CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

INTRODUCTION

Radical changes were alien to Jacobean politics and foreign policy, and this stability clearly reflected the wishes of the monarch. Yet in 1624 even James himself could not prevent a shift in policy so fundamental that some contemporaries termed it a "revolution." Remarkable though the "revolution" itself was, equally unusual was the fact that this shift resulted from events in the Empire, not in England. Contemporary Englishmen have often been seen as oblivious to news from London, but at the beginning of the Thirty Years War they avidly followed news of the disasters that overwhelmed Protestants in general and the Palatine household in particular. Early success in translating the Calvinist Elector Palatine and his English wife to the Bohemian throne in 1619 was to prove short-lived. In the following year the Spanish troops acting under an Imperial warrant invaded the Palatinate itself, and Imperial forces financed by Spanish contributions crushed the Bohemian rebellion and sent the son-in-law and daughter of James I into exile. The collapse of the Bohemian uprising, moreover, did not appease Emperor Ferdinand II; thus in 1622 Imperial soldiers stormed Frederick's capital in Heidelberg, and in 1623 Ferdinand transferred Frederick's Electorate to Bavaria. These Catholic successes produced mounting domestic pressure for James to intervene to redress the balance. The eventual result was one of the more dramatic reversals in early Stuart history; in 1624, James abandoned his longstanding entente with the Spanish Habsburgs for a bellicose policy of confrontation, which the following year led to open war. In domestic politics this reversal was equally remarkable. A loose coalition of "Patriots," dedicated to a war on behalf of the Palatine exiles, ousted the "Spanish" faction which had hitherto dominated Whitehall, and the triumph of the "Patriots" was in large part due to their ability to work with Parliament, a task which had hitherto baffled James himself.

The present study analyzes this major shift in politics and diplomacy in late Jacobean England. It is hoped that the results will illuminate some of the murkier aspects of the interplay of foreign and domestic policies, the relation-

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

ship between Crown and Parliament, and the linkage of "high" Court politics to the "low" politics outside the royal entourage.

In pursuit of these goals, it may appear initially that the appropriation of the term, "revolution," is unwarranted. After all, while the modern political definition of the term was in general use by the 1640s, the case for its extension to the 1620s is much more problematic; quite plainly neither Brooke nor Beaulieu had in mind "the complete overthrow of the established government . . . by those previously subject to it." Yet they seem to have meant the word more generally to describe "a great change in affairs," or as Henry Cockeram defined the word in 1623, "a winding or turning back." That definition certainly fits the situation in 1623–4 when plans for a Spanish war almost immediately replaced plans for an Anglo-Spanish domestic alliance. Furthermore, both men may have employed the word's original astronomical sense of a completed orbit as a metaphor for contemporary events; when Brooke congratulated Buckingham on leading "this greate revolution," he was praising the favorite for leading England back to the heroic days of Elizabeth, back to a Spanish war and Protestant unity.[1] Hence there is little question that both men witnessed in 1623–4 what was in their own terms a political revolution.

While revolutions, however defined, are inherently interesting, their fascination is intensified if they bear on historiographical disputes as directly as the "revolution" of 1623–4 does. The publication in 1979 of Russell's seminal *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* initially so unsettled the interpretation of early Stuart history that one scholar aptly described the period as a historiographical "minefield" in which those who publish "deserve awards for bravery."[2] Russell's "revisionist" work has done much more than produce a remarkable controversy; it has also emphasized the need for further detailed research. Although the dispute quickly polarized scholars in the field and even generated epithets like Whiggish "Old Guard" and revisionist "antiquarian empiricists," the two sides have never really joined in the promised battle royal.[3] Instead to date Russell has largely won the debate by default. Unfazed by furious theoretical counter-attacks, the revisionists have insisted that their opponents must "answer evidence with evidence,"

[1] Henry Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie* (London, 1623), sig. k; and C. Hill, "The Word 'Revolution' in Seventeenth-Century England," *For Veronica Wedgwood These* (London, 1986), pp. 134–51.

[2] Christopher Haigh, Review of Margot Heinemann's *Puritanism and Theatre*, *EHR* XCVIII (1983), p. 194.

[3] Kevin Sharpe, "An Unwanted Civil War?," *New York Review of Books*, 3 December 1982, p. 45; and Lawrence Stone, "The Revival of Narrative," *PP* LXXXV (1979) p. 20.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

and the general failure to meet this challenge has justifiably allowed Russell early in 1987 to conclude that the "revisionists" had "won the debate".[4]

This outcome is particularly unfortunate; Russell's theories deserve a careful assessment, and a field renowned for exacting standards demands such an examination. This present study is in part a belated answer to the call for hard evidence. The essential task of evaluation arguably should be limited in its scope to the early 1620s. The present study began as an analysis of the ill-fated English attempt to intervene in the continental war, and considerable research into the origins of the Mansfelt, Cadiz and Ré expeditions revealed only that all lines of reasoning led back to the early 1620s and especially the Parliament of 1624. It is only a slight exaggeration to suggest that much of the controversy between Charles and his subjects later in the decade stemmed from different impressions about what really happened in the 1624 session. In 1626, for example, Roger Mainwaring sought to remind his countrymen that "the Resolutions of his [Charles's] owne Subiects represented in the high Court of Parliament, caused him to undertake [those wars] and that, with the highest Protestations and fullest Assurances from them, to yield him all those Subsidarie helpes that way, which, the Power, or Love of Subiects, could possibly reach unto." The other side of the coin can be seen in Mr. Newbery's *cri de coeur* of the same year; "when we engaged the king in this war it was not the intention of this House that we should send away our treasure and ships into other countries and pay 50,0001. per mensem to I know not who beyond the sea, but for a war as should be for our good and the weakening of our enemies."[5] Given the intense contemporary confusion over the agreements struck in 1624, a thorough understanding of this earlier Parliament was essential in order to comprehend the later problems.

Methodology also supports this narrow focus on the early 1620s. Generations of historians have struggled to make the often maddeningly ambiguous parliamentary documents speak more eloquently, and Conrad Russell has recently advanced one of the most promising means of gaining a new perspective on the Palace of Westminster. The traditional variety of parliamentary history, he argued, runs the grave risk of becoming so obsessed with legislative minutiae that it ignores the broader political milieu in which peers and MPs operated. And given the nature of Parliaments, a firm understanding of the milieu is indispensable. Since Parliament in one sense was a mirror reflecting events taking place outside Westminster, the best way of clarifying the fuzzy mirror images is to come to a better understanding of the outside

[4] Conrad Russell, "The Prisoner of His Documents?," *Times Higher Education Supplement* 9 January 1987, p. 16; Geoffrey Elton, "Two Kinds of History," *Which Road to the Past?* (New Haven, 1983), p. 113, n. 25; and Sharpe, "An Unwanted Civil War?," p. 45.

[5] Roger Maynwaring, *Religion and Allegiance* (London, 1627), pp. 28–9; and 12 June 1626, Whitelocke Diary, Cambridge University Library, MSS DD.12–22, fo. 232.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

events.[6] Persuasive though this argument is, its leading advocate ironically cannot be said to have followed it in his book on parliamentary history; the overwhelming number of references and the focus of the volume is on Parliaments, not English politics. Russell himself confessed that by vaulting from session to session across a turbulent decade, an author "risks presenting something like a badly-cut film: a series of shots from a story in which the continuity has been lost."[7] Consequently, the fitful pursuit of his own model has produced a work which sometimes resembles this cinematic nightmare. More importantly, his axioms about parliamentary behavior have yet to be tested against the parliamentary context.

This book proposes to correct this lacuna. Russell rightly cautioned that "no mortal historian is ever likely to become equally familiar with the misdeeds of the saltpetre men at Chipping Sodbury, the fortunes of the Dartmouth fishing industry, the limits of King James I's confidence in the Duke of Buckingham, and the day-to-day fluctuations in Richelieu's relations with Marie de Medici."[8] In keeping with this injunction, the present study has been limited to the period between the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624 and during the latter session; it has also been restricted to *the* topic in this period, the appropriate English reaction to the disintegrating Protestant position on the continent. Such limitations and restrictions allow us to unravel the tangled political skein of diplomacy, Court politics and popular opinion immediately before and after the "revolution" of 1623–4; it also permits us for once to place the parliamentary texts of 1624 within their political milieu.

There is in addition a final reason for focusing on 1622–4. Ample opportunity exists for contextual studies of other parliamentary sessions, but centering on 1621, 1626 or 1628 would not bear as directly on the question of popular and parliamentary enthusiasm for intervention in the continental mêlée. Both Russell and Lockyer have argued that the majority of the political nation was "lukewarm" about military intervention in the first place. The localist perspective of most MPs meant that they were at best only dimly aware of the reasons for English involvement and more importantly that they regarded the costs of warfare as a violation of provincial autonomy. Consequently the ultimate blame for the failure of the war effort must be laid before the House of Commons whose members refused to shoulder the necessary financial and administrative burdens. Admittedly this view has elicited vigorous dissent, but it has also been employed to exculpate the government and in one extreme case to compare the Duke of Buckingham favorably with Sir Robert Walpole.[9] We can arrive at a more considered judgment of this

[6] Russell, *Parliaments*, pp. 1–2.
[7] Russell, *Parliaments*, pp. 1–2 and 121.
[8] Russell, *Parliaments*, p. 121.
[9] Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London, 1981), pp. 469–74; and Russell, *Parliaments*, pp. 70–84

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

question through the close study of England's road to war in the early 1620s. First of all, an investigation into the background of the continental military involvement will clear up some of the confusion that currently exists about the reasons for the press for war and about the strategy Charles and Buckingham sought to pursue. Equally important, a tight focus on the period before the expense of war made some contemporaries think with their purses affords us the opportunity to reconstruct a fairly clear picture of the contemporary response to the German crisis and to James's inaction. This contextual background in turn will illuminate the 1624 parliamentary debates on which Lockyer and Russell have largely constructed their cases. Thus then we will have more substantial grounds on which to come to a decision about the ultimate failure of the war effort.

These justifications, it is hoped, will excuse another work on 1620s, but they cannot excuse the fact that criticism is perhaps more evident than approbation. Unfortunately it is not possible to redress this imbalance without producing an intolerably long work. The students of the period will quickly see how much this book owes to preceding scholars; for others, suffice it to say that such is the achievement of earlier historians that this book at very best can merely hope to supplement their labors; it cannot supplant them.

and *passim*. See also Kevin Sharpe, "The Personal Rule of Charles I," *Before the English Civil War*, pp. 54–8; and J. C. D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 85–6.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

Prologue

"The evill time," 1622–1623

CAROLUS REDUX

Late on 5 October 1623 Mr. Wiat, a publican in Godalming, welcomed a group of prominent travellers who had stopped to refresh themselves. The fact that such a distinguished party insisted on riding through the night to London was peculiar, and the visitors' evasive replies to polite enquiries about their travels further aroused suspicion. Eventually these questions were all resolved when they paid the bill – in Spanish coin. In the ensuing excitement, Mrs. Wiat repeatedly kissed the leader of the party while an old woman refused to let go of his hand until he vowed never to return to Spain.[1]

The man was Prince Charles, and the scene at the tavern gave him fair warning of the pandemonium his arrival would cause in the capital. One commentator noted that Mrs. Wiat "had the first kisse the Prince gave"; there were to be many others in the next few hours. Earlier in the day, a salute from the guns of the fleet announced his arrival to the inhabitants around the Solent. Charles, impatient of any delay, left his entourage to disembark at Portsmouth while he and a small party rode to London. Dawn found the party at Lambeth where George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, greeted Charles and escorted him across the Thames to the Duke of Buckingham's city residence at York House.[2] When the Lord Mayor had learned of the prince's imminent arrival, he ordered the constables to prepare the customary demonstrations of joy. The citizens, however, had already anticipated the command and were in the midst of celebration before Charles crossed the Thames. Peter Heylin recalled that "Publick Societies and Private Families everywhere abounded in all expressions, both of Religious and Civil rejoycing," and John Beaulieu was confident his brother-in-law in Brussels

[1] Simonds D'Ewes, *The Diary* (Paris, 1974), pp. 162–3.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 162–3; John Finett, *Finetti Philoxenis* (London, 1656), p. 221; Phineas Pett, *The Autobiography* (London, 1918), p. 132; and Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 October 1923, *Letters*, II, p. 515.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

could hear the city's "unspeakable joyes and universall acclamation." The bells pealed incessantly, and the "reioycing noyses" of "Ordnance, Musket . . . Drums and Trumpets" filled the air. The ensuing cacophony from "ringing of the Bells and the harmonie of the Mutiche was heard in every street 'pour l'aubade de sa bien venu.' "[3]

In the citizen's display, light was as important as sound. Fireworks "most delightful flew in every way," and the roof of St. Paul's was decorated with "as many burning Linkes as the Prince his Highnes was yeares old." On such a "very fowle and rainie" day, a bonfire required careful attention and considerable fuel. The crowds devoted themselves to the task and erected fires of "almost incredible" size and number: one at Blackheath for example began with fourteen loads of wood, and D'Ewes counted 335 fires between Whitehall and Temple Bar. Once the shops were "emptied" of their stocks of firewood, anything flammable was added; furniture, tubs and fat. In order to keep the blaze roaring, coachmen broke up their coaches, and watermen their boats. In places, "the people were so mad with excesse of joy" that rather than drag a cartload of wood to an existing bonfire, they torched the cart and cargo on the spot. Later in the day when Charles hurried out to see his father at Royston, his coach had to turn up Charing Cross Road; it simply could not have proceeded directly through the City because several hundred bonfires blocked the main streets and "seemed to turn the City into one flame."[4]

Conflagrations of such size easily could have ended in tragedy, if, as Secretary Calvert remarked, "the heate" had not been "well allayed with London Liquor." Gentlemen and wealthy citizens distributed drink to the revellers, since Sir Benjamin Rudyerd observed, "So open-hearted men were, as't had been / No point of faith to think excess a sin."[5] "The saluations of joy" convinced Secretary Conway that there could not have been "a sober head between Southampton and . . . "; at first he wrote Royston, then added Cambridge and finally settled on "God knowes where to fynde one." Little wonder then that one poet found in the carnival atmosphere the appropriate image to commemorate the occasion. Just as 5 November lent itself to rhymes about "remember," so too 5 October naturally rhymed with "sober," as in "on the 5th day of October / it will be treason to be sober."[6] The collective result was awesome. "Harke," one popular poet began,

[3] Beaulieu to Trumbull, 12 October 1623, Trumbull MSS, VII/104; John Taylor, *Prince Charles His Welcome From Spaine* (London, 1623), p. 102; and Peter Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1668), p. 104.

[4] Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 October 1623, *Letters*, II, p. 515; and Taylor, *Prince Charles*, pp. 102 and 105.

[5] Calvert to Conway, 7 October 1623, SP 14/153/22; and "Benj. Rudyerd to the Prince at his Return from Spain," *The Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, Knt.* (London, 1881), Appendix, xliv–xlv.

[6] Conway to Aston, 10 October 1623, SP 94/28/127; and Taylor, *Prince Charles*, p. 102.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

I heare the bells doe ringe,
Good Lord here the gunnes doe singe . . .
The Mallincholly drummers doe beat,
The Bonfires all are in a sweete,
And melt away themselves in ioy.

Another contemporary recorded a scene of wild exultation: before dawn

an infinitt number of bondfires (and more I thinck then ever was seene before) was made, and that seconded with the noise of bells and drincking his Highnesses health even in the streets, there being many that caused whole peeces of wine and of beere to be brought in to the streets for everyone to take and the people for joy and gladness ran up and down like madde men and none of what condition soever would work upon that day.[7]

Fortunately for seven men and two women, their execution was planned for this day when "Ioy did so transport the soule of the whole Kingdome that death was loth to do his office," and the crowds liberated the prisoners on the way to Tyburn. Even normally staid Privy Councillors found it impossible to conduct business as usual. They attempted to handle the case of a minister who had plunged into affairs of state, but gave up the task "by reason of his Highnesse most happy arrivall here." Instead the councillors sent a letter to James reporting "such is the universall joy at this present and ours in particular . . . as we can better conceive it than express it."[8]

In all the "universal joy," the main attraction remained Charles. While he refreshed himself at York House, a mass of citizens, eager for a glimpse of the prince, immediately surrounded the palace. The throng was so thick that courtiers and officials had trouble getting into the ducal town-house, and when Charles eventually came out, his carriage had to be carried in places through the crowds. The celebration peaked when the coach passed with the duke "bowing to the people" and the prince "waving his hand and smiling." "The Peoples hearts did burn to see him," and the prince "leaned his body out of the Coach, with his hat in his hand and gave thancks to them all for their loves." The crowd in response shouted, "God save your Highness and the Lord of heaven preserve you." Once he had passed, the crowds then cried "We have him . . . We have our prince again."[9] The city, Dr. Ryves reported, "resounded all over with such shouts as is not well possible to express," and Sir Robert Naunton himself proclaimed "GLORY BE TO GOD." Sir Henry

[7] "Uppon Prince Charles his arrivall," Beinecke Library, Osborn b197, pp. 63–5; and Woolley to Trumbull, 10 October 1623, Trumbull MSS, XLVIII/104.
[8] *The Ioyfull Returne of the Most Illustrious Prince Charles* (London, 1623), p. 42; and *APC*, XXXIX, p. 95.
[9] Woolley to Trumbull, 10 October 1623, Trumbull MSS, XLVIII/104; Thomas Reeves, *Mephibosheths Hearts Ioy* (London, 1624), p. 31; Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 104; and D'Ewes, *Diary*, p. 163.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

Goodere observed "within the cirkles of myne eye and ear / I nought but ioy desceerne nought els can heere."[10]

Rejoicing quickly spread with the news across the country. In Coventry the bells rang through the night while the city council toasted the prince's return. In Great Yarmouth where the celebration rivaled that of London, old men "with droppes of ioy trickling along their cheekes" insisted "such triumphanting they did never behold." Even in small towns, the festivities were extraordinary: in Manningtree in Essex, when Samuel Ward preached a sermon on the prince's return, he spent much of his time rebuking his congregation for overindulgence. While it was understandable that the community scarcely know "how to express our ioyes enough," Ward reminded his congregation that "cheer of countenance, gestures of the body leaping and dancing are but dumb shewes."[11] After the initial celebration, many other towns held similar solemn thanksgivings with a sermon and a salute by the trained bands. The city of Oxford, for example, laid out almost nine pounds for the thanksgiving ceremonies, the city's largest expenditure for the fiscal year. "The Cantabrigians" on the other hand "will not be so contented" merely with "bondfires and musicke upon the topps of their steeples and such a noise with gunnes and orations in every college besides sermons in Latine and english"; they also dispatched "theire chiefe Doctors" to Royston to tell James "for all the rest" of their joy.[12]

The festivities were not confined to England. In Edinburgh, when news of the prince's return arrived on 13 October, the Scottish Council immediately despatched town criers to announce public celebrations and a sermon later in the day. As in London, official encouragement was scarcely necessary; the news itself prompted "shooting of ordanance, ringing of bells, setting on of bonfires, with the greatest contentment." Likewise the citizens of Aberdeen went out of their way to "expres the joy and gladness of the hartis of the people." Trumpets at the town cross, drummers in every street, and all the city bells summoned the population together to hear a sermon and toast Charles's return. Later the magistrates led the young men armed with muskets in a procession through the town. In the Irish plantations, the lack of bells often forced the English settlers to give their commemoration more overtly martial overtures: there the local militia mustered to practice drill

[10] Ryves to Ussher, 8 October 1623, quoted in Anthony à Wood, *The History and Antiquities . . . of Oxford* (Oxford, 1797), p. 351, n. 3; Naunton to Buckingham, 6 November 1623, *Fortescue Papers* (London, 1871), p. 9; and H. Goodere, "Congratulations to the Prince," SP 14/153/112.

[11] *Coventry: Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto, 1981), p. 417; Reeves, *Mephibosheths Hearts Ioy*, p. 37; and Samuel Ward, *A Peace-Offering to God* (London, 1623), pp. 12 and 16.

[12] *Oxford Council Acts, 1583–1626* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 322–3 and 420–1; and Locke to Trumbull, 10 October 1623, Trumbull MSS, XXIX/160.

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521023130 - The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624
Thomas Cogswell
Excerpt
More information

formations and marksmanship. But whatever form it took, celebrations were held, Stephen Jerome proclaimed, "from Ulster to Connaught, as all in Great Britaine, even from Dan to Beersheba, from Barwicke to Dover, from Edenborough to utmost Orcades."[13]

The joy over the occasion was not soon forgotten, for poems, squibs, sermons, plays and buildings soon immortalized the event. Both universities organized formal ceremonies and issued volumes of Latin verse, and Cambridge printed George Vaughan's Latin oration to commemorate 5 October.[14] Sir Henry Goodere, Edmund Bolton, John Taylor, Sir John Beaumont and Sir Benjamin Rudyerd hastened to produce similar efforts in English while more popular writers brought forth less elegant rhymes, as one did, on "prince Charles his arrivall from Spain."[15] A little later, once "the extemporall dinne of balladry" had died down and "all the country and the Citie-wit, of bels and bonfires and good cheere was spent," Ben Jonson offered his own gloss on Charles's return in a masque, *Neptune's Triumph*. He recycled this masque in the following year as *The Fortunate Isles*. Later in 1624, Thomas Middleton aimed at a more popular audience and achieved a brilliant success in his version of the prince's trip abroad.[16]

For the rest of the decade the return of the prince remained popular material for literary treatment. In later collections in honor of Charles I, a poem on 5 October 1623 was almost de rigueur as it was in popular chronicles: "sodianely," John Vicars recalled, "sweetly to our admiration / He came to us, to our Hearts exultation." Likewise preachers found the topic irresistable. In 1625 Daniel Price intoned, "O let it never be unsavory to remember . . . your Highnesses returne." There was little danger of that: any minister attempting to persuade his congregation to reflect on God's providential care of England would be certain to link 5 October to 5 November and the Protestant Wind. "Shall we not blesse the God of Jacob," Henry King asked in 1628, "who hath brought back the staffe of our Jacob?"[17] The

[13] Stephen Jerome, *Irelands Iubilee* (Dublin 1624), dedication to Henry Wright; David Calderwood, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1842), VII, p. 580; and *Extracts from the Council Register of . . . Aberdeene, 1570–1625* (2 vols., Aberdeen, 1848), II, pp. 389–90.

[14] George Vaughan, *Oratio qua auspicatissumum serenissimi Principis Caroli* (Cambridge, 1623); *Carolus Redux* (Oxford, 1623); and *Gratulatio Acadamiae Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge, 1623).

[15] Edmund Bolton, "Vinden, or the Blame is Spaines," Bodleian Library, Tanner MSS, LXXIII, fos. 420–1; "Poems of Sir John Beaumont," *The Works of the English Poets* (London, 1810), VI, pp. 33–4; Taylor, *Prince Charles; Memoirs of Rudyerd*; SP 14/153/112; and Beinecke Library, Osborn b197, pp. 63–5.

[16] Ben Jonson, *Neptune's Triumph* and *The Fortunate Isles*, printed in *The Complete Masques* (New Haven, 1969), pp. 409–24 and 433–53; and Thomas Middleton, *A Game at Chess* (London, 1966).

[17] John Vicars, *Englands Hallelu-jah* (London, 1631), stanza 55; Daniel Price, *A Heartie Prayer in a Needfull Time* (London, 1625), p. 18; and Henry King, *An Exposition upon the*

© Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org