scotland in the preceding decade.[1162] It should not go unremarked that Laud was also the *first* archbishop since 1559 to reject the exclusive identification of the Pope as the Antichrist[1163] – an opinion which heretofore had united all fronts of public controversy against Rome, but one which ran into problems with divines in the 1630s who deemed it fashionable to situate the identity within a host of qualifications and caveats.[1164] In Laud's view, covert silence on the most notable object of Protestant self–definition *was* preferable, but this modest shift in ideological tone was not limited to the realms of high theory; it installed a sense of courage and confidence in those divines who wished to push the boundaries of the thinkable and sayable on much wider and more influential topics. Echoes of the Catholic past were no longer seen as severe embarrassments; rather, they became distinctive badges and testimonies of fervent loyalty to the church. The non–confessional *via media* of much repute and fame was symbolized by 'a determined exclusivity' from continental ideas and institutions rather than a strictly observed concept of moderation between extremes.[1165] Ecclesiastical policies in 1630s became yoked to a larger fear about the future of continental Protestantism, which was under threat. Laud attributed the self– satisfaction of many Puritans to a false confidence, an impervious '*Pride*', '*Security*' and '*Presumption*' for which they are 'in and under danger.'[1166] If they continue to 'sleepe on' in such assurance/s, he once said, a deadly slumber will engulf their actions, inviting 'riot and excesse'.[1167] The reorientation of

---

[1162] CALS, 112263: Bridgeman to Laud, 18 Dec. 1638: 'till the Scottish Business be abated.' See also NRS, GD406/1/570: Hamilton to Laud, 24 Oct. 1638: Hamilton believed that stronger 'garrisons' would ensure more suitable behaviour from the assembly.
[1163] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed,* pp. 63–72, 122 and 220–1.
[1164] Cf. Ussher told Laud that contrary to 'w[ha]tsoever others do imagine of the matt[er], I stand fully convicted … that the pope is AntiX': Bodl., MS Sancroft 18, p. 16: Ussher to Laud, 4 Jan. 1635–6. Laud begged to differ, blurring 'the dividing line' between moderate Romanists and English crypto-papists: Milton, *Catholic and Reformed,* p. 72.
[1165] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed,* p. 528. Cf. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 158: 'in 1610 … it [the Church of England] offered a *via media* between Rome and Geneva.' The ultimate narrative, emphasising how broad agreement over the constitutional status of the church helped to contain disputes over doctrine and/or ceremony, might reasonably be seen as defining and/or defending a 'political' version of the Anglican *via media.* One example of this appropriation of the *via media*, implying movement as much as moderation, by political scholars is Alan Orr's discussion of the so–called 'Erastian faction in the Long Parliament', which included everyone from crypto–royalists to William Prynne, excluding only those radical Presbyterians and radical Laudians who favoured clerical dominance of the church. See further Orr, *Treason and the State,* p. 131.
[1166] W. Laud, *A Sermon Preached Before His Maiestie, on Wednesday, the Fift of July, at White–Hall* (1626), pp. 16, 17, 39 and 17. On the pervasive influence of the Lord Chamberlain in governing preaching at court, see P.E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 64–76.
[1167] Laud, *White–Hall*, pp. 17–18.

the episcopate[1168] in the late 1620s towards ardent ceremonialism[1169] proved an effective, though costly, counter–measure to such rigid predestinarianism. It was designed to silence overt speculation on the afterlife, refocusing efforts on a deeply emotive, internalized and spiritually active piety – one that sidelined the divisive implications of an excessively experimental Calvinism and arguably presaged its rapid expulsion from the mainstream of the church. Laud's drive to define the spirit of the church against the twin and potent forms of Catholicism and Puritanism, 'these factions',[1170] assumed new heights of devotional and political activism. Although his downfall cannot be explained without due and diligent reference to Scotland,[1171] the conflicts of the 1630s should not be relegated to a position of secondary importance: 'some are ready to slander us as maintainers of Popish superstition, and I know not what', Laud proclaimed.[1172] Under the 'mask of zeal or counterfeit holiness', Puritans spread their 'poisoned conceits' among 'the weaker sort, who are prone to be misled by crafty seducers', i.e. 'that we intend to bring in some alteration of the religion here established.'[1173] The alpha and omega of the subject was that Puritanism *was* wholly pernicious to power. For many conformist divines, however, the formal equivalence of the popish and Puritan threats became almost axiomatic.

Wentworth's return to the Caroline court in mid–1639 was 'still a misterie' to many, but 'my Lo[rd] of Canterburie is held to be most able to expound the Rid[d]le'.[1174] This

---

[1168] In a provocative declaration issued on 24 Feb. 1640–1, the Scottish Commissioners reiterated their demand for wholesale (that is, 'Root[–]and[–]Branch') abolition of the episcopate: Univ. of Edinburgh Library, MS Dc.4.16., pp. 31–2, 81–3, 94 and 98.

[1169] Laud, *Relation of the Conference,* sig. *3v: '*That* Ceremonies *are the* Hedge *that fence the* Substance of Religion *from all the Indignities, which* Prophanenesse *and* Sacriledge *too Commonly put upon it*.' See, e.g., BL, Harl. MS 390, fo. 137r: Mead to Stuteville, 7 Oct. 1626, reporting that 'a Companie of Bishops [including Andrewes, Lake and Senhouse] have died (in a small time)': 'To have [the] power of disposing so many cheife Bishopricks together is a matter of moment either to build or pull downe that Faction in the Church which the present state or cheife statesman likes not.'

[1170] Laud, *Works,* vi, p. 85: 'Well, if I do suffer, 'tis but because truth usually lies between two sides, and is beaten on both sides (as the poor Church of England is at this day by these factions)'.

[1171] See James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, ch. 5, esp. p. 146: 'Laud's downfall can only be properly understood in the context of Anglo-Scottish political relations.' See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 40v: The thirteenth article of fourteen read, 'He plotted to Stir a War w[i]th Scotland'

[1172] Laud, *Works*, vi, p. 21 (Laud's Star Chamber speech in the trial of Henry Sherfield, 8 Feb. 1631–2). See also SRO, B/C/5 1634 Wem: William Lloyd, curate of Wem, when involved in a slander case in 1634 claimed that as well as being 'a man of sober and good carriage, [and] of honest life' he was 'verie conformable to the orders, gover[n]m[e]nt and discipline of the church'.

[1173] Ibid., v, p. 610 (the preface to the Canons of 1640) – suspected and likely author was Laud, but as Richard Cust writes, 'it would probably have been carefully scrutinised and approved by Charles himself': idem, 'Charles I and Popularity', in idem *et al.* (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity,* p. 247, n. 41. Allan MacInnes writes that Charles I possessed 'an authoritarian conviction in his own rightness': idem, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625–1641* (Edinburgh, 1991), p. 1.

[1174] Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 20/108: Thomas Stafford to Cork, 4 Sept. 1639. None of their surviving correspondence is dated any later than 25 May 1639, although the king reports that he has seen 'divers[e] letters' dissertation has sought to address the subtleties with which Laud as an ambitious theologian was forced to navigate within an institution which was dually established – 'the same men, which in a temporal respect make the Common–wealth, doe in a spirituall make the Church'[1175] – being *in* and *of* the Word and the world as both a sacred and secular entity.[1176] The historiographical tussle over Arminianism seems to have done much to diminish its major place in the conceptual toolbox of the historian. Peter Lake has even argued that its 'destabilising effects … were in part caused by and worked out through other divisions, disputes and tensions centred on the terms Puritanism and popery' rather than predestination *per se*.[1177] While such doctrinal conflicts are certainly not peripheral to this study, a closer analysis of Laud's relations with contemporaries reveals a far more attentive and tireless reformer, a figure bent on rebuilding the economic fortunes of the institution so dear to his heart while adjusting, even silencing, its doctrinal positions. He may never even have expressed any discernable interest in Arminianism,[1178] but the varied ingredients within his style of

from between them scarcely eleven months later: WWM, Str P 3(ii)/108: Charles I to Wentworth, 12 Apr. 1640. Almost two years' worth of correspondence – including Wentworth's imprisonment in late 1640 – remain missing. Wentworth was greeted 'with extraordinary demonstrations of affection' at court, as noted by the Venetian ambassador (*CSPV, 1636–9*, p. 578: 7 Oct. 1639), but curiously his arrival receives not a mention in Laud's diary: see, e.g., Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 233. This silence may be attributed to Wentworth's extensive travels in the country.

1175 W. Laud, *A Sermon Preached Before His Maiesty, on Tuesday the Nineteenth of June, at Wansted* (1621), p. 6: 'For both Common–wealth, and Church are collective bodies, made up of many into one.' See also J. Rigney, 'In the Midst of the Golden Candlesticks: Authority in English Sermon Literature With Particular Reference to the Sermons of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1573–1645' (Univ. of Sydney M.A. thesis, 1987), ch. 4, esp. pp. 92–103, at pp. 102–3: 'Laud fused civil authority with the visible church … In Laud's view the admission of power and acquiescence to hierarchy are not so much matters for the individual as they are collective concerns … When Laud creates a community in his sermons he makes an object of it – a fixed quantity possessing no natural propensity for radical change.'

1176 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 69r: 'The Bill ag[ains]t the Clergy saith, That no B[isho]p or man in Holy Order ought to meddle with any secular affairs' (13 May 1641).

1177 Lake, 'Predestinarian Propositions', p. 122. As aforementioned, however, Lake perfectly captures and evokes 'an ideal–type' of the Laudian 'style', an aesthetic group of attitudes towards holiness, sacredness and piety itself, 'a coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the Church, the divine presence in the world and the appropriate ritual response to that presence': idem, 'Laudian Style', p. 162. Reacting against Bernard, Sharpe and White *et al.,* Lake demonstrates that what strictly lay behind the pillars of Laudian policy (e.g. the railing of communion tables and the reordering of church buildings) was a coherent plan which viewed Puritanism as wholly subversive and that the most suitable answer was the promotion and enforcement of subjects united in prayer in a national church, which was the prerogative of the monarch and his bishops to order as they best saw fit. Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 390–2: Sharpe insists that a willingness to pay for controversial furnishings, gilt candlesticks and communion plates, etc., suggests an immeasurable sympathy, if not enthusiasm, for Laudian initiatives. Does compliance equate with consent, though? Laud told Wentworth mid–decade that the 'truth what ere it be, is not determinable by any humane reason in this life. And ther[e]fore [it] were farr fitter (had men that moderation) to be referred up into the next generall knowen truth in w[hi]ch men might rest, then to distract their Consciences, & the peace of the Church, by discending into indeterminable p[ar]ticulars': WWM, Str P 6/350: Laud to Wentworth, 22 Aug. 1636.

1178 Cf. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic,* p. 286: 'It were better to remain silent for the sake of peace.' See also A. Milton, 'Unsettled Reformations, 1603–1662', in idem (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism,* p. 72: 'it should be clear that there was a great deal more to Laudianism than an 'Arminian' rejection of Calvinist predestinarianism'. Indeed, he preached 'an invective against papists and Armynians' on 20 Feb. 1628–9 (BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 27v). He was denounced in Parliament around a fortnight later with Weston, curiously, as one of the 'traytors to the king & state who either favo[u]red Arminianism or Popery': BL, Harl. MS 383, fo. 82r: Justinian divinity – overt sacramentalism, the 'beauty of holiness' and especially *jure divino* episcopacy[1179] – were canvassed and popularized until – and, indeed, after – his death.[1180] Sustained by a shared ideology, Laudians retired to country houses and the continent during the years of the Interregnum,[1181] biding their time and waiting fruitfully for the Restoration. 'The power itself and the archbishop himself were *not* essential to the movement's existence', Calvin Lane has written. His public execution in 1644–5 'only strengthened the coherence of the movement'.[1182] It inspired, even reinvigorated, elements within the personnel of a far wider body of members, both clerical and lay.

It is hoped that this dissertation has moved far beyond the crass stereotypes associated so deeply with the archbishop that William Lamont observed half a century ago.[1183] His

---

Isham to Paul D'Ewes, 5 Mar. 1628–9. Like the king himself, Laud was unmoved by theological complexities – his contrasting vision of the church owed much more to its institutional and visible edifice, a uniform and unified form of public worship. His exalted view of ceremonies and prayer went beyond mere Whitgiftian clericalism. See, e.g., K. Fincham, 'Introduction', in idem (ed), *Early Stuart Church*, p. 15: 'What cannot be proved is that Laud and his allies were consciously following in the footsteps of Whitgift'. See also Prior's Kitchen: Hunter MS 67, item 14: Bishop Neile reportedly told Parliament that 'I do not know that I ever read 3 lines of Arminius's writings'. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 105: Abbot's report of 2 Jan. 1631–2 is extant: 'for aught it appeared', the bishops had resided in their 'Episcopall houses', except the Bishop of St David's who was helping at Westminster. 'On Arminian pointes there is no dispute: And Ordination of Ministers for aught that I can learne, are canonically observed. The rules for Lecturers are strictly kept.'

1179 Laud deeply believed in the dignity of the clerical estate. The core power of bishops and their jurisdictional power central to this (*in foro conscientiae*) was *iure divino*, albeit the extra powers given (*in foro contentioso*) and only the exercise of their function was *iure humano*: Laud, *Works*, iii, pp. 406–7 (in answer to the assumption of 'a Papal and tyrannical power', at p. 406) and iv, p. 196. See also Bodl., MS Clarendon 29, fo. 5r (Hyde to Nicholas, 12 Dec. 1646): 'Episcopacy' was 'as much fenced and secured by the Lawes as Monarchy it selfe, and an intire part of the frame and constituc[i]on of the Kingdome'.

1180 Two major works were swiftly published in the month of Laud's execution (Jan. 1644–5): H. Hammond, *Considerations of Present Use Concerning the Danger Resulting From the Change of Our Church Government* (1644), p. 14, equated the abandonment of episcopacy to 'an Act of *infidelity* and practicall *Atheisme*', while H. Ferne, *Episcopacy and Presbytery Considered* (Oxford, 1644), p. 27, railed against 'those seditious Doctrines, which have been hitherto taught, to erect and uphold the Presbyterian Government'. Hammond would advocate, however half–heartedly, later on Ussher's model of reduced episcopacy as '*the almost only piece of* reformation *which this* Church *of* England … *may justly be thought to stand in need of*': idem, *Of the Power of the Keyes* (1647), sig. A2v. Thorndike's *Of the Government of Churches* (Cambridge, 1641), esp. pp. 68–81 and 107–10 remains the only exception that proves the royalist rule of episcopal defiance.

1181 To cite a few examples, Jeremy Taylor was situated at the Earl of Carbery's countryseat Golden Grove, Henry Hammond in the Pakington household and Gilbert Sheldon with the Okeover and Shirley families. For the last example, see V.D. Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon: Architect of Anglican Survival, 1640–1675* (Hague, 1973), p. 35. Those loyal to Laud were, in fact, able to maintain a distinct, if often somewhat precarious, identity in the face of an all–powerful Republic. One must not assume that they represent a monolithic or fully homogeneous school of thought or practice, however.

1182 Lane, *Laudians and the Elizabethan Church*, pp. 113–14 (my italics). There were many hagiographies printed to rescue the reputation of Laud(ianism). See, e.g., SRO, D593/V/4/1 (*A Necessary Introduction to the Historie of the Archbishop of Canterbury his Tryall*). However, Laud's execution also welcomed Parliament's suppression of the Book of Common Prayer and the imposition of the Directory of Worship, reiterating the process of violent purification as prelude to godly settlement in the church. See also D. Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–1642* (Oxford, 2006), p. 249: 'By 1641 it might be better to call them 'post–Laudians', since the Archbishop had fallen from power'.

1183 Lamont, *Godly Rule*, p. 56: 'When we discuss Archbishop Laud we begin with a type and usually end with nothing – nothing, that is, except clichés about the abasement of Church before Crown.'

views have recently come under closer scrutiny, but Laud has yet to receive a compelling biography; it remains the case that the field is ripe for further exploration. As scholarship is coming to realize, his policies shaped the British post–Reformation in profound ways, but this only underscores the importance of going far beyond Laud and investigating fully the legacy created by such a complex figure. The suspicion remains, however, that modern scholarship has failed to recognise the dangers inherent in the impulse 'to allow William Laud to speak for and explain himself.'[1184] The archbishop cannot, however, be considered as 'proto–Anglican' in this period,[1185] but his impact upon the churches – England, Scotland and Ireland – was substantial. John Southcot, an astute newsletter writer, was certainly not wrong when he reported from the Caroline court upon the selection of Laud as archbishop in mid–1633 that he 'will make a great change generally [h]ere long to the better'.[1186] The archbishop was not the only correspondent of the Lord Deputy's that was forced to resort to cipher due to the fear of interception,[1187] but he was among the most defiant of the characters that ever graced the seventeenth–century stage. He made few allies and many enemies – Herbert Croft, one of Charles I's chaplains during the second half of the English Civil War/s, said that he chose 'not fr[i]ends to himselfe but to the Church and Commonwealth, for he considereth not himselfe as a Totall, but as a part'.[1188] Wentworth knew the sheer importance of sustaining personal connections for political survival,[1189] but Laud

1184 Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 26. Kishlansky also believes that 'viewing government from the point of view of the monarch can hardly be dismissed as an illegitimate approach': idem, 'Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', p. 48. Laud's nightmare that 'the Church [was] undone' became spectacularly fulfilled: Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 246. Rigney suggests that 'Laud is a writer shouting against the storm as he brings the traditions of his form and role to bear on the conditions of his time': idem, 'In the Midst of the Golden Candlesticks', p. 8. He argues, convincingly, that this malevolent language of power combined with the occasional expression of despair makes Laud's message all the more urgent, showing how authority can be exercised and, in turn, manipulated.

1185 See Lake and Questier, 'Introduction', p. xix, for 'the entirely justified demise of 'Anglican' as an analytic category or term of art suitable for deployment in the religious history of this period.'

1186 *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, ed. Questier, p. 198: Southcot to Biddulph, 16 Aug. 1633: his installation 'wilbe a great strength[e]ning of the Arminian party against the puritans'. A month earlier Southcot had expressed his delight that it was thanks 'chiefly' to Laud that 'all things here go on more and more in a moderat[e] way': ibid., p. 191: same to same, 19 July 1633.

1187 See, e.g., WWM, Str P 14/275: Conway to Wentworth, 20 Jan. 1634–5, for the Viscount's 'feare' of interception when writing to the Lord Deputy if he could not communicate with Wentworth's 'brother', George.

1188 Bodl., MS Tanner 102, fo. 165r: 'No Character[,] But some confused draughts[,] some obscure shadowes[,] Of the most Reverend Father in God'.

1189 He would often tell different people at varying times that they were his closest acquaintance. See, e.g., WWM, Str P 8/48: Wentworth to Earl of Arundel, 4 Nov. 1633: 'I shall be most ready to Serve you in any thing, w[hi]ch shall be in my power'. George Radcliffe was also – and rather disparagingly – called at Wentworth's trial in 1641 'His Creature & bosome freind' (SRO, D661/20/2, p. 37) and 'the L[ord] of Straf[f]ord[']s eccho': BL, Harl. MS 2233, fo. 180v. Wentworth knew he had to maintain several contacts at a place so slippery as the Caroline court. See, e.g., his attack upon Lord Chancellor Loftus in 1638 in which he had written to the Earl of Northumberland (WWM, Str P 10(a)/122: 23 Apr. 1638), Viscount Conway (WWM, Str P 10(a)/125: 23 Apr. 1638), Lord Keeper Coventry (WWM, Str P 10(a)/134: 14 May 1638), Chancellor Cottington (WWM, Str P 3/316–17: 23 Apr. 1638) and even Charles I: WWM, Str P 3/318: 22 Apr. 1638. Wentworth was not so astute in terms of court news, however, experienced few, if any, qualms about severing ties with many individuals. He was accused at his trial of 'exalt[ing] the Clergy above the Temporall Magistrate', that is, beyond the secular authorities. [1190] Indeed, it was said, albeit by 'Slannders', that upon his death Wentworth 'had charged all his Misfortunes, Oversights & Misdemeanours upon the Archb[isho]p of Canterbury'.[1191] Suddenly Laud became a scapegoat for many causes in the 1640s – his effective installation of Juxon into the Treasury in 1635–6 had confirmed his supreme power and influence over the Caroline government,[1192] though

---

for he believed 'Cottington shall be Treasorour' in late 1635: WWM, Str P 8/271: Wentworth to Earl of Newcastle, 26 Sept. 1635. See also *Wentworth Papers*, ed. Cooper, p. 102: 'soe respected a friend as yourselfe.'

[1190] Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 16 Apr. 1644: 'what an Arch[–]Tyrant & Subverter of Lawes & Liberties this Archb[isho]p … shew[e]d himself in all Temporall Courts where hee satt in p[er]son'. These are the words of John Maynard.

[1191] SRO, D661/20/2, p. 106: 'as the Prime Author of them all'. See ibid., p. 107: 'A pret[t]ie Invention it was to sharpen the Axe againe, & to furnish the People w[i]th Lungs & Voices to cry for another Sacrifice'. There might be some truth in this allegation, however. See Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle MS 15, fo. 91v ('The straight freindship that was betwixt 112 [Laud] and 115 [Wentworth] is shaken' – Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 22 July 1640) and UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 87r–v (reverse foliation): 'Lord of Cant[erbury] loved to stand behind the Curtaine and act by others. He wrote such to a Commissary: doe what you can of your selfe, if you meete wi[t]h [illegible], then I'll strike in and helpe you … [he] has crept on to his end in a cun[n]ing undermining way … my Lord of Straf[f]ord has bin a club in the Archbishop['']s hand.'

[1192] Quintrell and Pogson's shared argument that 'Laud *presumably* hid his disappointment at Juxon's appointment' cannot withstand critical scrutiny. See further Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 107 ('the link [between the two] *probably* only became common currency after Prynne had publicised Laud's diary just before his trial in 1644': my italics) and F. Pogson, 'Making and Maintaining Political Alliances', pp. 66–70, at p. 70 (my italics also). Laud, as one of the Treasury's commissioners alongside 'the Lord Privy Seale [Earl of Manchester], the Lord Cottington, [and] both the Secretaryes [Coke and Windebanke]' between 1635–6 (WWM, Str P 6/169: Laud to Wentworth, 27 Mar. 1635), returned an overpayment of approx. £6,000 to Wentworth: WWM, Str P 15/263: Laud, the Earl of Manchester, Cottington, Coke and Windebanke to Wentworth, 18 Nov. 1635. See also WWM, Str P 6/192: Laud to Wentworth, 12 June 1635: 'I have not leisure since I med[d]led w[i]th the Treasure (see how I am fallen upon R[h]yme and what I might doe if I would give my minde to it)'. Cust, *Charles I*, p. 177 and P. Lake, 'Retrospective: Wentworth's Political World in Revisionist and Post–Revisionist Perspective', in Merritt (ed.), *Political World of … Wentworth*, p. 276, consider Quintrell's essay to be a 'meticulous reconstruction' of 'a non-event' in 1635–6 which shows 'both the nature and the limitations of his [Laud's] career as a court politician.' It is, in fact, a dubious exercise in revisionist storytelling, a microstudy which claims that 'it was not really so' and seeks to reinterpret Laud's success as rather 'a feeling of resignation, [and] a shrugging of primatial shoulders' but offers an unconvincing and flawed alternative series of events: Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', pp. 108 and 105. Logan Pearsall Smith also too readily attributes a letter from Henry Wotton to William Juxon, although he does place a question mark after the recipient's name, celebrating his appointment as early as October 1635 – that is, five months before the announcement in front of the Privy Council: 'give me leave to congratulate your assumption to the Treasurership of this kingdom before I actually hear it' (*Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, ed. L.P. Smith [2 vols, Oxford, 1907], ii, pp. 354–5: Henry Wotton to William Juxon?, 4 Oct. 1635). 'Laud now had [in 1635–6] more influence with the King than anyone else': Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 128. See also ibid.: 'he probably could have been Lord Treasurer if he had wished'. Cf. Haskell, 'Windebank', p. 55: 'In temporal matters, however, his powers of patronage were considerably more limited.' However, Laud claimed in mid–1632 to have also secured Windebanke's appointment as Secretary of State, a claim which was made explicit in his diary (Laud, *Works*, iii, p. 215: 'which place I obtained for him') and only moderated a couple of years later in an effort to combat Roe's importunity: TNA, SP 16/266, fo. 26v: Laud to Roe, 22 Apr. 1634. Windebanke's appointment was yet another charge to be brought against Laud at his trial on the nineteenth day, the penultimate day, of hearings: Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 24 July 1644 (the seventh charge). It was duly claimed that Windebanke was 'one of the greatest and [most] visible protectors of the [Popish] Preists': ibid. As aforementioned, Windebanke fled to France in the early winter of 1640–1, the beginning of a long exodus – over half a decade – until his death in September 1646: G. Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Basingstoke, 2003), pp. 8–9. On 1 Dec. 1640, charges were drawn up against Windebanke – he was said to have been a corrupt Catholic who had sold recusants pardons and been in the pay of the Spanish: BL, Harl. MS 162, fo. 36r. Bishop Neile also alleged in 1629 to have brought 'many [recusants] to conformity': Prior's Kitchen: Hunter MS 67, item 14. Laud was also claimed to have promoted Augustine Lindsell to the bishopric of Peterborough – Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 5 July 1644 (the seventeenth day of hearing) – which he later claimed was Weston's entire doing. For reports of Weston's illness, he already had 'the King[']s eare more then hee [Juxon's predecessor, Lord Treasurer Weston]' by early 1634.[1193] Laud remained, however, in a state of indefinite imprisonment. Not found guilty until the autumn of 1644, 'the Catastrophe of the Lord Deputy of Ireland'[1194] had long preceded his own trial[1195] – 'we know not … what is become of the Archibishop [*sic*] of Canterbury'.[1196] No one was as unremittingly busy or as attentive to detail as he had been in the late 1630s,[1197] but 'Laud had to take what satisfaction he could from standing alone.'[1198] He recorded numerous libels and slanders against himself in his ever–so conscious diary,[1199] acutely aware of the rampant opposition which his church programme had created. Important individuals such as Laud who straddled the gap 'between open Catholicism and hot Protestantism', however, 'deserve [far] closer historical attention' than they have received thus far.[1200] While the royalists are beginning to enjoy a newfound level of scholarly appreciation in recent years, the Laudians – or, at least, the archbishop – remain as a fairly subordinate, almost inconsequential, field of study. Valuable works on the court and journalism in the 1640s have considerably enlarged our knowledge of those individuals

see WWM, Str P 14/316: Lord Chaworth to Wentworth, 10 Mar. 1634–5 and 14/327: John Bingley to Wentworth, 13 Mar. 1634–5. For the rather flimsy argument that Juxon was George Goring's 'creature', see BL, Stowe MS 326, fo. 63r. See also Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 400–1, at p. 400, for the fanning of 'the flames of such anticlericalism' by Juxon's appointment to a secular post in 1635–6. The diocese of Bristol had been held *in commendam* with Gloucester from 1562 to 1589 due to its poverty, but this was fully *the* exception. See also WWM, Str P 14/322: Cottington to Wentworth, 12 Mar. 1634–5 ('5 o[']clocke in the morninge'): that Wentworth had made a very wise decision in 1635–6 was confirmed by a friendly warning he received from Cottington, written while Weston was on his death–bed: 'All your fr[i]end[s] labour to make you Tre[asure]r butt I know what you wyll say to it.'

1193 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 18/4: Lord Dungarvan to Cork, 26 Apr. 1634.

1194 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 22/40: M. Marcombes to Cork, 20 July 1641.

1195 Cf. Le Bas, *Laud*, p. 311: 'The Archbishop vindicated himself against every charge with such consummate ability, such intrepid bearing, and such evident consciousness of innocence and high desert, as won for him the admiration of all'.

1196 Chatsworth House, Cork MSS Box 22/40: Marcombes to Cork, 20 July 1641. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 303: '[Juxon was] his old and trusty Friend'.

1197 Cf. Wandesford's claim that Wentworth's determination to serve the king – 'his excessive care and labo[u]r' – was proving detrimental to 'his health', though 'the ease of himself is the least thing he thinks of': Univ. of Nottingham, MS Cl C 475: Wandesford to Clifton, 22 Feb. 1636–7. See also CUL, MS Add. 7339/137: Laud to Ingram, 19 June 1638: 'the Busines[s] of these two last Termes hath lyen so heavy upon mee, that it left mee noe Leisure to speake seriously to you about it'.

1198 Quintrell, 'Church Triumphant', p. 92. See ibid., pp. 93 ('a courtly world where Laud was always ill at ease') and 95: 'his awkward high–mindedness'.

1199 See, e.g., Laud, *Works*, iii, pp. 210, 228, 229, 234 and 237. See also TNA, SP 16/161, fo. 57r: Anonymous letter addressed to William [mistaken for John] Laud, 20 Feb. 1629–30 ('your crime is … the suppres[s]inge of the gospell and the sup[p]ortinge of idollatry'); BL, Add. MS 35331, fo. 73r ('libells … in London ag[ains]t the Archb[isho]p of Canterbury' [May 1639]); and BL, Add. MS 46885A, fo. 39v: 'their Lewd Scandalls'. See as well Bodl., MS Laud Misc. 760, fo. 22r: 'I humbly desire the Reader to note these libells.' See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 70r, for a libel denouncing bishops as the 'Limbs of Antichrist' (18 May 1640).

1200 N. Younger, 'How Protestant Was the Elizabethan Regime?', *EHR*, 133 (2018), p. 1091. Younger, of course, is referring to the reign of Elizabeth I and the 'conservative figures on the council [who] proliferated in the closing years' and 'had much more ambiguous religious attitudes': ibid., pp. 1072 and 1065.

who stayed loyal to the crown and the church.[1201] Their beliefs and behaviour – the structures of belief, doctrinal developments and theological conflict – have been subject to close analysis and have generated a little controversy. Archbishop Laud stands adrift and alone in the early 1640s, however – 'hee liv[e]d not only free from Scandall, but his life was exemplary, and fit for a B[isho]p'[1202] – particularly upon his delayed imprisonment, the forced execution of Wentworth and the rapid rise of Queen Henrietta Maria as Charles I's most favoured adviser.[1203] Even as early as 1621 with Laud's

---

[1201] See the work of Smuts, esp. idem, 'Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', pp. 43–65 and J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007). See also Milton, 'Court Divines', for the intriguing suggestion that divines were never supporting a monolithic royal position but were, rather, 'people trying to make a pitch for what that Royalist position would be': ibid., p. 137.

[1202] Durham Univ. Library, Mickleton and Spearman Manuscripts MS 26/74, p. 272: Richard Steward to Edward Hyde, n.d. but c.1647: 'of a very eminent greatnesse'. For Steward as one of 'my reverend friends' whom Laud appointed in his will alongside Juxon and Wren to peruse his sermons after his death, see Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 449. For Steward's own comment that Laud was 'a very excellent Freind', see Durham Univ. Library MS 26/74, p. 272. Fincham, 'Laud', p. 83, accepts both the year of 1646 and that it is '*probably to Dr. Cosin*' that is given in *The Correspondence of John Cosin*, ed. G. Ornsby (2 vols, 1869–70), i, p. 228, but the letter can be more closely identified to 1647 since it provides the 'passages' in Grotius on the rights of banished kings that Hyde had asked Steward for in his letter earlier that year. See, e.g., Bodl., MS Clarendon 29, fo. 57v: Hyde to Steward, 8 Jan. 1646–7. This identification allows one to give a fairly rough date of the late winter of 1646–7, an entire two years *after* the archbishop's death. The recipient is also Edward Hyde, later Earl of Clarendon, not John Cosin – it is a letter included in the Mickleton and Spearman catalogue which includes correspondence to and from Cosin, which partly explains its misattribution. See TNA, SP 16/182, fo. 73r: Dorchester to Earl of Pembroke, 14 Jan. 1630–1 for comments about Steward's 'good' character. See also Bodl., MS Rawl. B.372, no. 15: Laud to gentry and clergy of Wiltshire, 30 June 1637: 'I have desired Mr Edward Hyde to be at the paines to acquaint you w[i]th theis my Lette[r]s.' The interpretation that Laud and Wren never saw eye–to–eye (see Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, esp. p. 45) is also difficult to sustain when faced with mounting evidence of their cooperation: despite Laud's preference for Juxon for Clerk of the Closet and the diocese of London in 1632–3, he indeed helped to secure a chaplain's slot and later bishoprics (Hereford and Norwich) for Wren. For Charles I's assent to Wren's elevation to the diocese of Hereford in 1634, see LPL, MS 943, p. 349. Laud christened William Wren, the fourth son of 'my worthy friend' Matthew Wren, and eventually bequeathed him £100 in his will: Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 448. Bishop Wren meted out 'extensive censures' to clergy who had refused to read the Book of Sports during divine service and implemented Laud's metropolitical directives relating to the communion table with 'unparalleled vigour': Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 188 and 219. Wren, indeed, was 'probably the most energetic of all the bishops in enforcing certain aspects of Caroline ecclesiastical policy': James, 'Introduction', p. xxxvi. See Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 47: 'The booke [of Sports] was printed by the K[ing']s command. It was not of my procuring.' These are the words of Laud. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 83v: '[Wren is/was] a Man Popishly affected, suppresser of preaching, Introducer of Arbitrary Governm[en]t' (20 July 1641). He has been described by Hugh Trevor–Roper as 'a crusading bishop … No single bishop of Laud's creation was so hateful to the Puritans': idem, *Laud*, p. 313. See also Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 331: 'The Bishop of *Norwich* [Wren] he [the king] compares (as before was noted) to a *Wren* mounted on the feathers of an Eagle, and fall upon his Adversary with as foule a mouth as [Henry] *Burton* doth upon the Prelates'. See also LPL, MS 943, p. 481: Beckington churchwardens challenged William Piers' interpretation of both the Elizabethan injunction and Jacobean canon and claimed that 'All the orthodox B[isho]pps [and] Governors of the Church upon the reformac[i]on of Kinge Edward[']s tyme of blessed memory have either writ[t]en or preached ag[ains]t alteringe the communion table.' See also BL, Harl. MS 385, fo. 147r: shortly after the summoning of the Long Parliament, it was rumoured that Bishop Wren had fled to France ('Bishop Wren in France'). See as well BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 57v: Matthew Wren – 'the B[isho]p. of Ely, [and] Dean of the Chappel' – married Mary Stuart, the eldest daughter of Charles I's offspring, to Willem II of the Netherlands, 'according to the English Form' (2 May 1641). See also Bodl., MS Tanner 66, fo. 220v ('he [Wren] abstayned from going to [the Long] Parliament') and MS Tanner 68, fo. 26v: a dark picture came in the mid–1630s from Wren, who noted that there was a general defect of 'catechizing' throughout the diocese of Norwich. See as well ibid., fo. 2r: Charles Corbett to Matthew Wren, 3 June 1636: a determined attempt was made in Norwich in the mid–to–late 1630s to abolish 'that Ratsbane of Lecturing … the virulency whereof hath intoxicated many thousands'.

[1203] For the influence she wielded in the first half of the civil war/s, see Cust, *Charles I*, pp. 361, 369–70 and 385. For the bedchamber's role during the Scottish crisis, however, see Donald, *Uncounselled King*, p. 321 and J. Greenrod, '"Conceived to Give Dangerous Counsel": William Murray, Endymion Porter, the Caroline Bedchamber and the Outbreak of Civil War, March 1641 – June 1642' (Univ. of Sheffield M.Phil. thesis, 2003), chs appointment to the diocese of St David's in Wales, James I asserted the right to nominate to all important ecclesiastical posts in the principality.[1204] In the turbulent times in which he lived, however, Laud's 'pursuit' of public uniformity was, indeed, 'a good purpose', although the means and methods behind it were 'extreamely faulty.'[1205] The finances of the crown were also broken – something which Wentworth would pass

---

4–7, esp. p. 137: '[with the departure of the queen for the continent in February 1641–2] there was no one else in direct attendance upon the King whose opinion would have held greater sway with him than the two Grooms.' The ejection of Charles' principal ministers in 1640–1 – 'the giveing way to the remove of divers[e] persons' (KHLC, U1475/C85/19: Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 13 Nov. 1640) risked within the space of a fortnight 'a very great deale of danger of beeing ruined [Lord Deputy Wentworth, Secretary Windebanke, Chancellor Cottington and Archbishop Laud]' (KHLC, U1475/C85/21: same to same, 26 Nov. 1640) – saw the immediate recourse to unsworn counsellors, especially the queen, out of practical necessity. Henrietta Maria had partly 'upon her knees' in Jan. 1640–1 'diverted the King from all whispers that … displease either house [of Parliament]' about Wentworth's 'arraignment': SRO, D(W)1778/I/i/12: Davenant to Legge, 19 Jan. 1640–1. It nicely twins with Davenant's own verse epistle, 'To the Queen', which persuaded Henrietta Maria to become the 'People[']s Advocate' by moderating the king's 'extreame obdurateness' through allowing a fair, though fatal, act of justice: Wentworth's execution, which will make her 'Triumphs … Esteem'd both just and mercifully good: / Though what you gain with Tears, cost others Blood': *Shorter Poems of Sir William Davenant*, ed. A.M. Gibbs (Oxford, 1972), pp. 139–40. In the next week, however, Charles I granted a reprieve to the Jesuit priest John Goodman, causing the Long Parliament to rethink its options and tighten its surveillance of Catholics, but giving the queen some delight: CUL, MS Add. 89, fo. 5r. Many people wondered what the king would be willing to do next in the case of Strafford if he sought to save someone so insignificant as Goodman. The pardon was 'taken by all to have been done of purpose, for a preparative to save the life of the Lieutenant [Strafford] and Canterburie': Baillie, *Letters*, ed. Laing, i, p. 295. William Drake, the writer of the parliamentary notebook of Strafford's trial (UCL, MS Ogden 7, Item 51, fo. 92v [reverse foliation]), begins the entry of 27 Jan. 1640–1 with 'Had I not bin preingaged': indeed, he attended the conference for the reprieve of Goodman earlier that same day. On 3 Feb. 1640–1, the day Strafford was awarded the fortnights' worth of deferment and Charles I had indeed rescinded Goodman's reprieve, Strafford expressed a subdued joy to the Earl of Ormond: Carte, *Life of Ormond*, v, p. 245 ('I thanke God, my lord, I see nothing capitall in the[i]r chardge': Wentworth to Ormond, 3 Feb. 1640–1). A week before, on 23 Jan. 1640–1, Pembroke's protégé, John Glynne (like his erstwhile patron, he had a penchant for explicit language), presented the case against Goodman's reprieve before the peers. Father Goodman is described as 'Strafford's surrogate' by Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, p. 178. See also ibid., p. 167, n. and p. 598, n. 12. There is also a letter from John Suckling to one of the queen's counsellors, Henry Jermyn, which remains undated but can be attributed to the winter of 1640–1, that is, the beginning of the Long Parliament. It encourages Henrietta Maria to assist her husband and cultivate 'the love of his Subjects' through 'composing differences, and … reconciling King and people': *Works of Sir John Suckling*, eds T. Clayton *et al.* (2 vols, Oxford, 1971), i, pp. 163–7, at pp. 164 and 166. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 8r–v. It is difficult to ascertain how successful was this advice. There were riots in Westminster in the spring of 1641, but according to one source, 'the Crowd of People was neither great, troublesome, nor unruly. All of them saluted him [Wentworth], & He them, w[i]th great Humilitie & C[o]urtesie' on 22 Mar. 1640–1 (the opening day of the trial): SRO, D661/20/2, p. 3. The trial was cut short by the Bill of Attainder – impeachment ultimately failed – though he requested on the last day of April 1641 (30th) 'to be heard againe' which was 'denyed' by the House of Commons: ibid., p. 89. The attainder bill was supported by such royalists as Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde: Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 291. David Smith barely comments upon this interesting formation (idem, *Constitutional Royalism*, pp. 74–5), i.e. that the constitutional triumvirate – 'the leading theorists' of his '-ism' – all supported the legally dubious attainder in 1641 and proceeds on the basis that 'the positions of those who became Constitutional Royalists were *extremely* varied': ibid., pp. 4 and 74 (my italics). Perhaps its main problem is the all-embracing 'vagueness' of the term, for it simply accounts for too wide a variety in opinion, practices and beliefs. See David Scott's effective and comprehensive rebuttal of Smith's thesis as both anachronistic and misleading in idem, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–9' in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, at p. 38 *et passim*, which claims the formulation is 'virtually useless' for determining factional alignments within the king's party. Charles I was, however, constantly reminded that the coronation oath forbade him from making any concessions with regard to clerical privileges: BL, Add. MS 34312, fos 3v ('perpetually binds') and 5v. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 25r: it was debated on the 21 Feb. 1640–1 'whether English Recusants should be removed from the Queen's Court'. At this stage, there were already Wat Montague, Toby Matthew and Kenelm Digby all gone. However, there was John Winter, 'her Secretary', still there ('only there remains').

1204 White's dubious contention that James I 'initiated … a doctrinal revolution' by appointing Laud to this see is rendered fully void by this fact: idem, 'Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', p. 40.

1205 Dering, *Collection of Speeches*, p. 4: 'And for the Bishop [Laud], I professe, I did (and doe) beare a good degree of personall love unto him'.

comment upon,[1206] though Laud seldom did – due to the inability (or rather hesitancy) of Parliament to grant extraordinary revenue. As aforementioned, both men – who were among 'those Lords that were all this while most averse to parl[i]aments'[1207] – supported its calling in the early winter of 1640. With the possible exceptions of Sharpe and Kishlansky, however, much blame has since fallen upon the shoulders of the king: 'slow and ambiguous in his response', 'Charles's austere temperament led him throughout his career to expect unquestioning submission', making him guilty thereby of 'intolerance, authoritarianism, paranoia, [and] duplicity'.[1208] It has been argued that the archbishop 'may well have seen the writing on the wall' after the emphatic defeat at Newburn in the late summer of 1640 – after all, 'Laud was on dangerous ground'[1209] – though this view attributes too much weight to his *ex post facto* defence at his trial in 1643–4. The architects of *Thorough* – Laud and Wentworth – sat on both of the committees for Scottish affairs in late 1639–40: one dealing with finance, the other occupied by strategy. Both of them exercised a considerable degree of influence[1210] – Wentworth's anger and violence at the council table has been the topic of much conversation among scholars, but Laud also independently organized a boycott of the Lord Mayor of London's procession, believing him to have been a hindrance in the city's support for the dismal farce that was the First Bishops' War. [1211] Charles I was

---

[1206] NRS, GD406/1/1234: Wentworth to Hamilton, n.d.: 'unlesse wee ~~have~~ get the pepper money [the arrival of an East Indies ship laden with a cargo of pepper estimated at a value of £70,000] the whole Armye will disband most sham[e]fully, and all [will] be lost'. Internal evidence – 'this Friday morning being ready to returne to the Counsell chamber' – tenuously suggests a date of 21 Aug. 1640. It was, indeed, written at Laud's residence in 'Croydon.' Wentworth had little hope of raising money from the city.

[1207] KHLC, U1475/C85/4: Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 12 Dec. 1639. The Earl of Leicester was, in fact, Northumberland's brother–in–law.

[1208] Donald, *Uncounselled King*, p. 76; D. Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660: Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (1999), p. 6; and Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 303. Cust, Hughes and Hibbard *et al.* offer a far more balanced appraisal, 'not accept[ing]' that the outbreak of civil war can be explained 'almost wholly in terms of Charles' personality' and instead highlighting 'how thoroughly the king's hands were tied by the end of 1640': R. Cust and A. Hughes, 'Introduction: After Revisionism', in eidem (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, p. 38 and Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, p. 227. See also M. Kishlansky, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), p. xi: 'I am in consistent disagreement with my predecessors'. See as well Kevin Sharpe's attempt to reapportion the blame: idem, *Personal Rule*, p. xvii: 'the divisions in the church, always latent, came to the surface in the last years of James's reign and were a problem bequeathed *to* his son.'

[1209] Greenrod, '"Conceived to Give Dangerous Counsel"', pp. 64–5.

[1210] Cf. Shepherd, 'Political Patronage', p. 45: 'if Laud did not wield such a degree of influence then there must be some way of explaining the cause of the perception that he did, and this can be found partly in the historiography of the subject and partly in the type of evidence which is available.' Brian Quintrell rejects an entire scholarly tradition 'in associating the Book [of Orders] so regularly with Laud and Wentworth', arguing rather that in 1630 Wentworth and Laud were *not* responsible for the book's creation. See further Quintrell, 'Book of Orders', p. 554.

[1211] Fissel, *Bishops' Wars*, p. 114: 'Arundel, Holland, and Coke had fallen from grace in a general purge precipitated by the King's displeasure with the 1639 campaign. In their place came Strafford and Laud with the tenacity which characterized their institutional management.' The first committee comprised Laud, Wentworth, Juxon, Cottington and Windebanke; the second was effectively run by Laud, Wentworth, Northumberland and Hamilton. Laud has also been accused of 'expensive … tactlessness' in this episode with the Lord Mayor: ibid. Donald argues that directly held responsible for ‘sette[ing] up of cobb[l]er[’]s sonnes, & the sonnes of poore Mechanicks to be Bishops & privy Councellors’[1212] – a direct and unapologetic reference to Laud’s humble origins as the child of a clothier. The Oxford Tractarians, however, were at pains two centuries later to situate Laud as *the* defining start of a nascent pre–stage of Anglicanism, neither disregarding Richard Hooker’s ceremonious traditionalism nor the Tyackean ‘consensus’ model of the later 1970s nor the mid–twentieth century big–tent *via media* – a man who bore all the fruits of later developments in the material fabric of the Churches, despite the king’s complete lack of personnel in the early 1640s.[1213]

Despite the apt lack of unanimity about the causes and consequences of Laudianism, this thesis has hopefully provided some insight, beginning to deepen and develop many of the more traditional interpretations. Laudianism, indeed, teemed with debate and difference;[1214] an examination of a single archbishop, however intense and detailed, cannot hope to address the multiplicity of voices that made up the movement – ‘writers such as Heylyn and the rest who were ultimately the ones spelling out the actual

---

Charles was, indeed, ‘wrongly counselled’ *and* ‘unable to be counselled’ in Scotland (idem, *Uncounselled King*, pp. 320 and 322), a brushstroke that encompasses everything rigid and inept about the king. Fissel, *Bishops’ Wars*, p. 112, n. 4, reminds us ‘that Laud (and Wentworth for that matter) had little to do with the 1639 mobilization; it was different in 1640.’ He argues, however, ‘that Charles I bears the brunt of responsibility for his defeat in the Bishops’ Wars’: ibid., p. 299, n. 30. He aggravated his difficulties by a number of disastrous errors of judgement.

[1212] TNA, SP 16/397, fo. 39v: Information, unsigned but given by Edward May and endorsed by Laud, of words spoken by Captain Nappier, a Scottish gentleman, 8 Aug. 1638. Reeve reckons that Charles I ‘had no conception of the art of the possible and was unreceptive and ill at ease in the world of affairs … in a fundamental sense, [he] did not understand the use of power’: idem, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, p. 176. See also Sharpe, ‘Image of Virtue’, p. 241, n. 88: ‘Charles rather than Laud was the prime initiator of the liturgical changes of the 1630s.’ Concessions made by the king in relation to bishops’ secular powers (e.g. removal from the House of Lords) met with a ferocious response and downright criticism from a number of so–called court divines in the 1640s: Ferne, *Episcopacy*, p. 26 and Williams, *Discovery*, pp. 78–81.

[1213] This is not to deny the magnitude of the problems facing the king. The previous six months up to May 1641 had seen his Archbishop of Canterbury imprisoned, his Lord Keeper, Lord Chancellor and one of his Secretaries in self–imposed exile, his Lord Treasurer forced to resign, his Chancellor of the Exchequer absent from court and his Lord Deputy of Ireland executed. The Earl of Northumberland observed in the summer of 1641that there had been ‘a strange alteration and change in the present affaires’, however – the political initiative had been restored to ‘the King [who] will easily overcome all difficulties that can arise in that place [Parliament]’: BL, Add. MS 78268, fo. 11v: Earl of Northumberland to Nicholas, 13 Aug. 1641. The earl had been considered much earlier by Wentworth to be worth employing in ‘the King[’]s Service’ (WWM, Str P 7/6: Wentworth to Laud, 31 Dec. 1636), though Laud was concerned with the way in which Cottington sought to develop his own friendship with him (‘shee [Cottington] courts him [Northumberland] much’): WWM, Str P 7/17: Laud to Wentworth, 11 Feb. 1636–7. It was the Earl of Carlisle who first advised Wentworth that the Earl of Northumberland was well worth cultivating (‘what he [Carlisle] conceived of the ability and worth of my Lord [Northumberland]’): WWM, Str P 13/220: George Wentworth to Wentworth, n.d. Mar. 1633–4.

[1214] The Laudians were not a political grouping far removed from the popular imagination, but rather areas of ‘pastoral Laudianism’ have, indeed, recently been recovered: see, e.g., A. Cambers, ‘Pastoral Laudianism? Religious Politics in the 1630s: A Leicestershire Rector’s Annotations’, *Midland History*, 27 (2002), pp. 38–51. What emerges from Leicestershire in the 1630s is a glorious picture of Laudianism as a positive and coherent religious programme that enthused and promoted a community spirit, not one that merely reacted to an established ‘Calvinist consensus’. As Peter Lake has written, Laudianism derived much, if not most, of its self–identity through its generation of a composite anti–type of religious dissent and lay sacrilege: idem, ‘Laudian Style’, pp. 179–80.

meaning and nature of Laudian policy.'[1215] Archbishop Laud is one prelate who has been persistently mistaken (and misrepresented) by posterity. Even seventeenth–century writers struggled to capture Laud's personal theology, an outlook that spoke of grace more as a quality or substance to be infused into the individual in the sacramental life of the church – he was described as being 'a learned B[isho]p' but whose thinking was, indeed, 'a mixture' of doctrines with a decided 'ounce of Papist mingles'.[1216] He was a figure 'in whome the church is happie',[1217] a figure whose acknowledged favour with the king – a relationship which was indeed strong – ensured cordial relations between church and state for much of the 1630s. If the Civil War is seen as an effective conspiracy of ambitious men,[1218] however, then the archbishop's stand must be recognised as an opportune moment for 'the overbearing, self–righteous and petulant Charles [I]'[1219] to craft a settlement[1220] within the church which would resist the rising tide of anti–popery.[1221] Royalist biographies have tended to be highly subjective.[1222] The prosecution of Laud, however, was deliberately circumscribed and understated,[1223] but there were enough dark rumours about the archbishop to make it highly sufficient:

[1215] Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 180. One disagrees with Milton, believing Laudianism to have been a steady movement rather than a fleeting moment. Cf. ibid., p. 183: 'think of Laudianism in terms of a process'. See, however, his refreshing portrait of Heylyn in idem, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic, passim*.

[1216] BL, Harl. MS 4931, fo. 8r: 'Upon the Archb[isho]p of Cant[erbury]'.

[1217] WWM, Str P 15/204: Thomas Dod to Wentworth, 28 Aug. 1635.

[1218] The view espoused alternately by Hyde, Nalson and to an extent Hume. Anthony Milton, in a very useful essay, compares the organized efforts of Laudians writing in praise of Laud's policies to the mentality in the Third Reich of 'working towards the Führer': idem, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 177. In an overblown article, Kishlansky accuses Milton of comparing the king to Hitler – 'the contempt is profound, the aversion is visceral' – when, if anything, he compares the archbishop to the dictator: idem, 'Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', p. 47. I. Roy, 'The Royalist Army in the First Civil War' (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1963), p. 84, claims that the peace party in 1642–6 such as the earls of Berkshire and Bath lacked leadership with 'totally ineffective' men.

[1219] Greenrod, '"Conceived to Give Dangerous Counsel"', p. 150.

[1220] The religious settlement of the Church and political disposition of the state turned on the religious proclivities and political judgement of the reigning monarch, Charles I. See further my 'York House Conference', *passim*.

[1221] 'That anti-popery became a more dominant, vocal and vituperative movement in the late 1630s and early 1640s was due to a culmination of factors … Laudianism was certainly a major component of it': Greenrod, '"Conceived to Give Dangerous Council"', p. 58.

[1222] Royalist biographies tend to be vanity projects, raising their subjects to impossible heights of critical acclaim and being often dedicated to their descendants. Utterly subjective, they tend to vindicate everything to which their eponymous heroes did or wrote. Carte's *Life of James, Duke*, to which one has earlier referenced, is a case in point – it is dedicated to Ormond's grandson, the Earl of Arran, in which the dedication eulogises Ormond as a paragon of 'heroic virtue, loyalty, and honour' (i, p. i) – and Warwick's *Memoirs*, from which one has also earlier quoted, which notes in its address to the reader that 'to rectify mistakes, and rescue the memory of that injured prince from the false imputations and indignities that have been cast upon him by prejudiced and malicious men, is the cause of this publication': ibid., p. xii. One finds Hyde's verdict more compelling, i.e. that there was 'some want of resolution' within the King, who 'was in truth sometimes liable' to 'mistakes and weaknesses', although the greatest ill-service done to him was that 'he many times suffered more vexation and trouble from the indisposition of his own people, than from the enemy': *Selections from Clarendon*, ed. G. Huehns (Oxford, 1955), pp. 6–7. Warwick was also a historian who served as Juxon's secretary at the time of his Lord Treasurership in 1635–6.

[1223] LPL, MS 943, p. 7: 'Wee did never alledge that any one Crime of the Bishope did amount to a Treason, or a felony, but wee doe say, That all the B[isho]p[']s misdemeanours putt together doe by way of Accumulation make many grand Treasons.' These are the words of John Wilde.

'to think well of 542 [Reformed religion] is cause enough to make 112 [Laud] their enimie'.[1224] The last letter, at least recorded, that Laud wrote is dated 8 January 1644–5, two days before his death, and addressed to John Birkenhead, his protégé, ensuring that 'all such allowances' were 'payed' to his servants and signed 'yo[u]r dyeing freind.'[1225]

Compared to the groaning shelves of monographs and articles dealing with Puritanism and almost every aspect of the parliamentary cause,[1226] the work on the Royalists – or, should we say, the religious conservatives, i.e. the Laudians – has, until recently,[1227] been sparse and some of the material that does exist is written from a clearly hostile point–of–view.[1228] James Daly's caricature of the royalists as 'the whipping boys of English history' may be, in fact, a crude exaggeration,[1229] but the neglect of Laudianism – there were very few contemporary expressions of sympathy for the personal plight of Laud in 1641–5, except from the obvious sources[1230] – has come down to us through many generations from a pernicious methodology which is unduly preoccupied with the minutiae of Parliament's cause. Laudianism (in so far as it can be spoken of as a single entity) has often seemed rather staid and uninspiring if we fast–forward to the religious excesses and enthusiasms of the Puritan cause in the 1640–50s – with the apocalyptic eschatology, avid Providentialism and doctrinal innovation associated with Parliament.[1231] Laud is often sidelined as an insignificant administrator,

---

[1224] KHLC, U1475/C85/4: Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 12 Dec. 1639.
[1225] LPL, COMM I/145: Laud to John Birkenhead, 8 Jan. 1644–5. It was also on this day, Wednesday 8th, that Laud was visited by John Herne, one of the defendants at his trial, and was persuaded to alter his final scaffold speech. It had originally been a bitter indictment of the parliamentary 'Ordinance of Traytors', but it was still 'in the first writeing' which led to Herne's 'great importunity [to make Laud] be persuaded to alter it': LPL, MS 943, p. 8. Herne had originally served as counsel for Prynne in the 1633–4 *Histrio–mastix* trial. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 61, fo. 240v: 'two dayes before his [Laud's] death Mr Herne[,] his Counsell, went to take his Leave of him in the Tower, where the Bishop gave him to peruse the Speech he afterwards delivered upon the scaffold'.
[1226] BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 99v: 'The K[ing] in person at the H[ouse] of C[ommons] demands but they [the MPs] had made an Escape (4 Jan. 1641–2)'. See also for a recent – and brilliant – restatement of the linkage between Puritanism and parliamentarianism, Tyacke's 'Puritan Paradigm of English Politics', pp. 527–550. He re–emphasises the linearity between Puritanism and parliamentarianism.
[1227] One congratulates the efforts, though, of J. McElligott and D. Smith in orchestrating and assembling some sublime essays on *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (2007) and *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (2010).
[1228] Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 6, is overtly critical of leading clerical voices and biographers that have made Laud seem like a giant 'since they approach him on their knees'.
[1229] J.W. Daly, 'Could Charles I Be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646', *Journal of British Studies*, 6 (1966), p. 23.
[1230] Heylyn, *Briefe Relation*, begins his virtuous account of the archbishop's death by describing him as 'a great man' (ibid., p. 1): 'a man of such eminent vertues, such an exemplary piety towards God, such an unwearied fidelity to his gracious Sovereigne, of such a publique soule towards Church and State': ibid., p. 2. The tract was published at a royalist press in Oxford.
[1231] Surrey History Centre, G52/2/19/22: Nicholas to Thomas Webb, 12 Oct. 1641. Under a year after the calling of the Long Parliament, however, MPs had to vacate the premises 'by reason of Sicknes[s]': ibid.

an ecclesiastical manager who found very little or no time for the reforms usually associated with him.[1232] If historians have found little importance in Laud's demise in 1644–5, it was because they believed Laud himself to have been infamous rather than famous. His esteemed predecessors, including Archbishop Whitgift, while never beyond criticism, have always commanded respect. He, however, fundamentally misunderstood – and therefore miscalculated – the strength of opposition in the Commons.

Scholarship has typically struggled to paint a coherent – or even a flattering – portrait of the archbishop.[1233] It may well be the case – to simplify brutally – that those who write about what Laud *wrote* portray him as a loyal, orthodox and much 'misunderstood' son of the Church, while those who write about what he *did* consider him the author of his own misfortune. The debate between these two markedly different – and deeply entrenched – positions has come to resemble a dialogue of the wilfully deaf. It has been the aim of my research to transcend this need ever to accuse or to excuse Laud, to give much sharper clarity to the range and reach of his significance, and to illuminate a career that was far more substantial and multidimensional than hitherto realised.[1234] Laud, indeed, aimed at nothing less than the 'ceremonial, liturgical and canonical conformity' of all his three Stuart dominions.[1235] Joong–Lak Kim's recent findings[1236] all seem to downplay or even underestimate Laud's role in Scotland,[1237] but, unlike his archiepiscopal predecessors, he had the freedom to intervene outside formal structures by using 'his personal standing with the king'.[1238] Laud, of course, 'was keen to disassociate himself' from controversial policies while simultaneously continuing to advance them.[1239] This became strictly part and parcel of

---

[1232] See, e.g., Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 109: 'Laud, true to character, played the discreet and cautious go–between.'
[1233] Scholars have succeeded in painting characterful portraits of aristocratic patrons, however: see, e.g., Atherton, *Ambition and Failure*; D.L. Smith, 'The Political Career of Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset (1590–1652)' (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1990); and A. Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford, 2012).
[1234] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 540: Peter Heylyn suggested that one of the reasons for Laud's difficulties was his 'reserved, and implausible humo[u]r' by which 'he so far lost the love of his own Dioces[e] (the Gentry whereof he neither entertained at *Canterbury*, nor feasted at *Lambeth*, as all his Predecessors had done before him) that one of them who served in Parliament for the County of *Kent*, threw the first dirt at him.'
[1235] James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 172.
[1236] Kim, 'Scottish-English-Romish Book', pp. 14–32. Taking the line adopted by Sharpe, Lang–Kim argues that 'the role played by the king … was no smaller than that of any other individual': ibid., p. 30
[1237] Cf. James, *'This Great Firebrand'*, p. 6, n. 19.
[1238] Ibid., p. 33: See also ibid., p. 144: 'Laud's proximity to the king'.
[1239] Ibid., p. 144.

what Leonie James calls Laud's 'personal damage–limitation strategy' where his priority became 'survival, rather than veracity' in his later dealings with Scotland.[1240] Laud was acutely – even expertly – adept at negotiating the unwritten rules of a composite monarchy.[1241]

Laudianism was far more than a polemical construct; it was, amongst other things, a distinct and fully inhabited identity, movement and program of beliefs. It was less a close–knit faction than a loose grouping. Lake, MacCulloch and Tyacke, *et al.*, have spilt much ink over the last few decades trying to sober us from the very potent 'English' exceptionalism of the *via media* approach.[1242] It still remains prevalent, of course, in much writing on the seventeenth–century church. Such difficulties may lead to the ossification of understanding where complexity and qualification give way to fixed patterns of explanation. Stripped of easy nuance, such hyperbolic characterisations can inhibit accurate portrayals of the archbishop within the English commonwealth.[1243] 'There is no need', as Ian Atherton concludes, 'to abandon the term 'Laudian' … in the collective case of Caroline England.'[1244] Religion has remained the only constant problem in the revisionism of the 1970s. Revisionism has, oddly enough, taken a Gardinerian turn in recent decades with its newfound emphasis upon radicalism ignited by an incipient Arminianism,[1245] the free play of high political manoeuvre and circumstance. Revisionism has come to the conclusion that England was less an ideologically–driven 'crisis', a struggle for sovereign power in the state, than a total

---

[1240] Ibid., p. 136.

[1241] Lang–Kim positions the king in complete control ('the Caroline ecclesiastical policy was dominated by the king himself': idem, 'The Scottish-English-Romish Book', p. 20) with Laud playing a 'less deep', fairly subordinate, role in the composition of the Scottish Prayer Book: ibid., p. 22. Although he later admits that there is 'ample evidence' that point to Laud's influence, 'it is wrong to say that Laud alone was responsible for the new liturgy': pp. 24–25. Contrary to his findings, it is hard to accept Lang–Kim's conclusion of a 'most active' royal master (ibid., p. 22), similar to Davies' faulty characterisation in *Caroline Captivity,* while the archbishop remains merely a bystander of 'relative detachment': ibid., p. 23. No doubt the king played an undoubtedly important role in 1637, but Laud also had been heavily involved in the whole process of composition of the Scottish Prayer Book or, at least, that was 'the public perception': K.M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603–1715* (1992), p. 109.

[1242] See, e.g., P. Lake, 'The Moderate and Irenic Case for Religious War: Joseph Hall's *Via Media* in Context', in S.D. Amussen *et al.* (eds) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe: Essays Presented to David Underdown* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 55–83; MacCulloch, 'English Reformation', esp. pp. 8–11; and Tyacke, *Anti–Calvinists, passim.*

[1243] For the changing uses of 'commonwealth', see C. Holmes, 'Parliament, Liberty, Taxation, and Property', in J.H. Hexter (ed.), *Parliament and Liberty: From the Reign of Elizabeth to the English Civil War* (Stanford, 1992), pp. 122–54.

[1244] Atherton, *Scudamore,* p. 79.

[1245] S.R. Gardiner, *Cromwell's Place in History* (1897), pp. 3–7, at pp. 3 and 6: Puritanism was 'a mere backwater' wholly alien to 'the master current of the age' as represented by Hooker, Bacon and Shakespeare and linked (somewhat accidentally) with political opposition due to the severe provocations of Archbishop Laud. Revisionists, to reduce it down to the pure basics, 'privilege archives simply because they are dusty': D. Purkiss, *The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth–Century Representations* (1996), p. 71.

breakdown of a broad procedural consensus resulting from the abuses of a distant and an increasingly deceptive monarch. Hostility to the clergy was not confined to specific members of the social elite either. It also provoked many shocking anticlerical riots: the attack on Laud's palace in May 1640, for example, as well as the demonstrations around, and the mass picketing of, Parliament in December 1641.[1246]

Scholars have, indeed, highlighted the very subjective and overtly polemical agenda of Prynne's account. Meanwhile, Prynne himself admitted that he intended to show that Laud 'Trayterously *endeavoured to subvert the fundamentall Lawes and Government of the Kingdome of England'*.[1247] Laud lived in constant uncertainty about where he stood with his royal master; he found Charles I's mind and character especially hard to read.[1248] If the identification of Laudianism with crypto–Catholicism was also a crude – and, in some cases, disingenuous – over–simplification, it might well be pleaded that it was no more so than Laud's failure to distinguish between moderate and radical anti–episcopal Puritans. It should be added that Laud (and his junior subordinates) seldom put themselves out 'to dispel the popular identification of Laudian' with popery and superstition[1249] or, indeed, that they ever showed moderation, caution and tact in introducing such practices.[1250] Laud's personal admission that Rome might be a true Church was too tame and far too unemphatic – corrupt, it may be, but not Antichrist! An incorrigible set of historians, including George Bernard, Julian Davies and Peter White, have argued that Laudianism was merely – that is, not only rhetorically – in continuity with the Jacobean, even Elizabethan, Church: the aggressive face of conformity. There has been surprisingly little disagreement about his essential characteristics as a man or as an archbishop, however. His refined sensibilities were not those usually associated with the head of the church – an introverted recluse much like

---

[1246] For accounts of these social disturbances, see B. Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution, 1640–1649* (1976), ch. 4 and K. Lindley, *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 4–6 and 105–13. See also much later Norfolk Record Office, KNY 615: John Holland to Lady Bell, n.d. 1649: 'How great are the difficultyes wee are in.'
[1247] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, sig. H1r. On the subjective nature and problems with William Prynne's account, see Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 119–20.
[1248] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, p. 50: 'it is significant that no fully satisfactory biography of him [Laud] has yet been written.'
[1249] Ashton, *English Civil War*, p. 112.
[1250] Laud was not as tactically moderate or as pragmatic a reformer as some scholars have suggested: Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, pp. 302–3 and Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 533, n. 10. Milton argues that Laud's opponents were tenuously held together by 'a common style of discourse': ibid., p. 543. His central argument challenges an underlying assumption of revisionist historians – namely, that the 'Calvinist consensus' of the Jacobean era was a uniform and straightforward entity.

the reigning monarch. '*Little* Will', as the archbishop soon became known, was left with little, if any, dignity intact during the early 1640s.[1251] Wentworth's religious views, however, were largely determined by his political ideals, in particular his belief in an ordered and obedient society.[1252] He pursued his tasks in government – newly elevated to an earldom in January 1639–40 – with a great deal of effort and in all seriousness.[1253] Charles I's over–compensating desire for order and uniformity in the face of 'popularity' coloured all aspects of his rule.[1254] There have been some crude attempts at analyzing the 'psychological origins' of Laud's own mindset,[1255] but it remains deeply problematic. He, indeed, was 'Charles' chief minister in England'[1256] but a clear and thoroughly consistent portrait of his psychological make–up *probably* remains out of our grasp.

Understanding the protean nature of early Stuart Protestant(ism) has aided us, however, with the fraught business of elucidating the nature of the church and of mapping some of its key fissile tendencies. The Kentish Parliament–man Edward Dering, for instance, was alarmed enough to write to Laud about the separatist sect led by 'the greate Leader … Fenner' which, *inter alia*, denied any 'covenant betweene God and us', denied that England had a 'true Church' and rejected parts of 'the Apostle['s] creede' as anathema to the faith.[1257] Indeed, the early Stuart Church was a complicated organisation –

[1251] *A Dreame: or, Newes from Hell* (1641), p. 8. Considering Milton's argument about the desire of clerics during the early 1640s to hurriedly – and shamelessly – distance themselves from Laudianism, see further idem, in Adamson (ed.), 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in *English Civil Wars*, p. 65**.**

[1252] Wentworth bowed at the name of Jesus not due to any discernible religious principle, but because it was expected of him by the king. Rather than leaving him at a physical distance, Charles I had personally chosen to place him away from the court, where his talent for revenue–raising would be maximized and Charles I would seldom be intimidated by his overbearing presence. He retained suspicions that were bred during the late 1620s – e.g., the Force Loan controversy of 1626–7 – that Wentworth was not fully a supporter.

[1253] Wentworth wrote to the Marquess of Hamilton in late March 1639–40, informing him that he was rather busy raising eight thousand foot soldiers, but would need some assistance from England: 'I beseeche your Lo[rdshi]p to mention thus much w[i]thall to his Ma[jest]y, that if I be not punctually performed w[i]th in thes[e] respectts, I shall not daire to take the chardge upon me, in regarde I judge alltogeither impossible to carry his ends thorow, if I be disappointed of thes[e] soe absolut[e]ly necessarye succours' (NRS, GD406/1/803: Wentworth to Hamilton, 24 Mar. 1639–40). He told Hamilton that he, as well as the invasion forces, would be 'ready to enter Scotlande by the last of June': ibid. Wentworth, however, coldly informed Henry Vane that he was willing to correspond with Hamilton 'as becomes the Dignity of the person and the Good of His Ma[jes]ties['] Affaires': WWM, Str P 10(b)/55: Wentworth to Henry Vane, 16 April 1639 and WWM, Str P 10(b)/90: same to same, 21 May 1639.

[1254] R. Cust, 'Charles I and Popularity', in idem *et al.* (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 235–58. See also Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots*, p. 215 for 'Charles's political incompetence'.

[1255] L. Namier, *Personalities and Powers* (1955), pp. 3–4, at p. 3; See also Carlton, *Laud*, p. 56, for an in–depth, if slightly imbalanced, account of Laud's chronic insecurity and a study of 'a man worried to the point of neurosis.'

[1256] A.I. Macinnes,'The Origin and Organization of the Covenanting Movement During the Reign of Charles I, 1625–41; With a Particular Reference to the West of Scotland' (Univ. of Glasgow Ph.D. thesis, 1987), p. 329.

[1257] KHLC, U350/C2/54: Dering to Laud, 20 Jan. 1635–6. Dering had previously been engaged in the reconversion of individuals to the Church of England. See, e.g., KHLC, U350/C2/53: Mr Carpenter to Dering, n.d. 1635, speaks of Laud's helpful suggestions towards 'some stay and Encouragement.'

Archbishop Laud, it was alleged, was also the recipient of 'unLawfull Guifts & Bribes'[1258] and has been esteemed and reviled in almost equal measure but never entirely ignored. His character has been set in stone for so long that it is almost impossible to imagine it chiselled differently. Laud seldom wrote or discussed much about the development of his personal views.[1259] Though he much later claimed that the Pope was indeed Anti–Christ,[1260] Laud upheld throughout his life a very moderate position on the identity of the supreme pontiff. 'His Causing of Superstitious pictures, images,[1261] and Crucifixes to bee sett uppe in many Churches' aroused much discontent in local parishes and London.[1262] Irrespective of whether or not they are based on any substantive reality at all, the sheer potency of religious fears that Kevin Sharpe, amongst others, is left baffled by (and thus unable to fully explain) unlocks this intense hatred, which, he later goes on to concede,[1263] was exhibited towards 'the most controversial and significant man in Charles I's government'.[1264] The most effective instrument in securing – and, most importantly, keeping – a subject's affections was the episcopate, whose nomination to which was entirely in the king's power. As Edward Hyde explained, 'There is no question [that] the Clergy will always have an extraordinary influence upon the people'.[1265] Given my earlier strictures on the dangers of getting stuck inside the world–view and self–presentation of Laud, a story largely or solely articulated from his clerical point–of–view, we must beware also of its damning limitations. There is, of course, always a temptation – which recent historians have perhaps given into a touch too easily – simply to accept the self–valuation of many

---

[1258] Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 28 Mar. 1644 (Entry misdated as 29 Mar. 1644).

[1259] Laud tended not to be verbose concerning his motive(s). See also Bernard, 'Church of England, c.1529–c.1642', p. 196: 'He [Laud] framed no new doctrinal articles, wrote no new catechism, published little.'

[1260] 'It was never held by me [Laud] that the Pope is *not* Anti[–]christ': Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 64 (my italics). For further comments on the nature of the pope's identity, see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 149–50 and 372–3. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 42r: 'He [Laud] never had any Intelligence or practise with the Pope by Priests, Agents, or Messengers directly or indirectly.' During his trial on the eighteenth day in 1644, however, Laud denounced the calling of the pope 'Anti–Christ' as a strategy which 'did [n]ever yet convert an understanding Papist': Laud, *Works*, iv, p. 309.

[1261] BL, Add. MS 20065, fo. 21v: Robert Skinner, a Laudian bishop of Bristol, still condemned Rome ('as manie doe') as guilty of worshipping images in 1630s.

[1262] Worcester College, Clarke MS 71: 20 May 1644. See also BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 79v: 'ArchB[isho]ps[,] B[isho]ps[,] Cathedrall Colleges[,] Churches … shall pay … their Fines & improved Rents' (2 July 1641).

[1263] Sharpe agrees with the Lord Deputy's perspective. See, e.g., idem, *Personal Rule*, p. 764: 'Wentworth's sense that the trial [of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick in 1637] marked a critical moment was not over–dramatization.' Sharpe is even, unlike Peter White, prepared to admit the existence of 'a series of bitter contests': ibid., p. 360.

[1264] James, 'Introduction', p. xx.

[1265] *State Papers Collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon*, eds R. Scrope and T. Monkhouse (3 vols, Oxford, 1767–86), ii, p. 365: Hyde to Richard Harding, 2 May 1647. See also R Clifton, 'The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution', *Past and Present*, 52 (1971), p. 23: 'studies of the opposition to … Archbishop Laud … assume but do not analyse deep wells of hatred and fear … at all levels of society.'

Caroline insiders like Laud as paragons of ever–expanding virtue and zeal, selfless servants of the commonweal and the gospel. Laud, indeed, was 'a man of few close contacts and fewer warm friendships.'[1266]

Laud's aims and objectives might be discerned in his grasp of theology: if only he could push forward Richard Hooker's discomforts over predestination a little further and then wait for the cold embrace of Charles I.[1267] For some reason not fully explored, still less explained, Laud's renewed drive to reinforce the sacredness of ritual and worship aroused great levels of opposition among MPs. The arrest of Wentworth and the impeachment of Laud altered these faulty dynamics of power. If Durham House had provided a suitable venue for the ability to associate, nourish and propagate individual ambitions, they could sufficiently prepare for future triumph. It should be understood that no claims are being made here for the spiritual superiority of 'Laudianism' over any other religious tradition. Such claims are above and beyond the historian's remit. Laud's natural caution and acute awareness of the absence of full canonical backing for policies such as the altar made him appear secondary in his thinking.[1268] No stranger to the operation of court patronage,[1269] Laud acquired several influential backers, including the Duke of Buckingham,[1270] in the mid–to–late 1620s. For he was a practical but 'a pragmaticall man', [1271] prepared to endure the dust and the heat, the opposition and the hatred, which attends those who seek to realise the ideals which strict theologians like Lancelot Andrewes or Richard Hooker from the serene comfort of their studies have outlined to an admiring world.

Laud promised to uphold, both publicly and privately, the estimation and peace of the Church. The prospect of a revivified clericalism under Arminian auspices,[1272] however,

---

1266 P. Gregg, *Charles I* (1981), p. 243.
1267 Cf. Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 304: Laud, 'whose true intentions were easily open to misconstruction.'
1268 Cf. Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 68: 'there can be no serious doubt that Laud wholeheartedly supported the altar policy.' No blemish of the Caroline Church, however, was more prominent or more wounding to the Puritan conscience than the altar policy. For the sheer complexity of its evolution, see Fincham, 'Restoration', pp. 919–40.
1269 According to Peter Heylyn, Laud became 'as it were his Majesties['] Secretary for all Church Concernments' as early as 1625: idem, *Cyprianus*, p. 140.
1270 Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, i, p. 160: Buckingham helped Laud to be 'transplanted out of his cold barren diocese of St. David's, into a warmer climate': ibid. See also Le Bas, *Laud*, p. 60: 'The performance of Laud, in his conference with Fisher, brought him into close and confidential intercourse with Buckingham.' See as well Hawkins, 'Government', p. 47: 'Laud owed much to Buckingham.' The duke had shown interest in the arguments which the Jesuits, such as Percy, were using at the time to make converts ('thought popish'): Bodl., MS Rawl. D.853, fo. 172r (Richard Corbett to the duke of Buckingham 2 Jan n.d.)
1271 SRO, D1287/18/2: Mr Gee's report to Bridgeman about his conference with Thomas Canon, 15 Apr. 1633 (P/1006/39).
1272 Southcot thought that 'the Arminians here do multiply a pace' and Laud 'who is very gratious with the king, and

alarmed Calvinists as much as it heartened Laud. The Jacobean Church had been built upon a series of ambiguities that the Caroline Church did little, if anything, to clarify.[1273] The Elizabethan debates of the 1590s furnished a crucial intellectual context for the conflicts of this period.[1274] It is important to remind us of the traumatic history of the early Stuart church.[1275] Little, if any, credence can be attached to such a verdict of Peter Heylyn's, that the purity of the Elizabethan and Jacobean churches was absolute, the '*Principles* and *Positions*, [that] the *Reformation* of this Church did [at] first proceed', and that there was a broadly acceptable spectrum of beliefs and practices.[1276] For this view there is not the slightest shred of evidence. It would be over–hasty even to declare it as possibly reasonable. It seems fair to conclude, therefore, that Prynne's prophecy a decade earlier that Laud's life would eventually end in 'misery, ruyne, if not in hell it self' was foreboding and tellingly accurate.[1277] However, political and ecclesiastical businesses rapidly increased during the decade: Laud became Chancellor of University of Oxford in 1630; primary overseer for the repair of St Paul's Cathedral in 1631; archbishop of Canterbury in 1633; Chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin also in 1633; and leading commissioner of the Treasury in 1635–6.[1278]

One of the more problematic tasks that the historian must face is the relative assessment of individual opinions and the due motives for the sheer multitude of their actions. How much more troublesome to assess the purpose of a figure for whom such sources are very slight, whose ideas are set out in the shortest (and slightest) of tracts, and whose opinions seem to represent little more than a mass of contradictions? Scholars have tended to fasten on one specific motive, either his career problems (especially at Oxford),[1279] his anti–Calvinism or his latent sympathies with Roman ideology, and to give that as the reason for his faith. But to take him one–dimensionally (as this approach does) is to misinterpret why such a figure as he might have advanced such an agenda

---

dispacheth all things belonging to matters of religion, intendeth to do his best for the suppressing of the new separists (as here we call them) who will not conforme them selves to the religion of England, saying it is altogeather papisticall': Questier, ed., *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, p. 99: idem to Biddulph, 22 June 1632.

1273 For much more on the Jacobean Church, see Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*. Amongst many other things, it was an edifice steeped in Calvinist theology and practice.

1274 See further Guy (ed.), *Reign of Elizabeth*, esp. intro, chs 1, 6 and 7.

1275 Cf. A. Milton, *England's Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625–1662* (Cambridge, 2021), p. 68: 'a very singular and selective reading of the history of the existing Church of England.'

1276 Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, p. 1.

1277 BL, Add. MS 5994, fo. 195r.

1278 WWM, Str P 15/263: Treasury commissioners to Wentworth, 18 Nov. 1635.

1279 Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 94–5, for Laud's involvement in predestinarian controversies in Oxford.

and to adopt an artificially clarified politicisation of his motives. The archbishop's personality, policies and practices have been so long judged contemptible that he has seldom been the subject of scrutiny. So formidable and exhaustive a store of manuscript sources are the documents for the study of Laud that, for deciphering, what at times have appeared indecipherable, namely Laud's foul annotations in abbreviated Latin, are, in fact, stimulatingly provocative and authoritative.

There can be few seventeenth–century figures whose papers are so frequently consulted and quoted by scholars as those of William Laud, yet who have been so sadly neglected as historical figures. Laud never wrote at length on episcopacy, *jure divino* or not,[1280] nor did he ever have a judgement on what he believed to be the ecclesiastical status of the continental Protestant churches. Plus, the reception of Laudianism at the grass–roots level remains allusive at best. The process of demonisation began in the 1640s among Puritan polemicists who sought to blacken the reputation of the archbishop: the polemical stereotyping and soteriological abstractions which scholars have too often marginalised as merely 'preacher's talk' were fundamental to their crusade. While Geoffrey Elton enjoyed making the occasional polemical foray into areas outside his official scholarly specialism/s,[1281] most historians have adopted the post–revisionist nametag and continued in the idyllic pursuit of 'an absolute Papist in all matters of Ceremony, pompe and externall worship'.[1282] At least in the early stages, the peers in the Long Parliament pursued reform in an entirely conventional, even conservative, manner,[1283] but political deadlocks and the king's stubbornness conspired against their traditional means. For the historian of ecclesiastical history, however, no periods of history are perhaps more frustrating – and yet, indeed, intellectually rewarding – than

---

1280 Carlton, *Laud*, p. 174: 'Laud was a poor communicator.'

1281 G. R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government* (Cambridge, 4 vols, 1974–92), ii, chs 27–9. See, e.g., ibid., ii, ch. 27, p. 163: 'the bluster and tempest of conflict have distracted historians too readily from asking some really searching questions'.

1282 W. Prynne, *Rome*[']s *Master–peece* (1643), p. 29. See also Bodl., MS Tanner 65, fo. 236r: Harbottle Grimston (18 Dec. 1640) called Laud 'the stye of all the pestilentiall ffilth' in the Long Parliament. See also idem, *Mr Grymston*[']*s speech in Parliament*, p. 2: 'the stye of all Pestilent filth, that hath infected the State, and Government of the Church and Common–wealth'.

1283 BL, Harl. MS 6424, fo. 97r: '[Denzil] Holles from the C[ommons] desires [that the] 13 B[isho]ps be brought to speedy answer' (23 Oct. 1640). See also Parliamentary Archives, BRY MS 8, p. 3: 'He [Laud] was acquitted by this house from any [unknown] of printing his [Roger Maynwaring's] sermons; inquiry being made by B[isho]p of Lyncolne.' See, however, the Petition of the Twelve Peers to which Richard Dyott, for instance, took offence. See, e.g., SRO, D661/11/1/5/c: Dyott to his father, Anthony, 7 Sept. 1640: 'Many doe wonder, that at such a season, when the Scots had gott sure footing in the land, & the King had bin at soe immense a charge in raising, furnishing, & paying soe great an Army, such a petic[i]on [of the Twelve Peers] should be offered; whereby this intended action should be retarded, discountenanced, & indeed overthrown. But wee must not imagine that the intenc[i]on of such noble Lords was other, then hono[u]rable as tending to the weale of both kingdomes.'

those that fall between 1633 and 1645. Laud's authoritarian aspirations, his administrative zeal and his passion for efficiency – the dogmatic advocacy of 'Thorough' policies, for example – has been admired but seldom scrutinised. William Laud has long been – and will continue to be – remembered as a prolific theologian who was an important influence on the Caroline Arminian movement.[1284] Is there no way in which Laud's political character and reputation can be redeemed, though? Obsessed with maintaining order and a unitary orthodoxy, 'avant–garde' conformists were tied very closely to people at the centre of the establishment. The success or failure of Laudianism is difficult to document; they – the historians, that are – rarely descend into particulars:

> Aside from Diarmaid MacCulloch's magisterial biography of Cranmer, we still await modern reassessments of numerous archbishops of the reformed Church of England central to their time … [for instance] Laud[1285]

This study has revolved around the several and much varied assessments of Laud's character and purpose, an unwilling practitioner of the political arts of persuasion and compromise. The paucity of material dealing with his early life and the nature of Laud's mind – sensitive and fastidious, almost 'discreet'[1286] – did not sustain the self–imposed burden of precise scholarship. Despite intellectual restlessness, a strong underlying strain was for submission to authority. He sought an infallible guide. It is a measure of the historiographical distortion of Laud that we have failed to recognise this point, but there is always a strong claim to a place of respect in the estimation of posterity. The slandering of his name has pervaded the historical discourse to such an extent that historians have come to accept much of it as true. Scholars, however, continue with increasing sophistication and precision to investigate the aspirations of the episcopate. My aim has not been merely to isolate or delineate a particular mode of Laudian discourse, as it were, for its own sake. As well as an exercise in ideology critique, this thesis has been intended as a species of ecclesiastical history – a somewhat episodic and schematic narrative at best. The efforts of the state to use almost identical modes

---

[1284] CUL, MS Add. 90, fo. 70r: 'to consider in p[ar]ticular how far the A[rch]B[isho]p of Cant[erbury] has been an Author in all the proceedings … & in the great design of the subversion of the laws of the Realm and of the Religion'.
[1285] K. Fincham, '*Archbishop Grindal 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (1979)', *History*, 100 (2015), p. 541. See also J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984), p. 187: 'But perhaps we should not suppose that Laud got everything wrong.'
[1286] Bodl., MS Tanner 72, fo. 292v: On 7 Aug. 1628, Edward Kellet, prebendary of Wells, wrote that 'Bishop Laud[:] his discreet proceedings, are too wise for mee, & did somewhat deject mee'.

of discourse to wrest the same conjectures has, indeed, led to the identification of 'Protestant England' as a fraught and complicated project, not an inevitable process.[1287] The suggestion that Laudianism might also perhaps best be seen as 'a process' has proven one of the most fecund recent interventions in pre–Civil War historiography.[1288] '4 lords of the Counsell' were imprisoned in late 1640 – Laud and Wentworth amongst them[1289] – and so began a long and arduous journey towards Laud's execution in 1644–5.[1290] Laud became a victim of a governmental system that impoverished the church – and the crown – with each succeeding decade. He was also a victim of an upsurge in anti–Catholic bigotry, a victim of a changing attitude among the noble elites about the relationship between subject versus sovereign and, finally, a victim of the historical myths that have defined his personality and character. We have moved a great deal on since we believed that 'almost all was well in religion until William Laud spoiled things.'[1291]

[1287] See, e.g., C. Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993) and 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation', *Past and Present*, 93 (1981), pp. 37–69, at p. 39: 'the English Reformation was not a precise and dramatic event, it was a long and complex process.'

[1288] See, esp., Milton, 'Creation of Laudianism', p. 177.

[1289] CALS, DSS 1/7/57: John Moyle to Somerford Oldfield, n.d. Dec. 1640: 'mie Lo[rd] of Canterb[urie] [Laud][,] mie Lord Deputie [Wentworth] & mie Lord Keeper [Finch] & mie Lord Cottington'.

[1290] His funeral sermon was 'read without spectacles … he read this speech, or rather spoke this sermon looking on his pap[er] at the beginning of every sentence, standing all that while leaning upon the great crosse–barre of the scaffold, before he began, when signes for silence were made' on 10 Jan. 1644–5: St John's College, MS 260, fo. 2r.

[1291] C. Haigh, [Review of D. MacCulloch's *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*], *JEH*, 43 (1992), p. 485.

Bibliography

The place of publication is London, unless otherwise stated.

Primary Sources: Manuscripts

Archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle

MSS 14 and 15

Sy: Y.I.47

Bodleian Library, Oxford (Bodl.)

MS Add. C. 286

MS Add. D.111, fo. 186r: George Montaigne to the Duke of Buckingham, 29 Jan. 1621–2

MSS Carte 1 and 103

MSS Clarendon 7, 16 and 29

MSS Douce 173 and 393

MS Eng. Hist. e. 28

MS Eng. Poetry e. 14

MS Jones 17

MS Laud Misc. 760

MS Rawl. A.289

MS Rawl. B.158

MS Rawl. B.372

MS Rawl. C.197

MS Rawl. D.853

MS Rawl. D.1290

MS Rawl. Letters 89

MS Rawl. Poet 26

MS Sancroft 18

MSS Tanner 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 114, 142, 299 and 314

MS Willis 58

Bristol Archives

AC/36074/136d: Baynam Throckmorton to Thomas Smyth, 21 Nov. 1640 (‘Records of the Smyth family of Ashton Court’)

AC/36074/137b: Charles Howard to Smyth, 7 Jan. 1640–1

British Library, London (BL)

Add. MS 5461

Add. MS 5994

Add. MS 11045

Add. MS 11308

Add. MS 11764

Add. MS 14828

Add. MS 15567

Add. MS 19398

Add. MS 19832

Add. MS 20065

Add. MS 21935

Add. MS 27357

Add. MS 28000

Add. MS 28103

Add. MS 31116

Add. MS 33936

Add. MS 34253

Add. MS 35331

Add. MS 35838

Add. MS 36450

Add. MS 37719

Add. MS 46885A

Add. MS 64917

Add. MS 64921

Add. MS 69868

Add. MS 69886

Add. MS 70002

Add. MS 78268

Egerton MS 1820

Egerton MS 2597

Egerton MS 2978

Harl. MSS 162, 163, 164 and 166

Harl. MS 383

Harl. MS 385

Harl. MS 390

Harl. MS 476

Harl. MS 477

Harl. MS 764

Harl. MS 1026

Harl. MS 1581

Harl. MS 1601

Harl. MS 2233

Harl. MS 4022

Harl. MS 4931

Harl. MS 6424

Harl. MS 7000

Sloane MS 1467

Sloane MS 3317

Stowe MS 159

Stowe MS 187

Stowe MS 326

Stowe MS 361

<u>Cambridge University Library (CUL)</u>

MS Add. 44/6

MS Add. 89

MS Add. 90

MS Add. 6863

MS Add. 7339/137: Laud to Arthur Ingram, 19 June 1638

MS Dd.2.21

MS Dd.6.23

MS Kk.6.38

MS Mm. I. 45

MS Mm. I. 46

<u>Chatsworth House, Derbyshire</u>

Cork MSS Box 17/92

Cork MSS Box 17/108

Cork MSS Box 18/3

Cork MSS Box 18/4

Cork MSS Box 18/7

Cork MSS Box 18/60

Cork MSS Box 18/111

Cork MSS Box 18/130

Cork MSS Box 18/134

Cork MSS Box 19/51

Cork MSS Box 20/108

Cork MSS Box 21/75

Cork MSS Box 21/92A

Cork MSS Box 22/40

Cork Miscellaneous Letterbooks II and III

Cheshire Archives and Local Studies (CALS)

112263: John Bridgeman to Laud, 18 Dec. 1638

CR/63/2/19

DLT/B18

DLT/B43

DSS 1/7/57: John Moyle to Somerford Oldfield, n.d. Dec. 1640

EDC 5/1637/9

EDC 5/1637/32

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

MS 318, fo. 139r: 4 Dec. 1584

Essex Record Office (ERO)

T/B 9/1

Dublin City Library and Archive

Gilbert MS 169

Durham University Library

Mickleton and Spearman Manuscripts MS 26/74: Richard Steward to Edward Hyde, n.d. but *c.*1647

Gloucestershire Archives

Gloucester Diocesan Records 93

Hampshire Record Office

Henry Sherfield papers: MS 44M69/L35/52

Henry Sherfield papers: MS 44M69/L39/88

Harvard University

Houghton Library, MS 1359

Hull History Centre

C BRI/23–24

Hull Univ. Archives

U DDEV/79/H10: A. Guthrie to Earl of Nithsdale, 7 Feb. 1635–6

Huntington Library, California

MS 80

John Rylands Research Institute and Library, Manchester

Legh of Lyme Correspondence, Box 3, Folder 9: Richard Parr to Thomas Legh, 3 Aug. 1638.

Kent History and Library Centre (KHLC)

U269/1/CP40: Earl of Dorset to Earl of Middlesex, 1 Oct. 1636

U269/C267/12: Earl of Bath to Countess of Bath, 29 Apr. 1641

U350/C2/53: Mr Carpenter to Edward Dering, n.d. 1635

U350/C2/54: Dering to Laud, 20 Jan. 1635–6

U1475/C85/4: Earl of Northumberland to Earl of Leicester, 12 Dec. 1639

U1475/C85/19: Northumberland to Leicester, 13 Nov. 1640

U1475/C85/21: Northumberland to Leicester, 26 Nov. 1640

Lambeth Palace Library, London (LPL)

COMM I/145: Laud to John Birkenhead, 8 Jan. 1644–5.

MS 943

MS 1030

MS 1253

MS 1372

MS 2686

MS 3516

Lancashire Archives

DDHu/46/21: John Pym to William Jessop, 3 Sept. 1640

Lincolnshire Archives

DIOC Vj 30

London Metropolitan Archives

DL/A/A/007/MS09531/015

DL/C/343

Manchester Central Library

M35/5/3/7

National Archives of Ireland

MS 2445, fo. 331r: Viscount Falkland to Charles Coote, 18 Aug. 1633

National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London (NAL, V&A)

Forster MS 30: Prince–Elector Charles Louis of the Palatinate to Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia, 18 May 1641

Forster MS 48 G 23, Item 4: Wentworth to Earl of Carlisle, 24 Sept. 1632

Forster MS 48 G 25, Item 7: Charles Louis to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 31 May 1636

National Library of Wales (NLW)

MS 467E/1683: Maurice Wynn to Owen Wynn, *c.* Apr. 1641

MS 9062E/1678: Wynn to Owen Wynn, 22 [23] Mar. 1640–1

MS 9063E/1681: Wynn to Owen Wynn, 30 Mar. 1641

National Records of Scotland (NRS)

GD406/1/167: Charles I to Marquess of Hamilton, 2 Dec. 1642

GD406/1/564: Hamilton to Laud, 24 Sept. 1638

GD406/1/569: Hamilton to Laud, 22 Oct. 1638

GD406/1/570: Hamilton to Laud, 24 Oct. 1638

GD406/1/803: Wentworth to Hamilton, 24 Mar. 1639–40

GD406/1/10550: Charles I to Hamilton, 10 May 1639

GD406/1/1234: Wentworth to Hamilton, n.d.

GD406/1/1335: Wentworth to Hamilton, 24 Apr. 1641

GD406/1/1419: Essex to Hamilton, 30 Aug. 1641.

New College, Oxford

MS 9502

Norfolk Record Office

KNY 615: John Holland to Lady Bell, n.d. 1649

Parliamentary Archives

BRY MS 8

HL/PO/JO/5/1/7

HL/PO/JO/10/1/183/13: Charles I to Henrietta Maria, 14 Jan. 1644–5.

Prior’s Kitchen, Durham

Hunter MS 67, item 14

Sheffield City Archives

Strafford Papers (Str P/s): 1, 2, 3, 3(ii). 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10(a), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 34 and 40

Sherborne Castle, Dorset

Digby MSS, FAM/C/I: Earl of Cork to Lady Offaly, 1 Mar. 1639–40

Somerset Heritage Centre

DD/PH/221, fo. 30r–v (n.d. 1635: Robert Phelips)

Staffordshire Record Office (SRO)

B/C/5/1630/26

B/C/5/1634 Wem

D593/V/4/1 (*A Necessary Introduction to the Historie of the Archbishop of Canterbury his Tryall*).

D661/11/1/5/a

D661/11/1/5/c

D661/20/2

D1287/18/2

D(W)1778/I/i/12: William Davenant to William Legge, 19 Jan. 1640–1

D(W)1778/I/i/14: Daniel O'Neille to Legge, 23 Feb. 1640–1

Q/SR/214, no. 4

Q/SR/217, no. 29

St John's College, Cambridge

MS L.12

St John's College, Oxford

MS 166

MS 260

MS 317

Surrey History Centre

G52/2/19(8): Edward Nicholas to Charles I, 18 Aug. 1641

G52/2/19/22: Nicholas to Thomas Webb, 12 Oct. 1641

The National Archives, Kew (TNA)

C 115/105/8158: John Flower to Viscount Scudamore, 21 Sept. 1633

C 115/106/8386: John Pory to Scudamore, 17 Dec. 1631

C 115/106/8405 and 8406: Pory to Scudamore, 26 May and 9 June 1632

C 115/106/8436: Edmund Rossingham to Scudamore, 3 Oct. 1634

SP 81/38, fo. 312r: Roe to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 1 July 1632

SP 14/66, fo. 27r: James I to Thomas Bilson, bishop of Winchester, 23 Sept. 1611

SP 16/20, fo. 20v

SP 16/87, fo. 68r: William Juxon to Laud, 26 Dec. 1627

SP 16/95, fo. 61r: Earl of Arundel to Charles I, 9 Mar. 1627–8

SP 16/95, fo. 105r: Conway to Arundel, 14 Mar. 1627–8

SP 16/96, fo. 24r: Arundel to Conway, 16 Mar. 1627–8

SP 16/108, fo. 159

SP 16/114, fo. 19r

SP 16/150, fo. 70r: Lord Keeper Coventry to Charles I, 12 Oct. 1629

SP 16/161, fo. 57r: Anonymous letter addressed to William [mistaken for John] Laud, 20 Feb. 1629–30

SP 16/163, fo. 45v: Charles I to Bridgeman, 21 Mar. 1629–30

SP 16/174, fo. 11r: Wentworth to Laud, 3 Oct. 1630

SP 16/182, fo. 73r: Dorchester to Earl of Pembroke, 14 Jan. 1630–1

SP 63/252, fos 99r–101v, at fo. 100v: Cork to Dorchester, 18 May 1631

SP 63/254, fo. 101r–2r: Bramhall to Laud, 10 Aug. 1633

SP 16/286, fo. 80v: Roe to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 5 Apr. 1635

SP 16/291, fo. 60r: Roe to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 23 June 1635

SP 16/298, fo. 18v: Garrard to Conway, 18 Sept. 1635

SP 16/331, fo. 26v: Garrard to Conway, 4 Sept. 1636

SP 16/331, fo. 38r: Goring to Conway, 6 Sept. 1636

SP 16/397, fo. 39v: information spoken by Captain Napier, 8 Aug. 1638

SP 16/442, fo. 95v: Thomas Smith to John Pennington, 17 Jan. 1639–40

SP 16/479, fo. 56r: Nathaniel Tomkyns to [John Lambe?], 12 Apr. 1641

SP 16/484, fo. 137r: John Lambe to Laud, 4 Oct. 1641

SP 16/529, fo. 15r: Earl of Pembroke to Carlisle, 31 Aug. 1628

SP 63/254, fo. 248r: Michael Boyle to Laud, 7 Mar. 1633–4

Trinity College, Dublin (TCD)

MS 809

MS 816

MS 836

MS 1180

Warwickshire County Record Office

CR2017/C1/104: Hamilton to Lord Feilding, 4 Nov. 1641

CR2017/C9/2: Harbottle Grimston, 25 Aug. 1642

CR2017/C48/9: Nicholas to Feilding, 13 Dec. 1631

West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds (WYAS)

WYL100/LA/8/4

WYL100/PO/1/51

WYL100/PO/7/II/16: George Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 Aug. 1634

WYL100/PO/7/II/20: Radcliffe to Ingram, 4 Nov. 1635

WYL100/PO/7/II/22: Radcliffe to Ingram, 7 Aug. 1637

University College London (UCL)

Special Collections, MS Ogden 7, Item 51

<u>Univ. of Edinburgh Library</u>

MS Dc.4.16.

<u>Univ. of Nottingham, Manuscripts and Special Collections</u>

MS Cl C 54: George Buttler to Gervase Clifton, 25 Oct. 1634

MS Cl C 73: Francis Cheynell to Clifton, n.d. July 1636

MS Cl C 77: Cheynell to Clifton, 24 Feb. 1636–7

MS Cl C 309: Robert Leeke to Clifton, 3 May 1637

MS Cl C 376: Edmund Raskington to Clifton, 8 Aug. 1635

MS Cl C 475: Christopher Wandesford to Clifton, 22 Feb. 1636–7

MS Cl C 660: Earl of Kingston to Clifton, 23 Jan. 1635–6

Portland Welbeck Collection, Pw V 73

Pw 1/667: Laud to Ingram, 21 July 1633

PW2/HY/173

<u>Worcester College, Oxford</u>

Clarke MS 71 (unfoliated)

<u>Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service</u>

705:73/14450/403/230: Thomas Aylesbury, 7 June 1632

705:73/14450/406/454: Laud to Lord Keeper Coventry, 14 Aug. 1633

705:73/14450/406/470: Thomas Yates, 9 Sept. 1633

<u>Primary Sources: Printed</u>

Acts of the Privy Council, Charles I (11 vols, 1929–64).

F. Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises & Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert late Earle of Essex and his Complices, Against her Maiestie and her Kingdoms* (1601).

R. Baillie, *The Canterburian*[’]*s Self–Conviction* (Glasgow, 1640).

J. Bastwick, *A Briefe Relation of Certaine Speciall, and Most Materiall Passages* (Amsterdam, 1638).

N. Bernard, *The Penitent Death of a Woefull Sinner* (Dublin, 1641).

A Dreame: or, Newes from Hell (1641).

N. Breton, *The Mother's Blessing* (1621).

A Briefe and Perfect Relation (1647).

H. Burton, *A Divine Tragedy* (Amsterdam, 1636).

T. Cadell and W. Davies (eds), *Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts on the Most Entertaining Subjects: Reign of King Charles I* (1810).

Canterburies Amazement (1641).

The Life of James, Duke of Ormond, ed. T. Carte (6 vols, Oxford, 1851).

G. Cavendish, *The Negotiations of Thomas Woolsey, The Great Cardinall of England* (1641).

T. Carte (ed.) *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851).

The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners Against Canterburie and the Lieutenant of Ireland (1641).

[Charles I], *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland* (1639).

[R. Chestlin], *Persecutio Undecima* (1648).

T. Clayton *et al.* (eds) *Works of Sir John Suckling* (2 vols, Oxford, 1971).

A Copie of a Letter Written from his Holinesse Court at Rome, to his Grace of Canterburies['] *Palace* (1642).

Wentworth Papers, 1597–1628, ed. J.P. Cooper (Camden 4th ser., vol. 12, 1973).

R. Cosin, *Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation* (1592).

A Declaration Shewing the Necessity of the Earle of Strafford[']*s Suffering* (1641).

E. Dering, *A Collection of Speeches … in Matter of Religion* (1642).

C. Downing, *A Discoursive Conjecture upon the Reasons that Produce a Desired Event of the Present Troubles in Great Britaine* (1641).

Eikon Basilike, ed. P.A. Knachel (New York, 1966).

L.C. Falkland, *A Speech Made to the House of Commons Concerning Episcopacy* (1641).

D. Featley, *The Gentle Lash, or, The Vindication of Dr. Featley, a Knowne Champion of the Protestant Religion* (1644).

H. Ferne, *Episcopacy and Presbytery Considered* (Oxford, 1644).

K. Fincham (ed.), *The Further Correspondence of William Laud* (Church of England Record Society, Woodbridge, 2018).

From the Commissioners of Scotland, 24 February, 1640 (1641).

Documents Relating to the Proceedings Against William Prynne, in 1634 and 1637, ed. S.R. Gardiner (Camden Soc., vol. 18, 1877).

Shorter Poems of Sir William Davenant, ed. A.M. Gibbs (Oxford, 1972)

H. Grimston, *Mr Grymston*[']*s Speech in Parliament upon the Accusation and Impeachment of William Laud, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, upon High Treason* (1641).

A.B. Grosart (ed.), *The Lismore Papers: Autobiographical Notes, Remembrances and Diaries of Sir Richard Boyle, first and 'Great' Earl of Cork* (2 ser., 5 vols, 1886).

H. Hammond, *A Vindication of Episcopacie* (1644).

__________, *Considerations of Present Use Concerning the Danger Resulting From the Change of Our Church Government* (1644).

__________, *Of the Power of the Keyes* (1647).

T. Herbert, *Vox Secunda Populi, Or, The Commons Gratitude to the Most Honorable Philip, Earle of Pembroke and Mongomery* [*sic*] (1641).

P. Heylyn, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate, the L. Archbishop of Canterbury* (1645).

_______, *A Survey of the Estates of France* (1656).

_______, *Historia Quinqu-Articularis* (3 vols, 1660).

_______, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668).

E. Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars* (8 vols, Oxford, 1826).

Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Hastings*, ed. F. Bickley (4 vols, 1928–47).

Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the Marquess of Abergavenny, Lord Braye, G.F. Luttrell, Esq.* (1887).

L. James (ed.) *The Household Accounts of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1635–1642* (Church of England Record Society, Woodbridge, 2019).

Journals of the House of Lords (147 vols, 1509–1916).

Selections from Clarendon, ed. G. Huehns (Oxford, 1955).

H. Killigrew, *A Sermon Preached Before the King*[']*s Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, 1643).

H. L'Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles* (1655).

A. Leighton, *An Appeal to Parliament; or Sion's Plea Against the Prelacie* (1629).

_______, *An Epitome or Briefe Discoverie* (1646).

Stuart Royal Proclamations, 1625–46, ed. J.F. Larkin (Oxford, 1983).

D. Laing (ed.), *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1841–2).

W. Laud, *A Sermon Preached Before His Maiesty, on Tuesday the Nineteenth of June, at Wansted* (1621).

________, *A Sermon Preached on Munday, the Sixt of February, at Westminster at the Opening of Parliament. By the Bishop of S. Davids* (1626).

________, *A Sermon Preached Before His Maiestie, on Wednesday, the Fift of July, at White–Hall* (1626).

_______, *A Speech Delivered in the Starr-Chamber* (1637).

_______, *Harangue Prononcee en la Chambre de l'Estoille* (Paris, 1637).

_______, *A Relation of the Conference Betweene William Laud … and Mr Fisher the Jesuite* (1639).

_______, *History of the Troubles and Tryal* (1695).

J. Ley, *Sunday a Sabbath* (1641).

Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe (1810), ed. T.D. Whitaker.

The Political Works of James I, ed. C.H. McIlwain (Cambridge, Mass., 1918).

Mercuries Message, Or the Coppy of a Letter sent to William Laud (1641).

O. Millar, *Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I* (Glasgow, 1960).

G. Morley, *A Modest Advertisement Concerning the Present Controversie About Church-Government* (1641).

New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot; The Black Box of Roome (1641).

O. Ormerod, *The Picture of a Puritane* (1605).

G. Ornsby (ed.), *The Correspondence of John Cosin* (2 vols, 1869–70).

H. Parker, *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* (1641).

A Perfect Journal of the Daily Proceedings and Transactions in that Memorable Parliament, Begun at Westminster, 3 November 1640 … (1641).

W Perkins, *The Works of … William Perkins* (3 vols, 1631).

J. Pocklington, *Altare Christianum* (1637).

W. Prynne, *The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Man's Estate* (1627).

_________, *Healthes Sicknesse* (1628).

________, *The Unlovelinesse of Love-lockes* (1628).

________, *The Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme* (1629).

________, *A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Prelates* (1636).

________, *A New Discovery* (1641).

_______, *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie* (1641).

_______, *Rome*[']s *Master–peece* (1643).

________, *The Arch–bishop of Canterburie his speech, or, His funeral sermon preached by himself on the scaffold on Tower–hill on Friday the tenth of January, 1645* (1645).

Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–1638: Catholicism and the Politics of the Personal Rule, ed. M.C. Questier (5th ser., 26, 2005).

A Reasonable Motion in the Behalfe of Such of the Clergie (1641).

The Works of … William Laud, eds W. Scott and J. Bliss (7 vols, Oxford, 1847–60).

R. Scrope and T. Monkhouse (eds), *State Papers Collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon* (3 vols, Oxford, 1767–86).

R. Shelford, *Five Pious and Learned Discourses* (Cambridge, 1635).

L.P. Smith (ed.), *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (2 vols, Oxford, 1907).

T. Stirry, *A Rot Among the Bishops* (1641).

R. Tedder, *A Sermon Preached at Wimondham in Norfolke, at the Primary Visitation of the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Matthew Wren, Lord Bishop of Norwich* (1637).

The Bishops Mittimus to Goe to Bedlam (1641).

The Bishops Potion (1641).

H. Thorndike, *Of the Government of Churches* (Cambridge, 1641).

D. Townshend, *The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork* (1904).

A True Relation of the Manner of the Execution of Thomas Earle of Strafford (1641).

G. Vernon, *Life of the Learned and Reverend Dr Peter Heylyn* (1682).

P. Warwick, *Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1813).

F. White, *An Examination and Confutation of a Lawlesse Pamphlet* (1637).

A. Wilson, *The History of Great Britain being the Life and Reign of King James the First* (1653).

G. Williams, *The Discovery of Mysteries* (1643).

J. Ussher, *The Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God* (1638)

Secondary Sources

J. Adamson, [Review of L.J. Reeve's *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*] *JEH*, 42 (1991), pp. 323–326.

_________, 'England Without Cromwell: What If Charles I Had Avoided the Civil War?', in N. Ferguson (ed.), *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (1997), pp. 91–124.

_________, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (2007).

_________, 'Introduction: High Roads and Blind Alleys – The English Civil War and its Historiography', in idem (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (2009).

J.W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603–1644* (1938).

R. Asch and A.M. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age* (Oxford, 1991).

R. Ashton, *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution, 1603–1649* (1978).

_________, *The City and the Court, 1603–1643* (Cambridge, 1979).

I. Atherton, *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, first Viscount Scudamore* (Manchester, 1999).

G.E. Aylmer, 'Charles I', in W. Lamont (ed.), *The Tudors and Stuarts* (1976).

J. Barish, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley, 1981).

H. Bell, *Archbishop Laud and Priestly Government* (1905).

G.W. Bernard, 'The Church of England, c.1529–c.1642', *History*, 75 (1990), pp. 183–206.

_________, 'Henry VIII: "Catholicism without the Pope?"', *History*, 101 (2016), pp. 201–221.

E.C.E Bourne, *The Anglicanism of William Laud* (1947).

M.J. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008).

B. Bradshaw, 'The Invention of the Irish: Was the Ulster Rising Really a Bolt from the Blue?', *Times Literary Supplement* (Oct. 1994).

C. Brady, 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroys, 1541–1641', in B. Bradshaw *et al.* (eds), *The British Problem, c.1534–1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (1996), pp. 89–117.

L. Brockliss, 'The Anatomy of the Minister–Favourite', in J.H. Elliott *et al.* (eds), *The World of the Favourite* (1999), pp. 279–309.

C.W. Brooks, *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth: the 'Lower Branch' of the Legal Profession in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986).

K.M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603–1715* (1992).

G. Burgess, 'The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered', *EHR*, 107 (1992).

_________, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603–1642* (1992).

W. Burghclere, *Strafford* (2 vols, 1931).

A. Cambers, 'Pastoral Laudianism? Religious Politics in the 1630s: A Leicestershire Rector's Annotations', *Midland History*, 27 (2002), pp. 38–51.

C. Carlton, 'The Dream Life of Archbishop Laud', *History Today*, 36 (Dec. 1986), pp. 9–14.

________, *Archbishop William Laud* (1987).

N. Canny, *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, 1566–1643* (Cambridge, 1982).

A. Capern, ‘The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension’, *HJ*, 39 (1996), pp. 57–85.

P. Carter, ‘Parliament, Convocation and the Granting of Clerical Supply in Early Modem England’, *Parliamentary History*, 19 (2000), pp. 14–26.

A. Clarke, ‘28 November 1634: A Detail of Strafford’s Administration’ *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 93 (1963), pp. 161–167.

_________, ‘The Policies of the “Old English” in Parliament, 1640–1’, *Historical Studies*, 5 (1965), pp. 85–102.

_________, ‘Sir Piers Crosby, 1590–1646: Wentworth’s “Tawney Ribbon”’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 26 (1988), pp. 142–160.

_________, ‘The Government of Wentworth, 1632–40’, in T.W. Moody *et al.* (eds), *A New History of Ireland* (9 vols, Oxford, 1991), pp. 243–269.

_________, ‘A Woeful Sinner: John Atherton’, in V.P. Carey *et al.* (eds), *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2003), pp. 94–105.

M. van Cleave Alexander, *Charles I’s Lord Treasurer: Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland (1577–1635)* (1975).

C.S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001).

J.T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry: From the Reformation to the Civil War* (1969).

R. Clifton, ‘The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution’, *Past and Present*, 52 (1971).

_________, ‘Fear of Popery’, in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (1973), pp. 144–67.

T. Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge, 1989).

_________, ‘Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture’, in S.D. Amussen *et al.* (eds), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 1995), pp 277–300.

P. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford, 1967).

_________, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford, 1982).

_________, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (1983).

_________, 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments', *Parliamentary History,* 7 (1988).

_________, 'Sects and the Evolution of Puritanism', in F.J. Bremer (ed.) *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth–Century Anglo– American Faith* (Boston, 1993), pp. 129–144.

_________, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti–Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2013).

J.S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford, 1970).

E. Cooper, *Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland* (2 vols, 1874).

J.P. Cooper, 'Strafford: A Revaluation', in J. Morrill *et al.* (eds), *Land, Men and Beliefs: Studies in Early-Modern History* (1983), pp. 192–200.

D. Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 2000).

_________, 'Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36 (2005), pp. 359–374.

_________, 'The Blindness of Charles I', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), pp. 637–656.

A. Cromartie, 'The Constitutionalist Revolution: The Transformation of Political Culture in Early Stuart England', *Past and Present*, 163 (1999), pp. 76–120.

_________, *The Constitutionalist Revolution: An Essay on the History of England, 1450–1642* (Cambridge, 2006).

_________, 'King James and the Hampton Court Conference', in R. Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006).

_________, 'The Mind of William Laud', in G. Burgess *et al.* (eds), *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 75–100.

_________, 'The Testimony of the Spirit, the Decline of Calvinism, and the Origins of Restoration Rational Religion', *JEH,* 72 (2020), pp. 71–94.

C. Cross, *Church and People, 1450–1660: The Triumph of the Laity in the English Church* (1976).

R. Cust, 'Wentworth's "Change of Sides" in the 1620s', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 63–80.

_________, ‘Charles I and Popularity’, in idem *et al.* (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 235–58.

_________, *Charles I: A Political Life* (2005).

_________, *Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625–1642* (Cambridge, 2013).

J.W. Daly, ‘Could Charles I Be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646’, *Journal of British Studies*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44.

G. Davies, [Review of H.R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645*], *EHR*, 57 (1942), pp. 383–384.

J. Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism*, *1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992).

C.A. Dennehy, ‘The Irish Parliament After the Rebellion, 1642–48’, in P. Little (ed.) *Ireland in Crisis: War, Politics and Religion, 1641–50* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 100–118.

C.M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983).

A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (1989).

L. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590–1640* (Aldershot, 2014).

P. Donald, *An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles, 1637–1641* (Cambridge, 1990).

G. Elton, [Review of C.S.R. Russell’s *Origins of the English Civil War*], *HJ*, 17 (1974), pp. 213–16.

_________, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government* (Cambridge, 4 vols, 1974–92),

_________, *The Parliament of England, 1559–1581* (Cambridge, 1986).

F.W. Faber, *The Autobiography of Dr. William Laud* (Oxford, 1839).

L.A. Ferrell, ‘Preaching and English Parliaments in the 1620s’, *Parliamentary History*, 34 (2015).

K. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990).

_________, ‘Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity’, in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (8 vols, Oxford, 1984–94).

_________, ‘Introduction’, in idem (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp.1–22.

_________, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud', in P. Lake *et al.* (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 125–58.

_________, 'William Laud and the Exercise of Caroline Ecclesiastical Patronage', *JEH*, 51 (2000).

_________, 'The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s', *HJ*, 44 (2001).

_________, 'Archbishop William Laud: A Study in Failure?' (Anglo–Catholic History Society, 2004).

_________, '"So potent, crafty and violent an adversary": Samuel Harsnett, Master of Pembroke and Archbishop of York', *Pembroke College Cambridge Society Annual Gazette*, 80 (2006).

_________, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *EHR*, 128 (2013), pp. 684–6.

_________, '*Archbishop Grindal 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (1979)', *History*, 100 (2015).

and P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985).

___ and P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993).

_________ and N. Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford, 2007).

M.C. Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge, 1994).

A. Ford, '"That Bugbear Arminianism": Archbishop Laud and Trinity College, Dublin', in C. Brady *et al.* (eds), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2005).

A. Foster, 'The Function of a Bishop: The Career of Richard Neile, 1562–1640' in R. O'Day *et al.* (eds) *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England, 1500–1642* (Leicester, 1976), pp. 33–54.

_________, 'The Clerical Estate Revitalised', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–42* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 139–60.

_________, 'Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited', in P. Lake *et al.* (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 159–178.

S. Foster, Notes from the Caroline Underground: Alexander Leighton, the Puritan Triumvirate, and the Laudian Reaction to Nonconformity (Hamden, Conn., 1979).

L.A. Freeman, *Antitheatricality and the Body Public* (Pennsylvania, 2017).

A. Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford, 2012).

S.R. Gardiner, *Cromwell's Place in History* (1897).

_________, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649* (4 vols, 1901).

C.H. and K. George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570–1640* (Princeton, 1961).

H. O'Grady, *Strafford and Ireland: The History of His Vice-Royalty* (2 vols, Dublin, 1923).

P. Gregg, *Charles I* (1981).

A. Guibbory, 'Donne's Religion: Montagu, Arminainism and Donne's Sermons, 1624–1630', *English Literary Renaissance,* 31 (2001), pp. 412–439.

C. Haigh, 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation', *Past and Present*, 93 (1981).

_________, 'The Elizabethan Church and the New Religion', in idem (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (1984), pp. 169–94.

_________, [Review of P. Collinson's *Religion of Protestants* and *Godly People*], *EHR*, 50 (1985).

_________, [Review of N. Tyacke's *Anti–Calvinists*], *EHR*, 103 (1988), pp. 425–427.

_________, [Review of D. MacCulloch's *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*], *JEH*, 43 (1992), pp. 485–487.

_________, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993).

_________, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570–1640* (Oxford, 2007).

H. Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England* (2 vols, 1827).

P. Hamburger, 'The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press', *Stanford Law Review*, 37 (1985).

T. Harris, 'Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain' in *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, eds A. Houston *et al.* (Cambridge, 2001).

_______, 'Revisiting the Causes of the English Civil War', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), pp. 615–635.

J.S. Hart, 'Rhetoric and Reality: Images of Parliament as Great Council', in M.J. Braddick *et al.* (eds), *The Experience of Revolution in. Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 74–95.

M.J. Havran, *Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington* (1973).

M. Hawkins, 'The Government: Its Role and its Aims', in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (1973), pp. 35–65.

F. Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', *JEH*, 33 (1982), pp. 544–563.

C.M. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983).

C. Hibbert, *Charles I* (2001).

C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (Oxford, 1956).

_________, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* (1958).

_________, *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714* (1961).

_________, 'From Grindal to Laud', in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill: Religion and Politics in 17th Century England* (3 vols, Brighton, 1985–6), pp. 63–86.

L.M. Hill, 'County Government in Caroline England 1625–1640', in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (1973), pp. 66–90.

D. Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603–1658* (1986).

_________, 'The King Redeemed', *Times Literary Supplement* (15 Jan, 1993).

_________, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660: Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth* (1999).

S. Holland, 'Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of 'Puritanism'', *HJ*, 37 (1994), pp. 23–43.

C. Holmes, 'Parliament, Liberty, Taxation, and Property', in J.H. Hexter (ed.), *Parliament and Liberty: From the Reign of Elizabeth to the English Civil War* (Stanford, 1992), pp. 122–154.

W.F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (12 vols, 1860–76).

A. Hughes, 'Thomas Dugard and His Circle in the 1630s – a 'Parliamentary–Puritan' Connexion?', *HJ*, 29 (1986), pp. 771–793.

_________, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire 1620–166*0 (Cambridge, 1987).

_________, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2004).

H. Hulme, 'Charles I and the Constitution', in W.A. Aiken *et al.* (eds), *Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein* (1960), pp. 87–128.

D. Hume, *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary* (2 vols, 1889).

W. Hutton, *William Laud* (1895).

L. James, ''I Was No "Master of this Work" But a Servant to it'? William Laud, Charles I and the Making of Scottish Ecclesiastical Policy, 1634–6', *Historical Research*, 90 (2017), pp. 506–525.

_________, *'This Great Firebrand': William Laud and Scotland, 1617–1645* (Woodbridge, 2017).

C. John Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (New York, 1992).

W.J. Jones, '"The Great Gamaliel of the Law": Mr. Attorney Noye', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 40 (1977), pp. 197–226.

B. Kane, 'Scandal, Wentworth's Deputyship and the Breakdown of Stuart Honour Politics', in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Reshaping Ireland, 1550–1700: Colonization and Its Consequences* (Dublin, 2011), pp. 147–162.

H. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland: A Study in Absolutism* (Manchester, 1959).

_________, 'Strafford in Ireland, 1633–40', *History Today*, 39 (July, 1989).

R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979).

P. King, 'The Episcopate During the Civil Wars, 1642–1649', *EHR*, 83 (1968), pp. 523–537.

M. Kishlansky, 'The Emergence of Adversary Politics in the Long Parliament', *Journal of Modern History*, 49 (1977), pp. 617–640.

_________, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986).

_________, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603–1714* (1997).

_________, ‘Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity’, *Past and Present,* 189 (2005).

_________, ‘A Lesson in Loyalty: Charles I and the Short Parliament’, in J. McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 16–42.

_________, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *Renaissance Quarterly*, 65 [2012], p. 968–9.

_________, ‘‘A Whipper Whipped’: The Sedition of William Prynne’, *HJ,* 56 (2013), pp. 603–627.

_________, ‘Martyrs’ Tales’, *Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), pp. 334–355.

_________, *Charles I: An Abbreviated Life* (2014).

A. Kucharski, ‘Archbishop William Laud’s Dreams: Their Personal and Political Significance’, *Journal of Psychohistory*, 46 (2019), pp. 214–231.

P. Lake, ‘Matthew Hutton – A Puritan Bishop?’, *History,* 64 (1979), pp. 182 P. Lake, ‘Matthew Hutton – A Puritan Bishop?’, pp. 182–204.

_________, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982).

_________, ‘Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635’, *Past and Present,* 114 (1987), pp. 32–76.

_________, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (1988).

_________, ‘Anti–Popery: the Structure of a Prejudice’, in R. Cust *et al.* (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642* (1989), pp. 181–210.

_________, ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant–Garde Conformity at the Court of James I’, in L.L. Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 113–33.

_________, ‘The Laudians and the Argument from Authority’, in B.Y. Kunze and D.D. Brautigam (eds), *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin* (Rochester, 1992).

_________, ‘The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s’, in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Baingstoke, 1993), pp. 161–85.

_________, ‘Predestinarian Propositions’, *JEH,* 46 (1995), pp. 110–23.

_________, ‘The Moderate and Irenic Case for Religious War: Joseph Hall’s *Via Media* in Context’, in S.D. Amussen *et al.* (eds) *Political Culture and Cultural*

Politics in Early Modern Europe: Essays Presented to David Underdown (Manchester, 1995), pp. 55–83.

_________, 'Retrospective: Wentworth's Political World in Revisionist and Post–Revisionist Perspective',in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 252–83.

_________ and M. Questier, 'Introduction', in eidem (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. ix–xx.

_________, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester, 2001).

_________, T. Cogswell and R. Cust, 'Revisionism and its Legacies: the Work of Conrad Russell', in eidem (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell (*Cambridge, 2002), pp. 1–17.

_________, 'The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s', in S. Platten [ed.], *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion* (Norwich, 2003), pp. 90 –121.

_________, 'Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke', in K. Fincham *et al.* (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1–15.

_________, 'Anti–Puritanism: the Structure of a Prejudice', in in K. Fincham *et al.* (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 80–97.

_________ and S. Pincus (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007).

_________, 'The Historiography of Puritanism', in J. Coffey *et al.* (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp 346–71.

_________, 'From Revisionist to Royalist History; or, Was Charles I the First Whig Historian', *HLQ*, 78 (2015).

_________ and M. Questier, 'Thomas Digges, Robert Parsons, Sir Francis Hastings, and the Politics of Regime Change in Elizabethan England', *HJ*, 61 (2018), pp. 1–27.

W.M. Lamont, 'William Prynne, 1600–1669: '"The Mountainous Ice" of Puritanism', *History Today*, 11 (Mar. 1961), pp. 199–205.

_________, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (1969).

_________, 'Comment: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 107 (1985), pp. 227–231.

C. Lane, *The Laudians and the Elizabethan Church: History, Conformity and Religious Identity in Post-Reformation England* (2013).

H. Langelüddecke, 'Policy Enforcement during the Personal Rule of Charles I: The Perfect Militia, Book of Orders, and Ship Money', in G. Southcombe *et al.* (eds), *Revolutionary England, c.1630–c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 9–31.

C.W. Le Bas, *The Life of Archbishop Laud* (1836).

M. Lee Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (1990).

K. Lindley, *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot, 1997).

P. Little, 'The Earl of Cork and the Fall of Strafford, 1638–41', *HJ,* 39 (1996).

R. Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (1981).

_________, *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1485–1714* (2005).

A.J. Loomie, 'The Spanish Faction at the Court of Charles I, 1630–8', *Historical Research*, 139 (1986), pp. 37–49.

T. Macaulay, *History of England* (5 vols, 1849–61).

A. MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625–1641* (Edinburgh, 1991).

D. MacCulloch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies,* 30 (1991), pp. 1–19.

_________, 'The Impact of the English Reformation', *HJ,* 38 (1995), pp. 151–53.

_________, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490–1700* (2004).

W.L. Mackintosh, *Life of William Laud* (1907).

J. Maltby, '"By this Book": Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church', in K. Fincham (ed.*), The Early Stuart Church*, *1603–42,* pp. 115–38.

B. Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution, 1640–1649* (1976).

R.A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560–1642* (1960).

C. Marsh, 'Sacred Space in England, 1560-1640: The View from the Pew', *JEH,* 53 (2002), pp. 286–311.

P. Marshall, *Mother Leakey and the Bishop: A Ghost Story* (Oxford, 2007)

H. Martin, *Puritanism and Richard Baxter* (1954).

T.A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon, 1582–1663: Bishop of London, Lord High Treasurer of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury* (1985).

J. McCafferty, '"God Bless Your Free Church of Ireland": Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 187–208.

_________, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633–1641* (Cambridge, 2007).

_________, 'Ireland and Scotland, 1534–1663', in A. Milton (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism: Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 243–265.

J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007).

_________ *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (2007).

_________ *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (2010).

J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–1670* (1976).

_________, 'William Laud and the Outward Face of Religion', in R.L. DeMolen (ed.), *Leaders of the Reformation* (1984), pp. 318–44.

P.E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998).

A. McRae, 'Stigmatizing Prynne: Seditious Libel, Political Satire and the Construction of Opposition', in I. Atherton and J. Sanders (eds) *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 171–88.

M. Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public's 'Privado'* (Cambridge, 1995).

J.F. Merritt, 'The Historical Reputation of Thomas Wentworth', in eadem (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 1–23.

_________, 'Power and Communication: Thomas Wentworth an Government at a Distance during the Personal Rule, 1629–1635', in eadem (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 109–132.

O. Millar, 'Strafford and Van Dyck', in R. Ollard *et al.* (eds), *For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in Seventeenth–Century History* (1986).

A. Milton, [Review of C. Carlton's *Archbishop William Laud*], *JEH*, 41 (1990), pp. 504–505.

_________, 'The Church of England, Rome and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 187–210.

_________, 'The Personal Rule of Charles I', *History Today*, 44 (Feb, 1994), pp. 58–9.

_________, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 1995).

_________, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 133–56.

_________, 'The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 230–51.

_________, '"That Sacred Oratory": Religion and the Chapel Royal during the Personal Rule of Charles I', in A. Ashbee (ed.), *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on His Life, Times and Work* (1998), pp. 69–96.

_________, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *HJ*, 41 (1998), pp. 625–51.

_________, 'Canon Fire: Peter Heylyn at Westminster', in C.S. Knighton and R. Mortimer (eds), *Westminster Abbey Reformed: 1540–1640* (Aldershot, 2003).

_________, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth–Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007).

_________, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in J. Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (2009), pp. 61–81.

_________, 'Sacrilege and Compromise: Court Divines and the King's Conscience, 1642–1649', in M.J. Braddick *et al.* (eds), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 135–53.

_________, 'Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans, and Revisionists: Back to Which Drawing Board?', *HLQ*, 78 (2015), pp. 723–743.

_________, 'Unsettled Reformations, 1603–1662', in idem (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism: Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 63–83.

J. Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 34, 5th ser., (1984), pp. 155–78.

_________, ‘A British Patriarchy? Ecclesiastical Imperialism under the Early Stuarts’, in A. Fletcher *et al.* (eds), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 209–37.

L. Namier, *Personalities and Powers* (1955).

J. Newman, ‘Laudian Literature and the Interpretation of Caroline Churches in London’, in D. Howarth (ed.), *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 168–88.

D. Nussbaum, ‘Laudian Foxe–hunting? William Laud and the Status of John Foxe in the 1630s’, *Studies in Church History*, 33 (1997), pp. 329–42.

J. Ohlmeyer, ‘Strafford, the “Londonderry Business and the “New British History”’, in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 209–229.

_________, ‘The Irish Peers, Political Power and Parliament, 1640–1641’, in Brady *et al.* (eds), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, pp. 161–85.

R. Ollard, ‘Tyrant With a Limited Thirst for Power’, *The Independent*, 12 Dec. 1992.

A. Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Wisconsin, 1984).

W.G. Palmer, ‘Invitation to a Beheading: Factions in Parliament, the Scots, and the Execution of Archbishop William Laud in 1645’, *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 52 (1983), pp. 17–27.

M. Parry, ‘Bishop William Laud and the Parliament of 1626’, *Historical Research*, 88 (2015), pp. 230–248.

_________, ‘William Laud and the Parliamentary Politics of 1628–9’, *Parliamentary History*, 36 (2017), pp. 137–158.

M. Perceval-Maxwell, ‘Protestant Faction, the Impeachment of Strafford and the Origins of the Irish Civil War’, *Canadian Journal of History*, 17 (1982), pp. 235–256.

_________, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Dublin, 1994).

H. Pierce, ‘Anti–Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645’, *HJ*, 47 (2004), pp. 809–848

F. Pogson, ‘Wentworth as President of the Council of the North, 1628–41’, in J.C. Appleby *et al.* (eds), *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England, 1000–1700* (1997), pp. 185–198.

_________, ‘Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission’, *Recusant History*, 24 (1999), pp. 271–87.

_________, 'Public and Private Service at the Early Stuart Court: the Career of William Raylton, Strafford's Agent', *Historical Research*, 84 (2011), pp. 53–66.

S. Poynting, '"From his Matie to Me with his Awin Hand': The King's Correspondence during the Personal Rule', in I Atherton and J. Sanders (eds) *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 74–91.

_________, '"I Doe Desire to be Rightly Understood": Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Charles I', in J. McElligott *et al.* (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 136–154.

D. Purkiss, *The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth–Century Representations* (1996).

D.A. Orr, *Treason and the State: Law, Politics, and Ideology in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 2002).

J.–L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009).

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

_________, [Review of *Politics, Religion and Popularity*], *JEH*, 55 (2004), pp. 195–6.

B. Quintrell, 'Lancashire Ills, the King's Will and the Troubling of Bishop Bridgeman', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 132 (1983), pp. 67–102.

T. Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation', *Past and Present*, 19 (1961), pp. 26–45.

L.J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, 1989).

R.C. Richardson, 'Puritanism and the Ecclesiastical Authorities: The Case of the Diocese of Chester', in B. Manning (ed.), *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War* (1973), pp. 3–33.

P.R. Roberts, 'William Prynne's *Histrio-Mastix*: a Puritan Attack on the Court and Stage during the Personal Rule of Charles I', in K. Malettke *et al.* (eds), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an Europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Münster, 2001), pp. 447–457.

R. Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Pennsylvania, 2009).

M.V. Ronan, 'Archbishop Bulkeley's Visitation of Dublin, 1630', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 8 (1941), pp. 56–98.

C. Russell, ‘Introduction’, in idem (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (1973), pp. 1–31.

_________, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979).

_________, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990).

_________, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford, 1991).

J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984).

D. Scott, ‘Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–9’ in J. Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (2009), pp. 36–60.

_________, ‘Counsel and Cabal in the King’s Party, 1642–1646’, in J. McElligott *et al.* (eds) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 112–35.

K. Sharpe, ‘Archbishop Laud and the University of Oxford’, in H. Lloyd–Jones *et al.* (eds), *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor–Roper* (1981), pp. 146–64.

_________, ‘Crown, Parliament and Locality: Government and Communication in Early Stuart England’, *EHR*, 101 (1986), pp. 321–50.

_________, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987).

_________, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (1989).

_________, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (1992).

_________, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth–Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000).

J.A. Sharpe, ‘Crime and Delinquency in an Essex Parish 1600–1640’, in J.S. Cockburn (ed.), *Crime in England 1550–1800* (1977), pp. 90–109.

D. Shaw, ‘Thomas Wentworth and Monarchical Ritual in Early Modern Ireland’, *HJ*, 49 (2006), pp. 331–355.

D. Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 2006).

_________, ‘The Prison Diaries of Archbishop Laud’, in D. Beecher *et al.* (eds), *Taking Exception to the Law: Materializing Injustice in Early Modern English Literature* (Toronto, 2015), pp. 319–326.

D.L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640–1649* (Cambridge, 1994).

_________, ‘Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset, and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England’, in D.B. Hamilton *et al.* (eds), *Religion, Literature and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 115–137.

G. Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (2003).

M. Smuts, ‘Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain’, in B. Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (2003).

_________, ‘The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party’, in J. Adamson (ed.) *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (2009).

J.P. Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603–1640* (1999).

K.L. Sprunger, ‘Archbishop Laud’s Campaign Against Puritanism at the Hague’, *Church History*, 44 (1975), pp. 308–20.

D. Starkey (ed.), *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987).

M. Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory: the Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Lewisburg, 1982).

V.D. Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon: Architect of Anglican Survival, 1640–1675* (Hague, 1973).

Times Literary Supplement (1987): 21 Aug., p. 899 (4403: Conrad Russell); 4 Sept., p. 955 (4405: Ian Green); and 18 Sept., (4407: Thomas Cogswell), p. 1017.

P.W. Thomas, ‘Two Cultures? Court and Country under Charles I’, in Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1973).

M. Todd, [Review of J. Davies’ *Caroline Captivity of the Church*], *American Historical Review*, 99 (1994), pp. 894–5.

V. Treadwell, *Buckingham and Ireland, 1616–1628: A Study in Anglo-Irish Politics* (Dublin, 1998).

H.R. Trevor–Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645* (1965).

_________, ‘The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century’, in T. Aston (ed.), *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660* (1965), pp. 59–95.

_________, ‘Archbishop Laud’, *Friends of Lambeth Palace Library: Annual Report* (1978).

_________, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (1987).

_________, *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (1992).

N. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter–Revolution', in Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1973).

_________, *Anti–Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640* (Oxford, 1987).

_________, 'Archbishop Laud', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 51–70.

_________, 'Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War', *Journal of British Studies*, 35 (1996), pp. 139–167.

_________, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530–1700* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 1–36.

_________, 'The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642', *HJ*, 53 (2010), pp. 527–50.

_________, [Review of *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*], *JEH*, 64 (2013), pp. 187–89.

D.D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982).

_________, 'Via Media? A Paradigm Shift', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 72 (2003), pp. 2–21.

A. Walsham, 'The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti–Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England', *JEH*, 49 (1998), pp. 620–51.

_________, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1999).

_________, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999).

T. Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–1643* (Cambridge, 1997).

C.V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford, 1593–1641: A Revaluation* (1961).

_________, *The King's Peace, 1637–1641* (1971).

P.A. Welsby, *George Abbot: The Unwanted Archbishop 1562–1633* (1962).

P. White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (1983).

_________, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, 1992).

_________, 'The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church', in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 211–30.

C.Z. Wiener, 'The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti–Catholicism', *Past and Present,* 51 (1971), pp. 27– 62.

R.J. Willie, 'Sensing the Visual (Mis)representation of William Laud', *Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature*, 34 (2017), pp. 1–44.

M. Winship, 'Freeborn (Puritan) Englishmen and Slavish Subjection: Popish Tyranny and Puritan Constitutionalism, c.1570–1606', *EHR*, 124 (2009), pp. 1050–1074.

A. Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution: 1625–1660* (Oxford, 2002).

B. Worden, *The English Civil Wars, 1640–1660* (2009).

P. Zagorin, *The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution* (New York, 1970).

Theses

C.K. Brownhill, 'The Personal and Professional Relationships between Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and his Closest Advisors' (Univ. of Sheffield Ph.D. thesis, 2004).

A. L. Capern, 'Slipperye Times and Dangerous Dayes: James Ussher and the Calvinist Reformation of Britain, 1560–1660' (Univ. of New South Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1991).

A.J. Cooper, 'The Political Career of Francis Cottington, 1605–52' (Univ. of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1966).

K. Courtis, 'The Tyrannical Nature of Archbishop Laud: Evidence from the Acts of the Court of High Commission' (Univ. of Melbourne B.A. thesis, 2004).

M. Empey, 'Paving The Way to Prerogative: The Politics of Sir Thomas Wentworth, c.1614–1635' (Univ. College Dublin Ph.D. thesis, 2009).

T. Fitch, 'Caroline Puritanism as Exemplified in the Life and Work of William Prynne' (Univ. of Edinburgh, Ph.D. thesis, 1949).

N.R.C. Forward, 'The Arrest and Trial of Archbishop William Laud' (Univ. of Birmingham M.Phil. thesis, 2012).

K. Forkan, ‘Strafford’s Irish Army 1640–41’ (National Univ. of Ireland, Galway M.A. thesis, 1999).

A.W. Foster, ‘A Biography of Archbishop Richard Neile (1562–1640)’ (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978).

J.F. Fuggles, ‘A History of the Library of S. John’s College, Oxford: From the Foundation of the College to 1660’ (Univ. of Oxford M.Litt. thesis, 1975).

J. Greenrod, ‘“Conceived to Give Dangerous Counsel”: William Murray, Endymion Porter, the Caroline Bedchamber and the Outbreak of Civil War, March 1641 – June 1642’ (Univ. of Sheffield M.Phil. thesis, 2003).

P. Haskell, ‘Sir Francis Windebank and the Personal Rule of Charles I’ (Univ. of Southampton Ph.D. thesis, 1978).

S.M. Holland, ‘Archbishop George Abbot: A Study in Ecclesiastical Statesmanship’ (Univ. of London Ph.D. thesis, 1991).

M. Lawrence, ‘New Perspectives on ‘Black Tom’? The Female Relationships of Sir Thomas Wentworth, 1593–1641’ (Univ. of Kent MARes thesis, 2021).

A.I. Macinnes,‘The Origin and Organization of the Covenanting Movement During the Reign of Charles I, 1625–41; With a Particular Reference to the West of Scotland’ (Univ. of Glasgow Ph.D. thesis, 1987).

K.M. Mattia, ‘Crossing the Channel: Cultural Identity in the Court Entertainments of Queen Henrietta Maria, 1625–1640’ (Duke Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 2007).

J.R. Mawdesley, ‘Clerical Politics in Lancashire and Cheshire during the Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649’ (Univ. of Sheffield Ph.D. thesis, 2014).

K. McElroy, ‘Laud and His Struggle for Influence from 1628 to 1640’ (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1943).

J. Newall, ‘The Sermons of William Laud: A Critical Reappraisal’ (Univ. of Oxford B.A. thesis, 2014).

_______, ‘A Reappraisal of the York House Conference (1626)’ (Univ. of Oxford M.St. thesis, 2015).

M. Parry, ‘The Episcopate and Westminster Politics, 1621–29’ (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 2011).

F. Pogson, ‘Wentworth and Court Politics, 1628–40’ (Univ. of Liverpool Ph.D. thesis, 1995).

T.O. Ranger, ‘The Career of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork in Ireland, 1588–1643’ (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1959).

V.E. Raymer, ‘Durham House and the Emergence of Laudian Piety’ (Harvard Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1981).

J. Rigney, ‘In the Midst of the Golden Candlesticks: Authority in English Sermon Literature With Particular Reference to the Sermons of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1573–1645’ (Univ. of Sydney M.A. thesis, 1987).

A. Robinson, ‘‘Not Otherwise Worthy to be Named, but as a Firebrand Brought From Ireland to Inflame this Kingdom’: The Political and Cultural Milieu of Sir John Clotworthy During the Stuart Civil Wars’ (Univ. of Ulster Ph.D. thesis, 2013).

I. Roy, ‘The Royalist Army in the First Civil War’ (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1963).

M.D. Shepherd, ‘Charles I and the Distribution of Political Patronage’ (Univ. of Liverpool Ph.D. thesis, 1999).

D.L. Smith, ‘The Political Career of Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset (1590–1652)’ (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1990).