



Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Faculteit Letteren
Subfaculteit Geschiedenis

William Trumbull



A Jacobean diplomat at the court of the Archdukes in Brussels, 1605/9-1625

Promotor: Prof. dr. Johan Verberckmoes

Proefschrift aangeboden
door Imran UDDIN
tot het behalen van de graad
van doctor in de
geschiedenis

Leuven 2006



Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Faculteit Letteren
Subfaculteit Geschiedenis

William Trumbull



A Jacobean diplomat at the court of the Archdukes in Brussels, 1605/9-1625

Promotor: Prof. dr. Johan Verberckmoes

Proefschrift aangeboden
door Imran UDDIN
tot het behalen van de graad
van doctor in de
geschiedenis

Leuven 2006

List of Abbreviations	2
Note on the dates	2
Preface	3
Introduction	4
The Foreign Policy of King James	4
Jacobean Diplomacy	8
How to become a diplomat: a practical guide	11
Ambassadors and Agents	14
William Trumbull	17
Chapter 1 William Trumbull's rise to diplomacy	23
William Trumbull: life of a Jacobean Gentleman	23
<i>As farre as that money will stretch</i> , diplomatic compensation in the Jacobean era	38
<i>Patronage or the art of the courtier</i>	51
Chapter 2 Defending English interests.....	61
Cloth trade	61
Henry Hunt, Thomas Albery, Colonel Boyd and Thomas Stone	84
Chapter 3 The English, Scottish and Irish regiments in the service of the Archdukes.....	95
The Irish regiment	111
Chapter 4 Your Majesty's ill affected subjects.....	126
Gunpowder Plot	128
Monasteries, convents and colleges.....	140
High profile refugees: Sir William Seymour, Benjamin Carier, John Bull and William Cecil, Lord Ros	155
Recusants residing in the Archducal Netherlands	172
Chapter 5 Corona Regia: that infernall libell, and woorke of darknes	185
War of pamphlets.....	187
Scurillous pamphlets	193
Enter Corona Regia	195
Trumbull's hunt to discover the identity of author and printer of <i>Corona Regia</i>	196
Trumbull's dealings with the archdukes and their Privy Council.....	201
Sir John Bennet, ambassador extraordinary of king James VI/I (April-June 1617)	213
Trumbull's informants	221
Kidnapping Erycius Puteanus	229
Trumbull in Purgatory.....	231
Swan-song of Corona Regia.....	233
Chapter 6 Agent for the Rex Pacificus	240
The First Jülich-Kleve Crisis.....	242
The Second Jülich-Kleve crisis	246
The Treaty of Xanten.....	255
The promise	257
The aftermath	267
The Palatine war and the start of the Thirty Years War	270
Conclusion	278
Bibliography of Sources and Works Cited.....	285
Archival material.....	285
Published Sources	285
Literature	287
Index of Names and Places.....	307
Nederlandse samenvatting.....	318

List of Abbreviations

- APC J.R. Dasent *et. al.* (eds.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England 1542-1628* (46 vols., London, 1890-1964).
- BL London, British Library
- CPE Brussels, Archives générales du royaume, Conseil Privé Espagnol.
- CSPD Robert Lemon and Mary A.E. Green (eds.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1571-1625) preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. (1547-159) Edited by R. Lemon. (1591-1603), with addenda 1547-1579, By M.A.E. Green (12 vols., London, 1856-1872).*
- HMCD, ii Edward K. Purnell en Allen B. Hinds (eds.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder 1605-1610* (vol. ii of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1936).
- HMCD, iii Allen B. Hinds (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder 1611-1612* (vol. iii of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1938).
- HMCD, iv Allen B. Hinds (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder January 1613-August 1614* (vol. iv of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1940).
- HMCD, v G. Dyfnallt Owen (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder September 1614-August 1616* (vol. v of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Downshire formerly preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire*) (London, 1988).
- HMCD, vi G. Dyfnallt Owen and Sonia P. Anderson (eds.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder September 1616-December 1618* (vol. vi of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Downshire formerly preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire*) (London, 1995).
- PEA Brussels, Archives générales du royaume, Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience.
- SP London, The National Archives (formerly Public Record Office), State Papers
- WM Edmund Sawyer (ed.), *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (chiefly) from the Original Papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood, Kt. Sometimes one of the Principal Secretaries of State. Comprehending likewise the Negotiations of Sir Henry Neville, Sir Charles Cornwallis, Sir Dudley Carleton, Sir Thomas Edmondes, Mr. Trumbull, Mr. Cottingham and others, At the Courts of France and Spain, and in Holland, Venice, &c. Wherein the Transactions of those Times Are faithfully related, and the Policies and Intrigues of those Courts are discovered* (3 vols., London, 1725).

Note on the dates

All dates are given in Old Style, unless stated otherwise. The years have been changed so that a new year started on 1 January and not at the end of March.

Preface

It has been a long and interesting journey at the side of William Trumbull. These past six years sometimes felt like my own personal Herculean battle against the Hydra, but it was interesting nevertheless. After six years I cannot finish without expressing my gratitude to some people who, knowingly or unknowingly, helped me realise this project, who helped me subdue my *Corona Regia*.

Johan Verberckmoes, professor of early modern history at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven has been my supervisor and mentor since I started doing research for my master thesis in 1998. Since that time he took an interest in my research that has been, to this date, unrivalled. The art which makes a good historian is a craft he taught me. It was my privilege to work with such a distinguished historian. I can only aspire to one day be able to repay him for his wisdom, his witty pen, his valuable insight and so much more.

A special thank you goes to the students who studied history between 2000 and 2006. They were my chief concern in those years, working as a tutor for the history department. It was the combination of those two aspects, students and PhD, which made the past years worth it. It can only be described as a pity that the faculty decided to abolish research at my Alma Mater at tutor level. This is the end of an era for me, finishing my PhD, but also for the faculty. I appear to be the last history tutor to be able to do research. Since 2001 I had the privilege but especially the pleasure to be given the chance to work with Katrien Philippen. We were an excellent team. Starting as an outstanding colleague she became a trustworthy adviser and moreover a valuable friend. I can only hope we will be able to work together again in the future.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my family. First and foremost to my grandparents, Gilbert and Astrid Leire-Maricou, who took my two sisters and myself in as children in the late 1980s and raised us as their own. Thanks to them I can call the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven my Alma Mater. My two sisters and their families also have to be mentioned: Yasmin and Jeroen Vandenbroucke-Uddin, with their daughter, my goddaughter, Alies, and Shaheen Uddin with her daughter Lauren.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to my friends without whom, to quote Sir Francis Bacon, the world is but a wilderness. I feel compelled to mention a few of them who stood by me these past years: Henk and Cindy Desplentere-Ruelens, Tom and Sara Fourneau-Bink, Lieven Soetaert and Nick Roosen. Each and every one of them has taught me a lot about life. They were unrelenting in their support, entertaining me at their homes or somewhere else in the world (Provence, Austria, London), listening to my sometimes long and tedious reports without complaining, receiving me, sometimes at a moments notice, without questions.

Imran Uddin
Paus Adriaan VI-College, October 2006

Introduction

The Foreign Policy of King James

Jacobean foreign policy nor Jacobean diplomacy have been studied at length. This lack of interest has several reasons. Historians of early seventeenth century English history usually look for factors which led to the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. They concentrate on domestic issues during the governments of king James and his son Charles I. As a result early Stuart foreign policy remains elusive¹. Another reason is the perception that early Stuart foreign policy was a failure². This however does not imply a total lack of historiographical interest. Some aspects have indeed been studied in detail: e.g. the relationship between James VI/I and Henry IV of France, the attitudes of parliament in 1621 and 1624 towards Jacobean foreign policy, the choice for Spain or the Netherlands and most recently the Spanish match³. Moreover, British diplomacy in general has been studied only in general terms⁴. For the Jacobean period there are two notable exceptions: Lee's article on the Jacobean diplomatic service and Henneke's unpublished PhD dissertation on early Stuart diplomacy, which can be seen as a brave attempt to tackle half a century of diplomacy⁵. It is not within the scope of this study to provide the readers with a full overview of Jacobean foreign policy and its diplomatic service.

Due to the lack of foreign ministries in this period, the formation of foreign policy throughout Europe is a complex issue. France was one of the first countries to establish such a ministry in 1626⁶. England did not follow suit until 1782 with the creation of the Home Office and the Foreign Office⁷. Besides the monarch the secretaries of state were the key figures. Lee, in his *James VI and Henri IV*, provides a clear insight in who had a say when it came to foreign policy. *James never undertook to explain his foreign policy to his people: this, after all, was a matter for the king to decide*⁸. James VI/I considered foreign policy a royal prerogative. He would not share this power with his Privy Council much less with Parliament⁹. Nevertheless, several high placed servants tried to influence him,

¹ Coward, *The Stuart Age*; Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, xiii-xix; for the Tudor period the first study of Tudor foreign policy in 30 years was published in 2005 Doran and Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its neighbours*.

² Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 11-12.

³ Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Diplomacy'; Bouvier, *Comédie Royale*; Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match'; Lake, 'Constitutional consensus and puritan opposition in the 1620s'; Pursell, 'The end of the Spanish match'; Redwort, *The prince and the Infanta*; Redworth, 'Of pimps and princes'; Rosales, 'La alianza anglo-española en el año 1623'; Van Eeroe, 'The Spanish match to an English Protestant's eyes'

⁴ Black, *British diplomats and diplomacy 1688-1789*; Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689-1789*.

⁵ Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service'.

⁶ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practice of diplomacy*, 72; Nicolson, *The Evolution of the Diplomatic Method*, 51-53.

⁷ Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service*, 1.

⁸ Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, 177; for the black legend surrounding James VI & I and its origins see Coward, *The Stuart Age*, 120-121. For works which pictured James in an unfavourable light see Gardiner, *History of England* and Willson, *James VI and I*. For historians with a more sympathetic view see Donaldson, *Scotland James V-James VII*; Wormald, 'James VI and I: two kings or one?' and Croft, *King James*.

⁹ Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624'.

e.g. Robert Cecil (1563-1612)¹⁰, first earl of Salisbury, principal secretary of state during the latter years of Elizabeth and the first years of James. Recent research by Pauline Croft revealed that James was much more a hands on monarch than many historians before her assumed or gave him credit. Often described as lazy and incompetent, her new biography, *King James*, shows that although often absent he was kept apprised of what happened in London¹¹. The growing influence of favourites at the court of James was one of the characteristics of early Stuart courtlife. Famous favourites were Robert Carr (1585/6?-1645)¹², viscount of Rochester and later earl of Somerset and George Villiers (1592-1628)¹³, first duke of Buckingham. But they never had the influence of Salisbury. All the important decisions about policy, until the death of James, were the king's. Buckingham only succeeded in promoting his own candidates to offices like the secretaryship of State when the king had no preference, as was the case with Sir Robert Naunton (1563-1635)¹⁴. Sir George Calvert (1579/1580-1631)¹⁵, on the other hand, was appointed by James without the intervention of his favourite. Another example is the aftermath of the botched trip to Spain of prince Charles and Buckingham. After an unsuccessful negotiation for the Spanish Match, Charles and Buckingham wanted James to declare war on Spain. The king resisted. Only after his death in March 1625 war ensued¹⁶.

Lee argues that James's policy was a result of his experiences as Scottish king. His Scottish foreign policy was twofold: avoid interference in the domestic affairs of Scotland and secure the English crown¹⁷. Avoiding foreign interference engendered a passive foreign policy; James took as little initiative as possible to avoid conflict. On the other hand, he actively sought support to ensure his claim to the English throne when Queen Elizabeth I died. One of his great promoters in England was her principal secretary of state, Salisbury, with whom James started a secret correspondence in the latter years of the reign of the Virgin Queen¹⁸. James also had to find support on the continent, or at least he had to make sure that the European powers would not support a rival candidate. To accomplish this feat king James sent diplomats all over Europe.

James's extensive English diplomatic service can be linked to what he considered his successful Scottish diplomacy. This, according to James, had resulted into his peaceful accession to the throne of Elizabeth I, *with an ease which surprised many and pleased all*¹⁹. This led him to believe in his own abilities as a diplomat and negotiator²⁰. Maurice Lee, Jr. however disagrees and stresses the complex set of circumstances which led to the

¹⁰ Croft, 'Cecil, Robert, first earl of Salisbury (1563-1612)'.

¹¹ Croft, *King James*, 82.

¹² Bellany, 'Carr, Robert, earl of Somerset (1585/6?-1645)'.

¹³ Lockyer, 'Villiers, George, first duke of Buckingham (1592-1628)'.

¹⁴ Schreiber, 'Naunton, Sir Robert (1563-1635)'.

¹⁵ Krugler, 'Calvert, George, first baron of Baltimore (1579/80-1631)'.

¹⁶ Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands?', 97-98; Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', 154.

¹⁷ The focus of James VI on the English throne is also confirmed by Smith, 'Introduction', 8; Dodd, 'The Spanish Treasons, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 631-632; for the relationship between the Elizabeth and James see Doran, 'Loving and Affectionate Cousins? The Relationship between Elizabeth I and James VI of Scotland 1586-1603'.

¹⁸ Bruce (ed.), *Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland*.

¹⁹ Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*, 4.

²⁰ Smith, 'Introduction', 8.

peaceful handover in 1603. There was no consensus under European monarchs to support one candidate. According to the Spanish Council of State infanta Isabella, daughter of Philip II and together with her husband archduke Albert, sovereign of the Catholic Low Countries, was the ideal candidate. Philip III, however, never formulated a clear policy when it came to the succession of the Virgin Queen until 1601, after which he supported the infanta, but did not want this to be public knowledge. A Spanish candidate was unacceptable to the Protestant nations but also to certain Catholic kings, foremost the king of France. *James's anxiety over the menace of a "Spanish title" was only partially dissipated by his good relations with the court at Brussels. The reluctance of the Archduke to become involved in the succession was even known to the English refugees who complained at that time: "The Archduke does not seriously consider what they are proposing ... he is holding that kingdom [England] to be of small moment"*²¹. Short of a war, there was nothing Spain could have done to prevent the union of the crowns of Scotland and England²².

While a specific set of circumstances furthered James's desire in procuring the English throne, in his own perception it happened due to his foreign policy and especially his diplomatic skills. For almost his entire reign James's adopted a wait-and-see policy, seldom taking initiative, lest he would affront a foreign power. While he had one objective as king of Scotland, there were no real objectives after 1603 except his overwhelming desire for peace in Christendom. *In place of specific objectives in foreign affairs, James came south with a generalized but very firm conviction of the advantages of peace and friendship with as many states as possible*²³. His conviction was strong enough to act as mediator in some international conflicts and even to wish the end of wars which were in the best interest of England, e.g. the war between Spain and the Dutch republic which ended for twelve years in 1609 with the Twelve Years' Truce²⁴. He also wished to be hailed as the one who would be able to reunite Christendom²⁵. James wanted to go down in history as the *Rex Pacificus*, the peacemaker of Europe. The title was already attributed to him in his own life time. A prolific writer he stated in his *A Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer* of 1619: *I know not by what fortune the diction of Pacificus was added to my title at my coming to England; that of the lion, expressing true fortitude, having been my diction before*²⁶. The essential instruments for this foreign policy were twofold: marriage alliances and diplomacy. In the European dynastic tradition of the early modern age he arranged marriages for his children with the royal houses of Europe. *Like Queen Marie [of France], James saw foreign policy as intrinsically dynastic, a matter for the royal houses of Europe. Linked to the protestant princes by both religion and treaty obligations, he wished to balance those commitments by arranging a catholic marriage for Henry, which would also reinforce his personal links with other European sovereigns and demonstrate his ecumenical goodwill*²⁷.

²¹ Loomie, 'Philip III and the Stuart Succession in England, 1600-1603', 498-503.

²² Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, 6-11; for literature on the succession of Elizabeth I see Allen, *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598-1621*, 99-114 (chapter 5 The English Succession and the Hope for a Settlement); Mackie, 'The secret diplomacy of King James VI in Italy prior to his accession to the English throne', 267-82.

²³ Lee, *James I and Henri IV*, 12.

²⁴ Lee, *James I and Henri IV*, 12.

²⁵ Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*.

²⁶ James I, *A Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer*, 93; See also Smuts, 'The Making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War'.

²⁷ Croft, *King James*, 84.

On the war torn European continent the Protestant leaders wanted to create a Protestant and anti-Habsburg alliance. Elizabeth I had been the champion of the Protestant cause supporting the United Provinces and the Huguenots in France. In 1603 king James refused such a leadership. The issue was raised again with the Spanish intervention during the first Jülich-Kleve crisis²⁸ (1609-1610) but this time also a marriage proposal from the elector Palatine was on the table. The offer was only seriously considered after the murder on Henry IV (1553-1610) of France (1610). After the death of this former Huguenot, there was a slight possibility that France, under the regency of Maria de Medici, was going to join a Catholic league. James gave his daughter, Elizabeth, in marriage to Frederick V, elector Palatine. James joined the anti-Habsburg coalition, known as the Evangelical Union or the Union of Protestant Princes which was founded in 1608. But James's desire to unite all Christendom also led to the search for a Catholic bride for his heir-apparent. This quest for a Spanish or a French bride dominated Jacobean foreign policy in the second half of the reign of the *Rex Pacificus*²⁹.

The start of the Thirty Years' War proved to be a major obstacle in James's peace effort. The Protestant faction at the court of James saw this as an opportunity to break up the English-Spanish alliance which had been created with the Treaty of London in 1604. Sir Edward Herbert, ambassador in Paris and George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, were convinced that this was a confessional war. Their goal was to extend the existing alliance between England and the United Provinces to other Protestant nations. For James, however, this was a conflict to be averted whatever the cost. He wanted a general settlement, but that was rendered improbable when his son-in-law, Frederick V, elector Palatine, accepted the Bohemian crown in September 1619 which provoked an invasion of the Lower Palatinate by Spanish forces under the command of Ambrosio marquis of Spinola (1569-1630)³⁰ in August 1620. While Protestant nations were looking to England for leadership, James would not agree to a course that would bring England into a confessional war. Moreover, as an advocate of the divine right of kings, he could not agree with the election of Frederick V by the States of Bohemia.

His solution was not war, but rather an expansion of the Anglo-Spanish marriage negotiations. Disavowing both the rebels and his son-in-law, the King pressed for a ceasefire and a return to the status quo ante bellum. The cement for the general peace was to be the marriage of Frederick's brother-in-law, Prince Charles, to the daughter of Ferdinand's chief paymaster, Philip III of Spain. As always James was flexible; once Spanish troops overran the Palatinate in 1620, he simply added it to the Infanta's dowry³¹.

All his hopes were dashed when he discovered the terms for the Spanish match, which included an unacceptable demand of conversion of prince Charles to Catholicism.

The dynastic policy must also be related to the domestic issue of the royal treasury in England. Between 1610 and 1620 king James only convened parliament once, in 1614. This parliament, known as the Addled Parliament³², was a failure. The king was

²⁸ For the most recent research on this subject see, Anderson, *On the verge of war*.

²⁹ Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands?', 88-89 en 94.

³⁰ Brants, 'Spinola (Ambroise)'.

³¹ Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match', 114.

³² Moir, *The Addled Parliament*.

confirmed in his detestation of parliaments in general and of the Commons in particular. From 1610 until 1620 James would develop a strategy to try and avoid the convening of Parliament. The only way he could successfully accomplish that feat was by finding new financial resources. Although there were a certain number of measures to increase the royal income in England, such as the Privy Seal loans (1611-1612), the sale of baronetcies, a benevolence (1614), the sell of the Cautionary towns to the United Provinces and a City loan (1617), they proved to be insufficient. James had to turn abroad to raise more money. In November 1612 he started negotiating with the French crown to secure a bride, first for prince Henry and afterwards for Charles. *Indeed, until the summer of 1618 the pursuit of a dowry was an indispensable element in the strategy of avoidance [of convening Parliament]*³³.

Was James VI/I a successful English king and more specifically how can his foreign policy be rated? While most historians have been extremely unappreciative of king James's policy, research in recent decades has caused a reevaluation. Nowadays a much more nuanced image emerges.

*A general judgement of James's foreign policy must recognise the idealism which prompted it, and there is perhaps something to be said for it in practical terms during the earlier years of the reign. It did however contain a basic contradiction. James's desire to be a universal peacemaker, all things to all men, was bound to break down when serious conflict began in early seventeenth-century Europe, where political and religious rivalries were still acute*³⁴.

While the peaceful accession to the English crown is attributed, by many historians, to the complex set of circumstances, the same can be said for James's English foreign policy. Despite his best efforts to ensure peace in Europe, war ensued. A complex set of circumstances lead to a failure of his policy.

Jacobean Diplomacy

Garrett Mattingly remains the most authoritative author on early modern diplomacy. *Renaissance Diplomacy*, first published in 1955, is still widely quoted in recent diplomatic research concerning the early modern period³⁵. Mattingly acknowledges that contemporary diplomatic treatises and humanist texts trace the origins of resident diplomacy to Classical Antiquity. According to Mattingly diplomacy was an Italian invention that developed between the middle of the fourteenth and the middle of the fifteenth century. *Italy first found the system of organizing interstate relationships which Europe later adopted, because Italy, towards the end of the Middle Ages, was already becoming what later all Europe became*³⁶. It was also a new age for diplomacy. During the Middle Ages it had become customary to describe ambassadors as public officials, labourers for the common welfare, their business being peace. Ermolao Barbaro (1553/1554-1593), a Renaissance scholar and resident ambassador at Rome wrote an essay *De Officio Legati* (c. 1490). He was the first to mention resident ambassadors. Mattingly translates Barbaro saying that

³³ Thrush, 'The Personal Rule of James I, 1611-1620', 84-101.

³⁴ Smith, 'Introduction', 16-17.

³⁵ E.g. in Hamilton and Langhore's *The Practice of Diplomacy*, especially chapters 2 and 3.

³⁶ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 60.

the first duty of an ambassador is exactly the same as that of any other servant of a government, that is, to do, say, advise and think whatever may best serve the preservation and aggrandizement of his own state³⁷.

Spain was the first to follow suit and stationed resident ambassadors throughout Italy but also in England, with emperor Maximilian (1459-1519) and in the Low Countries. Henry VII (1457-1509), according to Mattingly akin to Ferdinand of Aragon in temperament and methods, was the second to implement this new kind of diplomacy, although with a minimum of fixed charges. John Stile can be considered the first English resident ambassador. He represented Henry VII in Spain from 1505 onwards. It was not until Thomas Wolsey (1470/1471-1530)³⁸ became the chief minister of Henry VIII (1591-1547) that the Tudor diplomatic service developed more rapidly. Besides to Spain resident ambassadors were sent to the Low Countries, the emperor and Rome. Due to the ideological differences that tore Europe apart, the system of resident ambassadors collapsed. Elizabeth reduced the resident diplomats. After 1568 the only English resident ambassador on the continent was stationed in France. After 1589 she only had official English residents in non-Catholic countries: France (under the Huguenot Henry IV who converted to Catholicism in 1593), the United Provinces that had seceded from the Catholic Low Countries and the Ottoman empire. *By 1589, then, European diplomatic contacts were interrupted everywhere except between ideological allies*, writes Mattingly³⁹.

Although the ideological argument is sound, there was one other important factor for Elizabeth: finances. She was very reluctant to send or receive resident ambassadors to and from foreign courts, because they drained the already depleted royal treasury. This does not mean she did not have semi-official agents or even informants and spies who generally answered to Walsingham. Furthermore she relied on the extensive networks of favourites like the earl of Essex to provide foreign intelligence⁴⁰. It would take over a decade and a change of monarch for a resurrection of the system of English resident diplomats. Although this was still a confessional age rulers no longer distinguished between Protestants and Catholics when sending representatives. James sent his representatives to Protestant countries as Denmark, the Protestant rulers of the Holy Roman Empire, the United Provinces and Sweden and to Catholics as the emperor, France, the Spanish Netherlands, Spain, Savoy and Venice. The most notable exception was, not surprisingly, the papal court in Rome.

The emergence of state-sponsored residents coincided with the accession of king James in England. He revolutionized the English diplomatic service. But also wider in Europe it was only in the seventeenth century that the practise of resident diplomacy prevailed. A diplomatic office became a viable career⁴¹. As already argued, in James's mind his peaceful accession in England was due to his Scottish diplomacy. In the years before 1603 he maneuvered in England and Europe to secure the English throne. In England he held a secret correspondence with Cecil, Elizabeth's most formidable minister. The earl of Essex, her favourite, had been a principle informant of the Scottish

³⁷ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 95.

³⁸ Jack, 'Wolsey, Thomas (1470/71-1530)'.

³⁹ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 176.

⁴⁰ Hammer, 'The Crucible of War', 244-245.

⁴¹ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, especially the first three chapters; Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 16-17.

king from at least 1598 until his execution in 1601⁴². Lee notes that he *approached everybody – Spain, France, the Protestant powers, Tuscany and even the Pope*⁴³. Securing the English throne had succeeded, why not use diplomacy to achieve his principal aim: peace in Europe between ideological adversaries. According to Mattingly James VI/I was the only important monarch who believed in peaceful diplomacy, who was convinced that countries could live in peace even if they were adherent of a different religion. This *earned him nothing except the title of ‘the wisest fool in Europe... Nothing, that is, except almost twenty years of the peace he sought*⁴⁴.

Henneke tries to give an overview of early Stuart diplomacy in his unpublished PhD dissertation, *The Art of Diplomacy under the Early Stuarts* (1999). He contrasts English diplomacy with an ineffective foreign policy. The main cause of this failure, he argues, is the lack of threat of war or military force. In spite of this failure the Jacobean diplomats have been described by twentieth century historian Lee as *a competent group of professionals, an intelligent and acerbic set of men who complained about everything from arrears of pay to bad health, from cost of living to the wretched climate, but who for the most part did their job efficiently and well*⁴⁵.

Although the invaluable contribution of the first Stuart on the English throne cannot be denied, this has to be nuanced. While in old historiography there is a clear chasm between Elizabeth and James, recent scholarship tends to look for continuity between both reigns. While he exchanged resident ambassadors with Catholic powers for the first time in decades, there are two elements that demonstrate that continuity. First, Robert Cecil kept his position of principal secretary of state after the death of the queen until he himself died in 1612. Secondly, the Jacobean diplomatic corps had been trained under Cecil and its members could be considered Elizabethan gentlemen.

King James did not let himself in with the day-to-day running government. Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, corresponded with the diplomats and provided guidelines. There was no formal chain of command for diplomacy in London during the reign of James VI/I, but a chain can be discerned: King – Privy Council – committee of the Privy Council – principal secretary of state – diplomat. But in practise there was no direct connection. The monarch was the key figure. He was aided by two Secretaries of State and attended the meetings of the Privy Council and the committees regularly⁴⁶.

The onus of the day to day running of foreign policy and diplomacy were the secretaries of state. There were two of them who, in theory, were equal. In practise, however, one was considered the senior. Unlike what Henneke states in his unpublished dissertation, both secretaries handled foreign correspondence. But it has to be admitted that the contacts of the senior secretary with the diplomats abroad were more extensive⁴⁷. Schreiber asserts that Sir Robert Naunton, who was created secretary of state in 1618, was jointly responsible with his colleagues - subsequently Sir Thomas Lake (*bap.* 1561-1630)⁴⁸ and Sir George Calvert - for the king's correspondence, both foreign and domestic, as for

⁴² Croft, *King James*, 48.

⁴³ Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, 6-7. The best account, according to Lee, about this manoeuvring is Stafford, *James VI and the Throne of England*.

⁴⁴ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 178.

⁴⁵ Lee, 'The Jacobean diplomatic service', 1282.

⁴⁶ Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 30.

⁴⁷ Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 31.

⁴⁸ Lockyer, 'Lake, Sir Thomas (*bap.* 1561, *d.* 1630)'.

the supervising of the English diplomatic corps. Until his death in 1612 Salisbury occupied that principal position. He advised the king when asked, reported to the king what his diplomats had written, and informed on negotiations in London. Most diplomats employed in the Jacobean service came to office under his auspices. The English diplomats looked to him for instructions, payment and support. James did not replace Cecil immediately after his death in May 1612. Until 1614 king James acted as his own secretary with the royal favourite Robert Carr, then viscount of Rochester and later the earl of Somerset, as his assistant. In 1614, before the meeting of the Addled Parliament, the monarch appointed Sir Ralph Winwood (1562/1563-1617)⁴⁹, who had been a diplomat himself. Sir Thomas Lake was appointed in January 1616 and remained in office until 1619. After the death of Winwood king James again used his private secretary, later the first duke of Buckingham, royal favourite⁵⁰. Croft speaks of the supremacy of Buckingham. He had privileged access to all papers of State and was able to promote his own men in the service. Two secretaries were instated thanks to Buckingham: Sir Robert Naunton in 1618 and Sir Edward Conway in 1623⁵¹. But Buckingham never was responsible for all appointments, his supremacy was never complete. When Sir George Calvert became secretary he thanked Buckingham, who replied that this was all the king's doing⁵².

How to become a diplomat: a practical guide

The seventeenth century can be considered as the heyday of early modern diplomacy. Although there was no diplomatic training school for English diplomats until 1724, with the foundation of the Regius Chairs of History at Cambridge and Oxford⁵³, there was an unmistakable interest in diplomacy. The importance of a diplomatic schooling has been exaggerated according to the historian Jeremy Black⁵⁴. Van Kemseke describes early modern diplomats as amateurs⁵⁵. Although there was no school for diplomats, this did not mean that there was a lack of training. Were the diplomatic treatises of the age the handbooks of diplomacy? Although some tend to regard them as *a complete schooling*⁵⁶ it should be noted that the authors of these treatises never provided a practical manual to the art of diplomacy. A great number of them were published throughout Europe⁵⁷. Indispensable to the study of these theories is Hrabar's 1906 *De Legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* which gives three important tractates in full and describes a further forty five which were printed before 1625. Other works of importance are the text of treaties which were published by Rymer in his *Foedera* and by Dumont in *Corps universel*

⁴⁹ Greengrass, 'Winwood, Sir Ralph (1562/3-1617)'.

⁵⁰ Croft, *King James*, 97.

⁵¹ Schreiber, 'Naunton, Sir Robert (1563-1635)'.

⁵² Krugler, 'Calvert, George, first baron of Baltimore (1579/80-1631)'.

⁵³ Black, *British diplomats and Diplomacy 1688-1800*, 7; Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 73.

⁵⁴ Black, *British diplomats and diplomacy 1688-1800*, 2.

⁵⁵ Van Kemseke, 'Inleiding. Diplomatie: een kwestie van cultuur', 22.

⁵⁶ Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', 427.

⁵⁷ For a concise bibliography see Nys, *Les origines du droit international*, 295-366 (chapter 14 La Diplomatie et les Ambassades Permanentes). One of the most recent books on diplomatic treatises is Berridge, *Diplomatic Classics*.

diplomatie du droit des gens. The Italian system of diplomacy was established by 1540 but it took over four decades for a surge in the interest in diplomacy. There were a few essays published prior to 1580, but it was after that date that fascination increased. Some essays of the mid-fifteenth century were republished and new contributions were made. Mattingly concludes that only 16 separate titles can be found for the century between 1498 and 1598, but that in the ensuing two decades until 1620 there were twenty new titles and numerous reprints.

These treatises shed some light on the evolution of diplomacy and the invention of the resident ambassador. Three have been chosen here. Alberico Gentili (1552-1608)⁵⁸ and his *De Legationibus Libri Tres* (first published in 1585, and translated in English in 1594) was one of the most influential books⁵⁹. Jean Hotman de Villiers (1552-1636), himself a diplomat, published his *L'Ambassadeur* in 1603, which was promptly translated in English⁶⁰. This was considered, according to Mattingly, to be of an European reputation, like the ones of Herman Kirchner and Frederick de Marselaer⁶¹. But the bestseller of the seventeenth century was without a doubt *El Embajador* of Don Juan Antonio De Vera published in 1620. The French translation of 1642 remained the most respected diplomatic treatise until 1681. In that year Abraham de Wicquefort (1598-1682) published his *L'Ambassadeur et Ses Fonctions*. While no adjective can be noted in De Vera's Spanish edition, the first French edition (1635) spoke of *Le Parfait ambassadeur*, which became commonplace after that⁶². An interest in these essays surged in the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century as part of interest in international law. The treatises have two distinct characteristics. On the one hand they focus on the qualities ambassadors should have and on the other hand they focus on matters of legality. The balance between the qualities and the legal aspects shifted in favour of the first in the late sixteenth century⁶³. A prime example was Alberico Gentili's *De Legationibus Libri Tres* which was frequently consulted. His work consists of three books. The first book examines diplomacy as an institution and is furnished with numerous examples from Antiquity. In the second book Gentili uses Roman Law to talk about immunity. He clearly states that it is not impossible to have diplomatic relations with someone of a different faith. The third book concentrates on the moral qualities an ambassador should possess⁶⁴: he should be a man of good personal appearance, favoured by fortune, of superior intellectual power, a good speaker, someone who understands the language of the person with who he is negotiating, and possessing a wide knowledge of history. An ambassador should also have moral qualities: fidelity, temperance, prudence and courage. Gentile did in fact create the profile for a perfect ambassador⁶⁵; his list of essential attributes was influential⁶⁶.

⁵⁸ Gause-Stambouloupoulou, 'Gentili, Alberico (1552–1608)'.

⁵⁹ Berridge (ed.), *Diplomatic Classics*, 57-59.

⁶⁰ For more information on Hotman see, Schickler, 'Hotman de Villiers et son temps'.

⁶¹ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 183; Van Marselaer, *Khpykeion sive Leationum Insigne*, a copy can be found in the University Library of Louvain, BTAB CaaA1145; Van Marselaer, *Legatus libri duo*.

⁶² Berridge, (ed.), *Diplomatic Classics*, 122-123; Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 70.

⁶³ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 68.

⁶⁴ Berridge (ed.), *Diplomatic Classics*, 57-59.

⁶⁵ Gentili, *De Legationibus Libri Tres*, ii, 141-201.

⁶⁶ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 187-188.

The Huguenot Jean Hotman de Villiers, himself a French diplomat, was well aware of Gentili's list of qualities when he wrote his *L'Ambassadeur*. Perfection is something that is rarely achieved, Hotman learns, *the perfect image of an Ambassador, such as they haue figured vnto vs, was neuer amongs men, for they would haue him to be a Divine, Astrologer, Logician, an excellent Orator, as learned as Aristotle, and as wise as Salomon*⁶⁷. However, there are a few necessities according to Hotman. An ambassador should have travelled abroad, have a good knowledge of history and sciences, he must have had some other charges on affairs of state a.s.o. The qualities mentioned in these early modern sources, retained their importance in the following centuries. Even in the early twentieth century Satow reiterated them:

*Good temper, good health and good looks. Rather more than average intelligence, though brilliant genius is not necessary. A straightforward character, devoid of selfish ambition. A mind trained by the study of the best literature, and by that of history. Capacity to judge of evidence*⁶⁸.

The most important and influential book was without a doubt that of De Vera. The purpose of this Spanish diplomat, according to Mattingly, was to provide

*a useful and comprehensive treatment of all the topics which his predecessors had found relevant ... the legal status of ambassadors, their privileges and immunities, with diplomatic practice and procedures, with advice about the practical conduct of an embassy, both in general and in particular courts, and with the physical, intellectual and moral attributes desirable for a diplomatic career*⁶⁹.

Contrary to Gentili, De Vera wrote extensively on practice and procedures: from what an ambassador should wear to how he should compose his letters, from the embassy household to the manner of arrival at the foreign court. According to Berridge the importance of De Vera is also in his discussion of *the differences between the tasks of 'ambassadors in ordinary' (resident ambassadors and 'ambassadors extraordinary' (special envoys), which are interesting because they suggest strongly the growing competence of the former*⁷⁰.

These treatises more often concentrated on legal issues, privileges and immunities, and on moral questions than on practical advice. Mattingly states that in the period of De Vera there was one overruling moral issue: resident ambassadors.

*What faith does the ambassador owe to the prince or republic he serves and what to the principal to whom he is sent? And what must he do when the two duties conflict? Or when the wishes or orders of his own government seem to him contrary to the true interests of his country? Or to his own honour? Or to the law of nations under which he lives and by which he is protected? Or to the interests of peace which he is supposed to serve?*⁷¹

⁶⁷ Hotman, *The Ambassador*, [B8].

⁶⁸ Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practise*, I, 183-184.

⁶⁹ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 183-184.

⁷⁰ Berridge (ed.), *Diplomatic classics*, 88.

⁷¹ Mattingly, *Renaissance diplomacy*, 188.

There was an unrealistic response from authors like Carlo Pasqualo and de Marselaer. They blamed the invention of resident ambassadors for the loss of this moral highground. De Vera was confronted with the same problem but does not offer a clear-cut answer. He tries to resolve the dilemma with what Mattingly considered *slippery dialectic*⁷².

Although several authors made moral objections to resident ambassadors, their importance would only increase in the course of the the seventeenth century. De Vera's *perfect ambassador*, although more practical than many of his predecessors, still does not give the reader a complete picture of what Mattingly called *Embassy routine*. Not the diplomatic treatise but the actual diplomatic correspondence describes a more vivid picture of a diplomat in those days⁷³. From Salisbury onwards the training of English diplomats remained essentially the same until the eighteenth century. Most of them were trained before receiving a major post. This training was a sort of apprenticeship, either to a secretary of state or *by serving in a subordinate capacity to some senior ambassador*. While there was no theoretical schooling Jacobean diplomats were well versed in the art of diplomacy⁷⁴. Throughout Europe attachés or secretaries were appointed to diplomats. These remained at their post, as *chargé d'affaires*, when a diplomat left. They were usually paid by the ambassador himself. In the later seventeenth century they were paid by their governments, but Britain did not implement this system until the later eighteenth century⁷⁵. There are numerous examples: Sir Thomas Edmondes (d. 1639)⁷⁶, ambassador in Brussels and Paris, was senior secretary of Sir Henry Unton (c. 1558-1596)⁷⁷ during an embassy in France in 1591-1592, Edmondes remained there as *chargé d'affaires* until April 1596. Ralph Winwood was secretary to Sir Henry Neville (1561/2-1615)⁷⁸, resident ambassador in Paris (1599-1615), and became agent after Neville's departure. Dudley Carleton (1574-1632)⁷⁹ was secretary to Winwood while in Paris, Francis Cottington (1579?-1652)⁸⁰ was secretary to Sir Charles Cornwallis (c. 1555-1629)⁸¹ in Spain. The lack of an official training therefore should not be exaggerated.

Ambassadors and Agents

Besides the training also the diplomatic rank proves to be anything but uncomplicated. Bell describes the clarification of a diplomatic rank *a notoriously imprecise business*. In the sixteenth century there was no clear nomenclature, and in the seventeenth century meaning of the terms kept shifting, though Bell also claims that in the course of the seventeenth century a more precise terminology emerged. *Resident ambassadors were typically known as 'ambassadors ordinary, 'or, if their social status was exalted, 'ambassadors extraordinary.'* *Special ambassadors were usually called 'ambassadors extraordinary' in the case of greater men, 'envoys extraordinary' in the case of lesser.* Besides

⁷² Mattingly, *Renaissance diplomacy*, 191.

⁷³ Van der Essen, *Le rôle d'un ambassadeur au XVIIe siècle*, 306.

⁷⁴ Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service, 1264.

⁷⁵ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 76-77; Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 161.

⁷⁶ Greengrass, 'Edmondes, Sir Thomas (d. 1639)'.
⁷⁷ Greengrass, 'Unton, Sir Henry (c.1558-1596)'.
⁷⁸ Greengrass, 'Neville, Sir Henry (1561/2-1615)'.
⁷⁹ Reeve, 'Carleton, Dudley, Viscount Dorchester (1574-1632)'.
⁸⁰ Pogson, 'Cottington, Francis, first Baron Cottington (1579?-1652)'.
⁸¹ Kyle, 'Cornwallis, Sir Charles (c.1555-1629)'.

those titles there were also agents, chargé d'affaires and commissioners⁸². But Bell does not define these titles. Henneke distinguished in the Jacobean and Carolinian diplomatic corps several kinds of diplomats: ambassador extraordinary, resident ambassador or ambassador in ordinary, agent, special ambassador, commissioner, consul, envoy and chargé d'affaires. The basic office was that of ambassador, an official accredited to a foreign court as representative of the crown, so he could be an ambassador extraordinary, a resident ambassador or an agent. The only difference between those three was their accreditation and social rank. The other main difference between an extraordinary and a resident is the fact that an ambassador extraordinary was sent for specific business and once completed he returned, while a resident (ambassador or agent) remained at his post until revocation.

Contemporary authors of diplomatic treatises also make a distinction between several kinds of diplomats, but they do not ascribe this to diplomatic rank. Gentili discerned two kinds of embassies: a public and a free embassy. He subdivides the public embassies in those involved with negotiations for peace or war, an embassy of courtesy and a time embassy. A free embassy concerns one with the title and honour of an ambassador who travels to a foreign country on purely private business. He goes on to describe in detail the ambassador of war as an ambassador who wages war by words and an embassy of courtesy as an embassy that is sent to congratulate or condole. It is the time embassy that is most important.

By time embassy or time ambassadors, I mean those who are sent on no specific or definite business but for a period of time sometimes prescribed, sometimes not, with the understanding that while they are on the embassy they shall be responsible for the negotiation and performance of everything which during the whole period may happen to be in the interest of the person sending them. Other ambassadors are sent on a special occasion, their orders being to return as soon as they have accomplished their mission⁸³.

De Vera distinguished between the several kinds of business ambassadors can have. He could be sent for temporal as well as spiritual affairs. The latter concerned the sending of an ambassador in the name of a prince to a sanctuary, or to the pope to deliver his obedience. Temporal affairs are manifold: congratulate fellow princes on births and marriages, negotiation for a marriage, a ceasefire, an alliance are but a few examples. De Vera goes on to define different kinds of ambassadors: those who reside ordinarily and those who are sent extraordinary. He provided his audience with a definition of both.

Celui qui reside ordinairement, est un homme envoyé d'un Prince à un autre Prince, avec autorité de traiter ce qui concerne l'honneur & l'utinité de tous les deux. Et l'Extraordinaire, est aussi un homme envoyé par un Prince vers un autre Prince, pour témoigner selon les occurrences de la joie ou du deuil, afin de conserver l'amitié⁸⁴.

⁸² Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688*, 7-8.

⁸³ Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres*, ii, 14-15, 20.

⁸⁴ De Vera, *Le Parfait Ambassadeur*, i, 141-143, 145.

But he goes on to tell that there really are two kinds of ambassadors extraordinary: those sent out of civility and those sent to conclude the affairs the ordinary ambassador has negotiated⁸⁵.

Residents, as argued above, became regular practise in England from the beginning of the reign of king James. Most missions lasted between three and five years. The superiority of an ambassador over an agent had nothing to do with the duties each official had to perform. The difference can only be attributed to their social rank, their credentials, their embassy household and their daily fee. The question which kind of official would be sent depended largely on the relations between the two countries. James also employed commissioners to aid his resident in the United Provinces. A commissioner had one sole duty, negotiate. Envoys and consuls were not so much political representatives, but officials residing or sent to a city or a port to facilitate commerce and guard the interests of the English merchants.

The two diplomats that were the most frequently used by the early Stuarts were the ambassadors extraordinary/special ambassadors and the residents (ambassadors in ordinary and agents). Mattingly defines an ambassador as an official with full diplomatic status who remains at his post until recalled, what Henneke calls a resident. An ambassador extraordinary was sent for specific business. There was also a difference between an ambassador extraordinary and a special ambassador. While both had the same task they differed in social rank and accreditation, the ambassador extraordinary was clearly superior to the special ambassador⁸⁶. Unlike most of their European counterparts most English residents came from undistinguished families. There were a few exceptions such as the Wotton family, Sir Thomas Parry and Sir Charles Cornwallis⁸⁷.

It is clear that there were essentially two kinds of diplomats: the residents and the non-residents. Further distinctions between those categories were due to differences in social rank and status, but rarely reflected the tasks the diplomats had to perform. Henneke definitely exaggerates the importance of ambassadors extraordinary during the reign of James and Charles. He fits the ambassadors extraordinary in with the importance of personal diplomacy of James and Charles⁸⁸, but his argument is unconvincing. It cannot be denied that during the reign of the early Stuarts a good number of ambassadors extraordinary or special ambassadors were sent throughout Europe. When we look at the ambassadors sent explicitly to France, Spain, the United Provinces and the Catholic Low Countries most were special ambassadors or ambassadors extraordinary. But in each country there were also permanent representatives, agents or resident ambassadors. Ambassadors extraordinary were usually sent to condole or congratulate or to ratify a treaty. In a few cases they were sent to negotiate, but even then that should be nuanced. De Vera in his treatise on ambassadors makes a distinction between ambassadors extraordinary and residential or ordinary ambassadors. According to him there is no doubt the latter were the most important. They lay the foundations on which ambassadors extraordinary built⁸⁹.

⁸⁵ De Vera, *Le Parfait Ambassadeur*, i, 141-143, 145.

⁸⁶ Henneke, 'The Art of Stuart Diplomacy', 64-76.

⁸⁷ Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', 1264-1265; for an list of English diplomats during the reign of James VI/I see Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688*.

⁸⁸ Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 35.

⁸⁹ De Vera, *Le Parfait Ambassadeur*, ii, 144-146.

One of the most important matters for English foreign policy in the latter years of James VI/I was the possibility of the Spanish Match. The king sent two missions to Madrid to negotiate. Twice he sent Sir John Digby (1580-1653)⁹⁰ (first earl of Bristol since the fall of 1618): May 1617 until May 1618 and February 1622 to April 1624. But it should be noted that Sir John Digby had been the resident ambassador in Spain for almost seven years (October 1610 until July 1616). One of the most important issues was entrusted to someone who had been resident ambassador in Spain. The emphasis in the research of Henneke on ambassadors extraordinary must therefore be nuanced.

Several ambassadors extraordinary were sent to the archdukes: Sir John Bennet (March–June 1617), Sir John Digby (February–April 1621), Sir George Chaworth (August–November 1621) and Sir Richard Weston (March–September 1622). Chaworth was sent to condole infanta Isabella on the death of her husband Albert, but also to negotiate a ceasefire in the Lower Palatinate. Digby and Weston were sent concerning the Thirty Years' War. Sir John Bennet was sent because of a pamphlet that was published in the Southern Low Countries: *Isaaci Casauboni Corona Regia*, which was nothing more than a virulent attack on king James. This controversial book caused quite a stir, and from 1617 onwards it was one of the most important focuses of William Trumbull's diplomacy.

William Trumbull

This thesis proposes a radically different approach to early modern diplomacy. Instead of focusing on the king and his favourites or the ambassadors extraordinary it aims to look at diplomacy at the 'lowest level'. The Jacobean diplomatic service has been described by Lee as professional. All authors of diplomatic treatises tend to agree that to be a perfect ambassador one had to be rich, well born and handsome, but they differ on which one is the most important quality. This of course was theory but a great number of diplomats throughout Europe were of noble descent. England seems to have been one of the nations represented by especially non-noble diplomats, although there were a few exceptions, above cited. Most of the English diplomats were not the heirs to illustrious English families. Some became member of the diplomatic service because of their economic background, e.g. Paul Pindar (1565/1566-1650)⁹¹ and his successor in the Ottoman empire Thomas Roe (1581–1644)⁹². Although patronage still played an important role, it was possible for the lower gentry to gain access to diplomacy. For some, a minority though, it was a stepping-stone to a further governmental career, e.g. as secretary of state, an office Sir Ralph Winwood (1614-1617) and Sir Dudley Carleton (1628-1632) occupied. Most of them never got a major function in government when returning home. While Henneke proposed that diplomacy was only a stepping-stone, it is obvious that for some it was a career. Looking at several diplomats king James sent all over Europe, there is one who catches the eye: William Trumbull (1576/80-1635). He was one of the longest serving diplomats in one place during the reign of James VI/I.

Trumbull was the English agent at the court of archduke Albert and infanta Isabella, known as the archdukes, in Brussels between 1609 and 1625. He has been described as *a familiar figure in the new age of government by paper: the relatively minor functionary who*

⁹⁰ Smith, 'Digby, John, first earl of Bristol (1580–1653)'.

⁹¹ Ashton, 'Pindar, Sir Paul (1565/6–1650)'.

⁹² Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', 1264-1266; Strachan, 'Roe, Sir Thomas (1581–1644)'.

becomes a major source⁹³. The essential duty of a resident ambassador was observing and reporting to his government and his fellow diplomats at foreign courts. His duties did not end there, a resident ambassador also was a representative promoting the interests of his monarch, country and fellow countrymen.

By the early seventeenth century, particularly during the period from the 1590s until the outbreak of renewed warfare after 1618, when the diplomatic system expanded again after the religious asperities and the gaps in representation of the 1570s and 80s, the resident ambassador came to acquire some of the representative character that had formerly belonged only to the orators of the traditional special mission⁹⁴.

To explore these two aspects Trumbull's vast correspondence is pivotal. It has been preserved in full, so that his career can be looked at in detail. Two main sources were consulted for this research: State Paper Flanders and the Trumbull Papers.

The State Paper Flanders preserved in the National Archives (Kew, Richmond) are mainly the official dispatches Trumbull sent while stationed in Brussel as the king's agent. In this collection there are also several of the letters Trumbull sent to Sir Dudley Carleton while the latter represented the English crown in the United Provinces (1615-1625). Communication was probably one of the most important tasks of any diplomat. A resident diplomat had to keep his government, and fellow diplomats, informed about the events which occurred during their assignment. Until 1612 Salisbury managed the day-to-day business when it came to diplomacy. He expected that the resident English diplomats wrote an extensive dispatch at least every two weeks or even weekly. This Cecilian system remained accepted practice until about 1642. William Trumbull was an exemplary reporter according to the Cecilian criteria. He reported on a weekly basis. The length of the dispatches varied. The only times Trumbull did not write was when he was in London for his private affairs. His secretary, John Wolley, however, kept him apprised of the occurrences in Brussels. Trumbull informed London about a wide variety of subjects. Gathering information was a complex matter: one's own observations were complemented with a network of informants and even espionage⁹⁵. The Southern Low Countries offered sanctuary to Catholic refugees from the British Isles. In propaganda these were often considered to be pockets of possible rebellions. Of special interest were the English, Scottish and Irish regiments which served the archdukes. The Irish regiment in particular caused anxiety as the other two lead a troublesome existence. Every diplomatic correspondence also includes information about the state of affairs of the court: the want of money, the fragile health of the archduke and with that the matter of his succession were points of interest. Military intelligence, such as the movement of troops during the Jülich-Kleve succession crises (1609-1614) or the Thirty Years' War, could not be absent. Trumbull was also mindful when books and pamphlets were published by the enemies of the king.

Where did Trumbull get his information? Information could be collected a number of ways. According to Hamilton and Langhorne the embassy could be a center of

⁹³ Reeve, 'review of Owen G. Dyfnallt (ed.), *Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire: Vol. V: Papers of William Trumbull the Elder September 1614-August 1616* (London, 1988)', 572.

⁹⁴ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 63.

⁹⁵ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 212-213.

entertainment, where gossip became an excellent source. Besides that a diplomat could also acquire information from the court (from factions or through bribes), from co-religionists, from bankers and merchants and of course espionage⁹⁶. Trumbull had an extensive network within and outside the dominions of the archdukes. Unique is that most, if not all, of his correspondence has been saved over the centuries. These letters and papers are known as the *Trumbull papers*. In 1989 they were bought by the British Library. Part of these have been published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission under the heading of *Report on the manuscripts of the marquess of Downshire* (1936-1989) which covers a period from 1605 to 1618. Trumbull had an extensive network of correspondents. One of the tasks of a diplomat was to keep his colleagues apprised. Therefore he held correspondence with English diplomats, e.g. Sir John Digby in Madrid (1610-1616), Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice (1610-1615) and afterwards in Holland and Sir Ralph Winwood in The Hague (1609-1613). But Trumbull also kept in touch with his counterparts throughout Europe. The most extensive correspondences are with Protestants such as Paul Andre and Wolfrad de Plessen, ambassadors of the elector Palatine. The correspondence with representatives of Catholic monarchs was limited, with Jean Hotman as the most notable exception. Hotman represented France, but was a Huguenot. Trumbull's letter to his fellow diplomat and other correspondents in Europe is no longer extant. Only the letters to Sir Dudley Carleton have for a large part been saved and incorporated in the State Papers.

Trumbull's network within the Archducal Netherlands was as important for him to gather information, although there were few high profile figures, with the exception of Jean Thymon, advocat of the Council of Brabant, among his correspondents. Trumbull cultivated several of the English, Scottish and Irish refugees (e.g. Sir Thomas Leedes in Louvain), English merchants (e.g. Lionel Wake and John Chandler in Antwerp), but also subjects of James in service of the archduke in the English, Scottish or Irish regiment (e.g. Fergus Donnell of the Irish Regiment).

Besides collecting information Trumbull was also a representative of the English crown in Brussels.

The combination of the official correspondence (State Papers Flanders in the National Archives in London) and the Trumbull papers (all the letters he received) gives a researcher an excellent overview of Trumbull as the king's representative in Brussels. Historian Thomas Cogswell described his importance by mentioning that Trumbull's correspondence is

*the basic starting place for any study of Jacobean England ... the collection is so rich that, in terms of signal blows to scholarship, Trumbull's recall to London in 1625 must rank with the fire in the Cottonian manuscripts and the destruction of the Irish Record Office*⁹⁷.

While the adagio 'to advertise, and not to advise' was core to the way diplomats were expected to write their dispatches, it stands to reason that diplomats also advised. Residents who remained at their post for usually about four or five years certainly had something interesting to tell. Trumbull remained in Brussels first as chargé d'affaires and subsequently as resident agent for sixteen years and three months (August 1609 to

⁹⁶ Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 61-62.

⁹⁷ Cogswell, *The blessed revolution*, 324.

November 1625) and had been secretary to the former resident ambassador in Brussels, Sir Thomas Edmondson, with whom he arrived in the southern Low Countries in May 1605. He was the longest serving Jacobean diplomat in one mission, his insight in the political situation as his experience grew was appreciated in London.

From this vast correspondence it is clear that a typical early modern diplomat did observe and report on a wide range of issues: political, economical, cultural and each of the previous was entwined with religion in the early modern period. This PhD will address all several issues which will show that William Trumbull, and in extension the Jacobean diplomat, did more than just observe and report. Not all the issues that arose between 1605 and 1625 will be discussed but every aspect of the art of diplomacy will be discussed resulting in a comprehensive overview of the tasks of the early modern Jacobean diplomat.

The first chapter will address several issues. Trumbull's career will be discussed in depth. Starting point are Anderson's article in *The British Library Journal* and her contribution to the recently published *Dictionary of National Biography*⁹⁸. While most diplomats in Europe were of the nobility⁹⁹, this was not the case in Jacobean England, *most came from landed families of no great importance* which makes Trumbull's case particularly interesting¹⁰⁰. He started off as secretary to an ambassador, Sir Thomas Edmondson and ended up as his successor in Brussels. Through the contribution of archival sources a lot more can be said about Trumbull and his embassy in Brussels. A diplomat did not serve in a country on his own, he had a diplomatic household, which could include his family and staff. How big a staff could be, varied, but largely depended on the allowance the diplomat received. Diplomatic compensation, the second part of the first chapter, could come in many forms. The most clear examples were the salary (per diem diet) and the extraordinary allowance (expense account) an ambassador or an agent received. Although the perception exists that diplomats were underpaid in the early modern period, this was untrue for Elizabethan England according to Bell¹⁰¹. For the Jacobean period, however, it seems to have been the case. Besides money other things can also be considered as an integral part of the diplomatic compensation of the age: gifts for services rendered or patronage. Trumbull's tenure in London was exceptionally long to contemporary standards. With his fee he not only had to provide for his embassy household but he had to represent the interests of his sovereign and his fellow countrymen.

The following chapters will deal with the specific information contained in the Trumbull correspondence which sheds light on a broad range of topics. James was not only interested in the policies of a foreign court or details about armies, he revelled in anything his diplomats could tell him. The information an ambassador had to communicate was diverse: from negotiations to court gossip, from espionage to current events. From this information several subjects have been chosen because they occupied Trumbull over a longer period of time.

⁹⁸ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: a biographical sketch'; Anderson, 'Trumbull, William (1576x80?-1635)'.
⁹⁹ Van Kemseke, 'Diplomat: een kwestie van cultuur',

¹⁰⁰ Lee, 'The Jacobean diplomatic service', 1264.

¹⁰¹ Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation: Its Nature and Variety', 1.

In the second chapter the focus will be on the commercial interests of the English kingdom. In 1611 English cloth trade was at stake because archduke Albert wanted to ban English cloth. Cloth was one of the main export products of England. An extensive study on the cloth trade was written in 1917 by Astrid Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's project and the Cloth Trade. The Commercial Policy of England in its main Aspects 1603-1625*. Much more recent, but less exhaustive, is Benson's *Changes and Expansion in the English Cloth Trade in the Seventeenth Century* (2002). One of the issues that will be addressed in this chapter is the balance between awaiting instructions or taking the initiative. This specific case will show that Trumbull did not always awaited orders from London to act. As a representative of the English crown in Brussel Trumbull had to safeguard English interests and figured also as a rally-point for English merchants in the dominions of Albert and Isabella. It was not always easy for them to receive justice at the hands of the courts in the dominions of the archdukes, if justice came at all. Trumbull was instructed by London to help his fellow countrymen in their suits. One of the longest standing cases was that of Thomas Albery.

That the archdukes could levy troops in the kingdoms of James VI/I was stipulated in the Treaty of London (1604). The first British regiment, that of Sir William Stanley (1548-1630)¹⁰² was already serving the archduke before 1604. They had defected from the service of the United Provinces and joined the Catholics in the south. From the start it was clear that the English and Scottish regiments were the weak regiments of the Army of Flanders. The Irish regiment maintained its numerical strength during the Twelve Years Truce, but was internally divided. Trumbull would have preferred the disbandment of the Irish troops, for he feared that they eventually could be used by the Catholics against king James or his Protestant allies. There were frequent rumours of plots and the link between the Irish Franciscan friars in Louvain and the colonel of the regiment, Henry O'Neill, was enough to be alarmed. This chapter will not only provide an overview of two decades of history of the British regiments in the Southern Netherlands, but will furthermore shed light on Trumbull's task as an intelligence agent. One of his most valuable informants-spies, was a member of the Irish regiment, Fergus Donnell.

Although it was the duty of a resident to help his countrymen, the Catholic Low Countries presented this Jacobean diplomat with a specific problem: the Catholic refugees from Great-Britain and Ireland. In a third chapter this problem of the recusants is dominant. Propaganda viewed these men and women as dangerous people continually hatching plots to overthrow king, country and the Protestant religion across the Channel. It is a fact that the Southern Low Countries, since the sixteenth century, had become a safehaven for all who sought refuge from (possible) persecution in England. Who were they? What was their relationship to Trumbull? What did Trumbull tell the subsequent secretaries of state who could belong to a different faction: Sir Ralph Winwood was known as a stout Protestant, while Sir George Calvert rather belonged to the Spanish faction in court. Four separate paragraphs will focus on different aspects of the recusants in the Archducal Netherlands. Starting with the Gunpowder Plot and its repercussions for the relationship between both courts two kinds of refugees could be discerned, according to Salisbury. First there was the multitude who were of a quiet disposition

¹⁰² Rapple, 'Stanley, Sir William (1548-1630)'.

and lived peacefully in the Catholic Low Countries. Secondly there was a minority of traitors. This chapter will look at three different kinds of refugees: the ordinary recusants living in exile, the monasteries and the colleges and finally some high profile refugees. A gap between Protestant propaganda and the reality in the Southern Netherlands becomes evident from Trumbull's reports.

In the following chapter the books and pamphlets that were printed in the dominions of the archdukes are focal. Since the arrival of Sir Thomas Edmondes in Brussels in 1605 this became a recurring issue. One pamphlet in particular proved to be of key importance: *Is. Casauboni Corona Regia* which was published in the summer of 1615 in Louvain. King James took this pamphlet extremely serious and wanted that the author and printer, who were both anonymous, were punished. The archduke appointed commissioners to get to the bottom of it, so archival material from the southern Low Countries will complement the State Papers and the Trumbull papers. Because of its importance to James, Trumbull was very detailed in what he undertook to redress the wrong. *Corona Regia* was published in 1615 and Trumbull's quest for reparation lasted until 1625 when he left for London.

The previous chapters focussed on domestic issues or issues which were limited to the relation between the courts of London and Brussels. During Trumbull's agency in Brussels he saw the start and the end of the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621). Conflict, however, was never far off in a religiously divided Europe. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) is the best known conflict of the age, but the Jülich-Kleve succession crises (1609-1614) had all elements to plunge Europe into a bloody war. The first Jülich-Kleve succession crisis erupted just after the conclusion of the Twelve Years' Truce. Trumbull at that time was not only agent of king James VI/I but foremost of the *Rex Pacificus*. Trumbull played his part in both conflicts. The Treaty of Xanten which was negotiated in 1614 to end the conflict in Jülich and Kleve was never implemented, not because of the lack of trying of Trumbull and his sovereign. During the Thirty Years' War Trumbull, with others, was able to negotiate a suspension of arms in 1621 in the Lower Palatinate.

These specific issues will reveal different topics over the chapters. How did Trumbull collect his information and was it accurate? How extensive was his network within and outside the Southern Low Countries? In what way was Trumbull a functionary, a civil servant, who awaited orders and instructions and in what way did Trumbull take initiative? With these questions I not only want to discover how Trumbull worked as a diplomat, but also to shed some light on Jacobean diplomacy in general. Perhaps this can be a first step to a comprehensive study of Jacobean diplomacy.

The chronological focus for the main issues of this dissertation will be September 1609, when Trumbull became chargé d'affaires in Brussels, and November 1625, Trumbull's definitive return to England. In that time period it is possible to look in depth at how Trumbull worked as a diplomat. While there were numerous issues which commanded his time during his mandate, interest focussed more and more after 1618 to the Thirty Years War. It will become clear that an ambassador/agent was much more than an observer and reporter.

Chapter 1 William Trumbull's rise to diplomacy

William Trumbull: life of a Jacobean Gentleman

As noted in the introduction ambassadors in early seventeenth century England mostly came from landed families of little importance. William Trumbull is an excellent example of the humble origins of the Jacobean diplomat¹. About the early years of the life of William Trumbull little is known. Even the exact date and place of birth remain elusive. It must have been between 1576 and 1580, probably in the city of Stirton, Yorkshire, where his parents lived. His father, John Turnebull² was a tenant farmer and was married to Elizabeth Brogden. Trumbull had an older and a younger brother, Thomas and Roger. Very little is known about the education of the three sons. Handwriting and especially the similarity between that of the three siblings suggest they had the same teacher, which could have been in Skipton Grammar School.

Trumbull came in contact with the Elizabethan civil service in 1594. As an apprentice to an attorney at Hampton Court, William Dudson, he met high placed officials. One of them was Charles Howard (1536-1624), Lord Howard of Effingham (from 1573) who was a member of the Privy Council (1584), the Lord High Admiral (1585-1619) and at that time the Keeper of Hampton Court. In 1597 Charles Howard was elevated to the title first earl of Nottingham and became the second peer of the realm. During his stay at Hampton Court Trumbull either lived with Dudson or with Effingham. As Lord High Admiral, Howard captured two Spanish gentlemen either on the Cadiz expedition (1596) or on his last seagoing command (August 1599)³, from whom Trumbull learnt Spanish. Nottingham revealed this to Fargus Donnell, one of Trumbull's trusted Irish informants. Fargus Donnell reported that Nottingham

was pleased to discourse with me of your carriadg and great towardlines in your youthful dais when you were brought up in his Lordships house, where you begane to learne Spanishe of a cople of gentlemen Spaniards that were taken by his Lordship at sea⁴.

Apart from Nottingham, Trumbull also knew other Elizabethan gentlemen such as Owen Reynolds. Reynolds was the archivist of the Privy Council until his death in 1610. He was succeeded by Sir Thomas Locke, another friend of Trumbull. Trumbull also came in contact with the Edmondes family. Thomas Edmondes had been employed by

¹ The most recent biographical reseach has been done by Sonia P. Anderson who edited the last volume of the Downshire Manuscripts, Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', Anderson, 'Trumbull, William (1576x80?-1635)'. The entire biographical description of William Trumbull is based on this work, unless noted otherwise.

² On the change of the family name, Anderson states, *We can only speculate on why he and some other members of his family changed their name from Turnbull (or Turnebull) to Trumbull. It was not a natural progression, according to Reaney: 'OE Trumbeald developed naturally to Trumball, also spelled Trumbull. It is much more likely that this should be corrupted to Turnbull than that Turnbull should become an unintelligible Trumbull, Trumble;* Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 115; Lea, 'Contributions to a Trumbull Genealogy', 331.

³ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 118.

⁴ Historical Manuscripts Commission *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*, from now on, HMCD, v, 197 (letter 410), Donnell to Trumbull, 18 April 1615.

Sir Francis Walsingham (c. 1532-1590)⁵ in the 1580s. In the early 1590s he started his diplomatic career. He served under Sir Henry Unton, ambassador to France, as secretary in 1591-1592. After Unton's return to England, Edmondes remained behind as chargé d'affaires until April 1596. Edmondes was created an extraordinary clerk of the Privy Council (29 June 1599) and shortly afterwards an ordinary clerk to the Privy Council (18 June 1601). When exactly Trumbull entered in the service of Sir Thomas is unknown. Trumbull provides a clue himself. In 1613 he wrote the following to king James, *Heretofore I served under Sir Thomas Edmondes, in the Counsell Chamber, during the reign of the late Queene (of famous memory) the space of 6 yeares, without fee, or other reward; and since your Majesties happy comming to the Crowne of England, have spent 8 years, and a halfe in these Countryes.* Anderson argues this leaves two possibilities. Or Trumbull served the initial 6 years during the reign of Elizabeth I (1597-1603) or he served them under the reign of the Virgin Queen and James (1599-1605). But it was not until 1599 that Trumbull's services to Thomas Edmondes became permanent. During that time he travelled with Henry IV through France. From late May 1598 until May 1599 Edmondes went back to France as chargé d'affaires, until he was relieved by the new resident ambassador, Sir Henry Unton.

The first mission Edmondes and Trumbull undertook concerned the preparations of the conference of Boulogne, a failed prelude to the Treaty of London. In the 1590s several initiatives had been taken to procure a settlement between the warring parties, the conference held at Boulogne was the most prominent one. To prepare for the conference Edmondes was sent to the court of the archdukes (1599). The Spanish speaking Trumbull will certainly have been an asset to Edmondes at the court of the archdukes, the Spanish infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia and her husband archduke Albert. The diplomatic representatives arrived in Boulogne, but they never met. Agreement could not be reached on matters of precedence⁶. It would take another four years before a treaty (the Treaty of London or the Somerset House Treaty concluded on the 16 August 1604) was successfully negotiated. This allowed resident ambassadors to be exchanged between Spain, England and the Catholic Low Countries.

Sir Thomas Edmondes (he was dubbed a knight by James VI/I on 20 May 1603) was appointed resident ambassador to the court of the archdukes. He arrived in Brussels in May 1605 together with Edward Seymour (1539?-1621)⁷, the first earl of Hertford, an envoy extraordinary⁸. Hertford left as soon as he had fulfilled his ceremonial function in the ratifying of the Treaty of London. Edmondes stayed on as resident ambassador. He had two secretaries with him, William Trumbull and Jean Beaulieu. As senior secretary Trumbull was, after Edmondes himself, the most important man in the Brussels embassy. Due to the importance of the senior secretary the position was usually taken by a relative of the ambassador or a friend. Occasionally, Henneke argues, it was someone who gained the position through his qualifications. Trumbull seems to have been one of those examples. The main responsibility of a senior secretary was the handling of the correspondence. He duplicated the dispatches and got them posted. Besides the correspondence he had to manage the daily running of the embassy. Sensitive issues that

⁵ Adams, Bryson, and Leimon, 'Walsingham, Sir Francis (c.1532-1590)'.

⁶ Allen, *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598-1621*, 33 and 42; Hamy, 'Conférence pour la paix entre l'Angleterre et l'Espagne tenue à Boulogne en 1600'.

⁷ Doran, 'Seymour, Edward, first earl of Hertford (1539?-1621)'.

⁸ Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688*, 265-266.

could not be discussed between official diplomats were easily conferred on these secretaries⁹.

Trumbull was sent a few times to England during the embassy of Edmond des at the court of the archdukes: April to beginning of August 1606, May to end of September 1607 (longer than anticipated due to a broken leg), April to June 1608 and April to June 1609. Trumbull of course kept in touch with the embassy in Brussels. During the first two trips it was the junior secretary, Jean Beaulieu, who kept Trumbull informed. The last to visits Sir Thomas himself corresponded with his senior secretary, but this had a specific reason. The last two visits were of particular importance for the future of Edmond des. During his stay in London in spring 1608 the Lord Treasurer, Thomas Sackville (c. 1536-1608)¹⁰, first earl of Dorset, died. Salisbury, principal secretary of state became the new Lord Treasurer. Trumbull also had to talk to Thomas Egerton (1540-1617)¹¹, baron Ellesmere, who was Lord Chancellor to get information on what Salisbury intended to do with Edmond des.

Trumbull seems to have been in London at that time to make sure that in the event of a reshuffle Edmond des would not be forgotten. Edmond des was already hoping to succeed the English ambassador in Paris, Sir George Carew (c. 1556-1612)¹². But the reshuffle after the death of Lord Treasurer Dorset had made him hope some further advancement. While Salisbury remained secretary of state he delegated some of his tasks: Sir Thomas Smith (c. 1556-1609)¹³ got the business of Ireland, Sir Thomas Lake (*bap.* 1561, 1630)¹⁴ and the Netherlander Levinus Munck would be responsible for foreign dispatches. Edmond des was convinced that he was the right man for the last job, *both for the pains which I have taken in those services, and also for that my place of Secretary for the French tongue*¹⁵. Levinus, however, let Edmond des know that he was intended to be the next resident ambassador in France after the recall of Sir George Carew¹⁶.

Edmond des planned to follow the advice of his friends and accept the diplomatic post in Paris. Trumbull, however, wrote him that Salisbury had mentioned him favourably, which could suggest another kind of employment. Edmond des presumed that he would get foreign dispatches¹⁷. In subsequent letters Edmond des's hope was abated. Trumbull and other friends advised the diplomat in Brussels to accept employment in France. Trumbull was instructed to try and procure a promise from Salisbury that Edmond des would be called home, to be able to make arrangements concerning his private estate. The main motive, nevertheless, was to ensure that no one else would get the ambassadorship at the French court¹⁸. Trumbull's last visit to England was to prepare for the homecoming of his master. Edmond des was revoked and sailed for England on 4 September 1609. He left Trumbull behind in Brussels as the *chargé d'affaires* until the arrival of the new ambassador. For a time Edmond des's prospects remained unclear. He

⁹ Henneke, 'The Art of Stuart Diplomacy', 87-90.

¹⁰ Zim, 'Sackville, Thomas, first Baron Buckhurst and first earl of Dorset (c.1536-1608)'.

¹¹ Baker, 'Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley (1540-1617)'.

¹² Jones, 'Carew, Sir George (c.1556-1612)'.

¹³ Hammer, 'Smith, Sir Thomas (c.1556-1609)'.

¹⁴ Lockyer, 'Lake, Sir Thomas (*bap.* 1561, *d.* 1630)'.

¹⁵ HMCD, ii, 56, Edmond des to Trumbull, Brussels, 11 May 1608.

¹⁶ HMCD, ii, 57, extract from a letter of Levinus Monck, s.l., 27 april 1608.

¹⁷ HMCD, ii, 61, Edmond des to Trumbull, Brussels, 25 May 1608.

¹⁸ HMCD, ii, 63-64, Edmond des to Trumbull, Brussels, 15 June 1608.

stayed in London but there was no indication that he would get what he wanted and furthermore he desired to leave the city¹⁹. There was a further complication. Sir George Carew did not get the preferment he wanted and asked to be sent back to Paris²⁰. In the end Edmondes got the function in Paris. He arrived at his new post in May 1610 and remained there until November 1617²¹.

Trumbull's stay in Brussels should have been short. As chargé d'affaires he was still on the payroll of Edmondes and it was to him that he addressed his dispatches. Edmondes then duly informed Salisbury of the occurrences in Brussels. The first dispatch addressed directly to Salisbury was dated on 22 November 1609²². What would happen with Trumbull after the arrival of the new ambassador was undecided, but during 1610 he was no longer a chargé d'affaires but a resident agent. This moment cannot exactly be pinpointed in time. His long-time friend, Edmondes's new senior secretary Jean Beaulieu wrote him on a weekly basis and addressed him as *My good bedfellow*. But a letter of the 18th January 1610 described Trumbull as *Resident with the Archduke*. From that time onwards, Beaulieu ceased to use the phrase *My good bedfellow*. At the very end of his letter he explains why he changed the style of his letters.

I hope you will not make any ill interpretation of the alteration of my style lately happened in the superscription of my letters, which though I do acknowledge that the quality of your place could very well admit, yet I know that it was far from your nature and modesty to affect any such honour of titles, which made me at the beginning to forbear it, upon the confidence and freedom of our old familiarity. But seeing almost all the rest, and amongst them those that are many degrees higher than the top of my head, to use that observance and formality towards you, I was afraid it might have been taken for a presumption or neglect in me to remain singular in the plainness of my form, and thought it better to incur the danger of your particular censure for too much, than the ill opinion of all the rest for too little respect towards you²³.

The members of the Privy Council also addressed Trumbull as *Agent with the Archduke*²⁴. Trumbull had to relinquish his place as a courier, which he had since 1603²⁵. John More advised him that it would be best to have the reversion for Trumbull's son or if he wished to sell it, he should do so timely²⁶. King James signed the reversion for William Trumbull the younger the following year²⁷.

Before Edmondes's departure from London in May 1610 to take up his new post in Paris he had a conversation with Salisbury about Trumbull. Salisbury enquired how Trumbull was going to dispose of himself after the new ambassador arrived (Dudley Carleton was intended for that post). Salisbury did not think Trumbull would be willing

¹⁹ HMCD, ii, 191, Edmondes to Trumbull, London, 24 November 1609.

²⁰ HMCD, ii, 194, Edmondes to Trumbull, London, 30 November 1609; HMCD, ii, 197, Beaulieu to Trumbull, [London], 7 December 1609; HMCD, ii, 200, Beaulieu to Trumbull, London, 14 December 1609.

²¹ HMCD, ii, 279, Edmondes to Trumbull, Blackfriars, 19 April 1610.

²² Hinds, 'Introduction', HMCD, ii, vi.

²³ HMCD, ii, 222-223, Beaulieu to Trumbull, London, 18 January 1610.

²⁴ HMCD, ii, 321, The Lords of the Council to Trumbull, Whitehall, 10 July 1610.

²⁵ CSPD, James I, 1603-1610, iii, 28.

²⁶ HMCD, iii, 169, More to Trumbull, London, 24 October 1611.

²⁷ HMCD, iii, 234, More to Trumbull, London, 7 February 1612.

to remain in Brussels under a new ambassador, having served as the king's agent. Edmondès complimented Trumbull. Trumbull, according to Edmondès's testimonial, was capable to serve in any function. Edmondès assured Trumbull that Salisbury would procure him a place or even that he would be employed by the Lord Treasurer himself. However, circumstances changed somewhat due to the archdukes. It had become clear that they did not intend to send a new diplomatic representative with the rank of resident ambassador to London. Their intention was to send an agent to reside at the court of James VI/I. Edmondès wondered at why James was intending to send Dudley Carleton as ambassador, but soon considered that king James could not leave Brussels and Madrid without diplomatic representatives²⁸. Sir Charles Cornwallis had left Spain in October 1609 and left his secretary, Francis Cottington as agent. The new ambassador, Sir John Digby, arrived a year later.

Although Salisbury had spoken highly of him and Edmondès had reassured him, Trumbull remained uncertain about his future²⁹. He was contemplating to join Edmondès in Paris and resume his service as secretary. Edmondès assured Trumbull that Salisbury had a high opinion of Trumbull, *and as his custom is to design places for those whom he findeth fit to do service and of whom he taketh a particular liking, I consider that your fortune will be subject to less impediment than those of a higher nature*. Furthermore Edmondès did not think that it would be wise for Trumbull's career to return to his service, but he would be welcome³⁰. Although Edmondès professed that his former senior secretary would be welcome, he made it perfectly clear that he could not resume his former responsibilities. Anything he would do, he would do in a voluntary capacity³¹. That things between them had turned sour became even more evident when Trumbull, through Jean Beaulieu, asked Edmondès to be the godfather of his newborn son, John, in summer 1611. Beaulieu reported that this request was met with not a word³². Trumbull kept himself apprised of possibilities in London. Samuel Calvert wrote him that at that time, July 1610, he would forbear to write Trumbull in regard to his return to London, because there was nothing worthy of him³³.

Edmondès's heir-apparent, Carleton, never came to Brussels however. After his departure had been delayed for six months, his credentials were withdrawn³⁴. This had everything to do with protocol and honour. The archduke had recalled his ambassador, Conrad Schetz or d'Ursel (1553-1632)³⁵, the count of Hoboken, before James had revoked Edmondès, so it was up to Albert to send a new ambassador first³⁶. Carleton avouched this to Edmondès writing, *a consideration of the archduke's slackness to send hither (who first*

²⁸ HMCD, ii, 308, Edmondès to Trumbull, Paris, 14 June 1610, HMCD, ii, 310, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 14 June 1610.

²⁹ This letter of the 21 June 1610 is mentioned in HMCD, ii, 324, Edmondès to Trumbull, 20 July 1610.

³⁰ HMCD, ii, 324-325, Edmondès to Trumbull, Paris, 20 July 1610.

³¹ HMCD, ii, 327, Devick to Trumbull, Paris, 20 July 1610.

³² HMCD, iii, 124, Beaulieu to Trumbull, 124, Paris, 18 August 1611.

³³ HMCD, ii, 328, Calvert to Trumbull, , [London], 25 July 1610.

³⁴ Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy', 152.

³⁵ Verhaegen, 'Ursel (Conrad d')', 924.

³⁶ HMCD, ii, 343, Devick to Trumbull, Paris, 7 Augustus 1610.

revoked his ambassador, and should therefore send first), diverted my course and I was at the same instant as I should have taken leave for that service assigned to Venice³⁷.

Beaulieu's opinion was that the change in plan for Carleton would not be prejudicial to Trumbull, except for the discontentment of his wife. Trumbull could send for her if he got assurance that his stay would be longer³⁸. Edmondès agreed with Beaulieu's assessment and was sure that this alteration meant that Trumbull would be settled in Brussels for a long time. He advised Trumbull that this would be better than to return to England. He should therefore send for his wife³⁹. Calvert on the other hand was certain that a choice of someone else would soon be made as the new ambassador to Brussels⁴⁰. Trumbull remained in Brussels but worried about his precarious situation.

But as for the coming of an Ambassador and uncertainty of my stay here, though I confess I cannot be without perplexity considering my unsettled condition, and the loss of that reward which my long and painful service did justly claim from my Lord Ambassador, yet knowing my own weakness, the burden of this charge, how necessary it is that his Majesty should be well served in this ticklish place, and that I am but a tenant at will, I shall be in utrumq. paratus⁴¹.

One of the other correspondents in London, John More, sounded Salisbury's close associate Munck about Trumbull's prospects. It was clear that no successor to Sir Thomas Edmondès would be nominated until the archduke sent an ambassador. Trumbull would remain in Brussels for at least six more months. John More wrote to Deborah Trumbull to prepare for the journey towards her husband in Brussels⁴². William Devick, one of the embassy household of Edmondès in Paris, while being in London informed that Trumbull's wife was preparing to cross the English Channel⁴³. She joined her husband at the end of October or the start of November 1610⁴⁴.

It was not until the beginning of January 1611 that Trumbull was able to inform Salisbury that the archdukes finally had decided to send a new representative to reside with the English monarch: Ferdinand de Boisshot (-1649)⁴⁵. His father, Jean-Baptiste de Boisshot (c. 1616-1580)⁴⁶, had already been an ambassador to the court of the Virgin Queen⁴⁷. There was a possibility that Trumbull would be recalled, but that would take some time. Trumbull had acquitted himself exemplary of his tasks. Furthermore, the dishonour the archdukes paid James by waiting this long meant that he would not be

³⁷ HMCD, ii, 342, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 7 August 1610; Birch, *Court and Times of James the First*, i, 103, quoted in Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collection in early Stuart Britain', 212.; for Carleton's embassy to Venice see Marshall, 'Sir Dudley Carleton, James I's Ambassador to Venice, 1610-1615'.

³⁸ HMCD, ii, 342, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 7 August 1610.

³⁹ HMCD, ii, 345-346, Edmondès to Trumbull, Paris, 14 August 1610.

⁴⁰ HMCD, ii, 353, Calvert to Trumbull, [London], 24 August 1610.

⁴¹ HMCD, ii, 364, draft Trumbull to Munck/Monck, Brussels, 19 September 1610.

⁴² HMCD, ii, 366, More to Trumbull, London, 27 September 1610.

⁴³ HMCD, ii, 378, Devick to Trumbull, London, 16 October 1610.

⁴⁴ Trumbull mentioned this in a letter of 2 November 1610 to Beaulieu in Paris. This letter does not exist anymore, but Beaulieu's reply mentions the arrival of Trumbull's wife, HMCD, ii, 394, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 14 November 1610.

⁴⁵ Delecourt, 'Boisshot (Ferdinand de)', 621-624.

⁴⁶ Britz, 'Boisshot (Jean-Baptiste de)'.

⁴⁷ The National Archives, State Papers, from now on SP 77/10, f^o 1r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 2 January 1611.

hasty in sending a new ambassador. Edmondes concurred with that feeling and did not think the English king would send a new ambassador that same year unless some strange accidents would occur⁴⁸. Names of a successor floated in London: George Calvert, who had been serving Salisbury since April 1603, Sir Thomas Overbury (*bap.* 1581, 1613), a candidate of royal favourite Sir Robert Carr (1585/6?–1645), later earl of Somerset, and Sir Henry Wotton (1568–1639), who had been English ambassador in Venice (December 1603–March 1611)⁴⁹.

The Privy Council, however, had no intention of nominating a new ambassador until de Boisshot arrived in London. This measure was to avoid competition, because at that time an embassy was considered a reward. But they also wanted to avoid the costs of having an embassy ready in London waiting to cross over to the continent⁵⁰. Mention of a new ambassador for Brussels is still made in September 1611⁵¹. De Boisshot finally arrived at his post in September 1611. At that time two names were floated for Brussels, George Calvert and Sir Edwin Sannes, but, John More assured Trumbull, he would not be revoked very soon⁵². The following month Trumbull received little hope for a speedy revocation⁵³. Although talk of a new appointment for Brussels continued, Trumbull remained there. In 1614 he was appointed a clerk of the Privy Council and Somerset was under the impression Trumbull wished to be recalled. Edmondes, however, informed the royal favourite that this was not the case. Furthermore, he argued, it would have been ill taken by the archduke that any other was going to be sent as agent. A resolution had been taken to send the further unidentified Mr. Crane to replace Trumbull, but Somerset changed that resolution and Trumbull stayed on in Brussels⁵⁴. When Winwood occupied the office of principal secretary of state in March 1614 he assured Trumbull that James VI/I did not want to recall Trumbull until he knew what would happen to the childless archdukes. If forever weak archduke Albert died who would become sovereign of those territories? Only when that became clear would he consider the revocation of William Trumbull⁵⁵.

After Edmondes left for England, Trumbull seems to have been lodged near St. Guricke (Sint Gorik?) in Brussels. Trumbull's residence in Brussels could be found in the a street called Blindenbech⁵⁶. We do not learn a lot about the embassy residence besides

⁴⁸ HMCD, iii, 8, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 17 January 1611; HMCD, iii, 12, Edmondes to Trumbull, Paris, 23 January 1611.

⁴⁹ HMCD, iii, 20, Devick to Trumbull, London, 8 February 1611; HMCD, iii, 21, More to Trumbull, London, 8 February 1611; HMCD, iii, 31, Devick to Trumbull, London, 7 [March] 1611; HMCD, iii, 44, Calvert to Trumbull, London, [22 March] 1611; HMCD, iii, 46, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 27 March 1611; Krugler, 'Calvert, George, first baron of Baltimore (1579/80-1631)'; Considine, 'Overbury, Sir Thomas (*bap.* 1581, *d.* 1613)'; Bellany, 'Carr, Robert, earl of Somerset (1585/6?–1645)'; Loomie, 'Wotton, Sir Henry (1568–1639)'.

⁵⁰ HMCD, iii, 85, More to Trumbull, London, 5 June 1611.

⁵¹ HMCD, iii, 139, More to Trumbull, London, 10 September 1611.

⁵² HMCD, iii, 146, More to Trumbull, London, 25 September 1611.

⁵³ HMCD, iii, 165, Kirkham to Trumbull, [London], 17 October 1611.

⁵⁴ HMCD, iv, 342, Edmondes aan Trumbull, 18 March 1614.

⁵⁵ HMCD, iv, 387, Winwood to Trumbull, 22 April [1614].

⁵⁶ HMCD, iii, 397, Father Marten to Trumbull, Cameraco, 15 November 1612 (n.s.), *en la rue dict Blindenbech, en bas de la maison de Monsr. La Chantre de St. Goudeuol*, currently the cathedral of Saint-Michael and Saint-Gudule in Brussels.

that it was near the Porte the Louvain⁵⁷. During the fall of 1617, just after the death of Winwood, he informed the new secretary of state that *the lease of the house, wherein I dwell is nowe expyred, and I shalbe forced to remove wthin these 20. dayes, or els to lye in the streets*. At the end of 1617 he effectively moved. While he was on leave in England for the first half of 1618 he wanted some changes done to his new residence. Wolley, who remained in Brussels, kept his master informed. The landlord, *Monsieur d'Erville*, did not want to change anything, e.g. build a stable or make a coach place. Wolley could not find another suitable house in Brussels except one that belonged to the Duchesse of Aerschot, Anne de Ligne (*d. 1635*)⁵⁸. Meanwhile, at the start of 1618, Trumbull was also trying to acquire some horses. He employed Jean Libigny to help him. He assured John Wolley, who was left in charge in Brussels, that the horses could be gotten at stud farms in Kleve and Gueldres for 300 or 400 florins⁵⁹. Apparently Trumbull did not stay in the same residence throughout his mandate, because he informed the secretary of state that he had moved into a new residence in September 1618 when he returned from his last visit to London before being recalled in the fall of 1625. His new residence was the house of the duchesse of Aerschot, as is apparent when the lease for the house ended at Michaelmass 1621. In July he informed secretary Calvert of his worries. *So that I must either hyer another, or lye in the streets*. Hiring another was difficult because Sir John Digby, who had visited the Southern Low Countries as ambassador extraordinary had told Trumbull of the possibility that he would be revoked by the king. If he decided to hire another he could do it for no less than three years. By mid-September he was moving into a new residence⁶⁰.

Every ambassordor or agent also had a staff, the embassy household. There was no specific layout of how an embassy household should be, according to Henneke. There were variations from resident diplomat to resident diplomat. Henneke further distinguishes between three kinds of personel. Resident diplomats had an embassy household which consisted of diplomatic officers, people without diplomatic duties and the resident's family. The most important of the diplomatic officers were the secretaries. Beside the secretaries every diplomat had also a domestic staff. But the composition of the domestic staff differed from embassy to embassy. It could include a steward, a chaplain, a stablemaster and for the bigger embassies also a *physician, porter, and cook, as well as coachmen, couriers, footmen, grooms, farriers, trumpeteres, scullery men, postilions, and grooms of the ambassador's chamber*⁶¹.

The exact composition of Trumbull's embassy household is difficult to ascertain. But the comparison with that of his predecessor and master can be made. Edmond's embassy household for Paris can give us some clues. In the middle of May 1610 Beaulieu reported that Edmond's was ready to depart for Paris.

⁵⁷ HMCD, v, 494 (letter 1044), Taylor to Trumbull, s.l., [6 May 1616 endorsed]: The letter is addressed to Myn Heere Thrumbal, Ingelgelsman [*sic*] woonende aen de Lovenshepporte [Mr. Trumbull, Englishman, living at the Porte de Louvain.

⁵⁸ HMCD, vi, 413 (letter 899), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 6 May 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 415 (letter 905), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 9 May 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f° 425v-426r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 22 November 1617; SP 77/12 f° 436v, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 13 December 1617.

⁵⁹ HMCD, vi, 373 (letter 814), Libigny to Trumbull, 2 February 1618 (n.s.).

⁶⁰ SP 77/13 f° 79, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, 20 September 1618; SP 77/14 f° 368r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 3 July 1621; SP 77/14 f° 464v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 13/23 September 1621.

⁶¹ Henneke, 'The Art of Early Stuart Diplomacy, 81-82.

To-morrow, God willing, we go without fail in the company of Mr. Devick, Mr. Woodford, our new Secretary, James the butler, Robin porter, our old acquaintance, a new cook, Thomas footman, and another new lackey, and one or two more new serving men ... The rest of the stuff shall be sent by sea a little afore my Lady Edmond's coming, afore which my lord may return on business. John Searle is minded to go with us, but his father is against it, so that we shall lose him, and Mr. Flood is not yet back from Wales. My Lord was desirous to have him with us to France⁶².

There are a few clues throughout his correspondence to ascertain what Trumbull's household was. A diplomat usually had several secretaries. Edmond's while in Brussels (1605-1609) had William Trumbull and John Beaulieu and while in Paris he kept Beaulieu and replaced Trumbull with John Woodford. They would usually copy correspondence and one of them was the senior secretary, the second in command.

Trumbull complained in a memorandum that he had to entertain many costly and painful correspondences with his own hands, because he did not have the means to pay for someone to assist him. Trumbull's closest thing to a secretary was John Wolley. He certainly was in service of Trumbull before April 1611. In a letter Elizabeth Devick asked Trumbull to pass greetings of Mrs. Wolley to her son, John. She was interested in what he did, especially how he used his spare-time, which she hoped he was spending studying. Until 1615 Wolley's name only comes up occasionally in the Trumbull correspondence, mostly in reference to his mother⁶³. From 1615 onwards he figures more prominently in the correspondence. Trumbull sent Wolley to England in 1615 (April until at the least August). He carried with him a packet and a letter from Trumbull. Although not mentioned explicitly this almost certainly concerned the ratifying of the Treaty of Xanten (1614) which was meant to conclude the Second Jülich-Kleves crisis. Although the Treaty was negotiated there was disagreement about the formulation of the preamble and of a promise of Spinola and Maurice of Nassau, as will be seen in one of the following chapters.

Meanwhile Trumbull was requesting leave to return to England for a certain amount of time. In July Winwood wrote the agent in Brussels that if he wanted to return to England he would ask the king for permission⁶⁴. Permission was granted to travel to England for a short time, one month, on the 21 August 1615. Although Trumbull could choose the best time to travel, the secretary of state urged Trumbull to be in London before Michaelmas, because then the king would also be in London. If not, Trumbull would have to travel to Royston or Newmarket to meet James VI/I⁶⁵. Trumbull left for England at about mid-September. Trumbull got letters of recommendation from several highplaced persons. The elector and electress Palatine each wrote a letter to the king to *testify to his diligence and good offices in my affaires, and to his most meritorious services as your*

⁶² HMCD, ii, 295-296, Beaulieu to Trumbull, London, 16 May 1610.

⁶³ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch, 120; HMCD, vi, 80, Memorandum by William Trumbull, s.l., [1616-1617]; HMCD, iii, 65, Paris, Devick to Trumbull, 26 April 1611; HMCD, iv, 213, Thomas Shelton to Trumbull, Paris, 16 October 1613 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 392, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 29 April 1614.

⁶⁴ HMCD, v, 286 (letter 585), Winwood to Trumbull, Ditton Park, 23 July 1615.

⁶⁵ HMCD, v, 319 (letter 644), Winwood to Trumbull, Beaulieu, 21 August 1615.

representative and earned the reputation of being a loyal and good servant to Your Majesty⁶⁶. Others who recommended Trumbull's service were archduke Albert and the John Frederick, duke of Würtemberg, whom Trumbull helped in a dispute between him and Albert concerning Montbelliard⁶⁷.

According to the testimony of Jean Beaulieu, Trumbull left John Wolley in charge in Brussels with the command *to receive and forward all correspondence addressed to you*, which makes John Wolley the senior secretary of the Brussels embassy⁶⁸. Another who defines Wolley as Trumbull's secretary is the Palatine envoy to France, de Gueretin⁶⁹. John Wolley was sent to England for months on end in the following years. In 1616 he arrived in England in March and was certainly back in Brussel by December, but most probably he returned by the end of the summer. This visit concerned the matter of the *Corona Regia*. In a subsequent letter Trumbull referred to the packet and a dispatch Trumbull had written and delivered to the secretary of state using John Wolley as courier⁷⁰. He was back in England in the fall of 1618.

Wolley did not only go to London as a courier with important news. While Trumbull was on leave in England (mid-September until mid-December 1615 and January until July 1618) Wolley remained in Brussels. For the period in 1615 there is little correspondence that gives account of Wolley's responsibilities. In 1618, however, John Wolley effectively took charge of the embassy and reported at least once a week (the first letter is dated the 25 January (n.s.) and the last 27 June (n.s.) to his master). Trumbull informed Carleton of his imminent departure in January 1618 and mentioned that he left John Wolley behind⁷¹. By then it certainly was clear that John Wolley had become the second in command at the Brussels embassy. John Wolley would remain in the service of Trumbull. After the agent's death at the end of August or the start of September 1635 Wolley, together with two assistants drew up inventories of Trumbull's possessions in London (9 September 1635) and at Easthampstead (17 September 1635)⁷².

Germain of Jarman Marsham was another man in the service of Trumbull. In November 1612 while in London he addressed Trumbull and his wife as *Right kind and loving Master and Mistress*⁷³. He was certainly employed by the English agent in Brussels by the end of 1610, possibly even by June 1609. Trumbull used him as a courier between Brussels and London but also as an intermediary between Trumbull and his informants such as Henry Taylor, a printer in Douai. Like Wolley, Marsham remained with Trumbull and his family after being recalled from the Spanish Netherlands. He witnessed Trumbull's will in 1635⁷⁴. Henry Ballam was another courier Trumbull often employed or who was employed towards Trumbull. But Ballam was not on Trumbull's payroll until 1614. He served Mathew de Quester and is mentioned as such in several letters before

⁶⁶ HMCD, v, 336 (letter 677), Frederick V to James VI/I, Heidelberg, 13 September 1615; HMCD, v, 336 (letter 678); Elizabeth to James VI/I, Heidelberg, 13 September 1615.

⁶⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 392r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 28 September 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 341-342 (letter 689), John Frederick to James VI/I, Montbelliard, 18 September 1615.

⁶⁸ HMCD, v, 343 (letter 692), Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 19/29 September 1615.

⁶⁹ HMCD, v, 385, De Gueretin to Trumbull, Paris, 31 December 1615 (n.s.).

⁷⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 49r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, s.l., 13/23 March 1616.

⁷¹ SP 77/13 f^o 3v, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 7 January 1618 (possibly n.s.).

⁷² Andersons, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 128.

⁷³ HMCD, iii, 394, Marsham to Trumbull, London, 5 November 1612.

⁷⁴ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 120.

March 1610⁷⁵. John Sanford, erstwhile chaplain to Edmondess in Brussels and later employed by George Abbot, informed his master that Trumbull had engaged Henry Ballam, *in conveying letters and books between the parties*⁷⁶. If this means that Ballam had an exclusive contract with Trumbull seems unlikely. A reference is made to Thomas Clarcke, who Trumbull call's his man in December 1619. He brought two dispatches from the secretary of state when returning to Brussels⁷⁷.

Besides the embassy staff, the diplomats family also joined the residence. Trumbull's wife, Deborah Downe, joined her husband when it became clear he would remain in Brussels for an extended period of time. Beaulieu, Trumbull's longtime friend and fellow secretary in service of Sir Thomas Edmondess, advised him in march 1610 that it would be a good idea for Trumbull to let his wife join him. She eventually arrived on the continent in Flushing half a year later. They had two children at that time, William and Elizabeth. Elizabeth came with Deborah when she joined her husband in October 1610. Anthony De Nort had seen them in Flushing and both were in good health, although Trumbull's daughter had been seasick⁷⁸.

There is no mention of Trumbull's eldest son, William. He remained in England and was left in the care of Christopher Wragge. Two letters of Wragge survive in the Trumbull papers. The first seems to be one final report on Trumbull's son, who is *as violent in his enterprises, never wearied for his book; of good understanding and aptness to learn*. He goes on that he has received instructions by Mr. Salmon that the boy should be sent to his father⁷⁹. William arrived on the continent late May 1612⁸⁰. The second letter is a reply to Trumbull letter of gratitude to Wragge for his teaching. The English agent did not summon his son to assist him in Brussels, but to send him to the Calvinist academy in Sedan. Sedan was a Protestant principality of Henri de la Tour de l'Auvergne, duke of Bouillon, until it was annexed by France in 1681. He was originally left in the care of William Blankes (Blancks, Le Blanc), sieur de Beaulieu, and Andrew Melvin. Blankes was a professor of Theology at Sedan. Melvin left for England in March 1613. Trumbull asked the Scot Guillaume or William Donaldson, who was principal of the academy between 1611 and 1622, to take care of his son, who accepted⁸¹.

While some diplomats had a chaplain with them to conduct religious services in an embassy chapel, Trumbull, unlike his predecessor Sir Thomas Edmondess, did not have one. This was no lack of religious fervour, but had more to do with the money he was paid. When Edmondess left Brussels in 1609 he had a per diem diet of 66s. 8d./day; Trumbull only received 20s./day. That they did not have their own Protestant minister became evident with the birth of another son and daughter, John and Anne. John, frequently referred to as captain Hans or Hansken, was born in Brussels in August 1611⁸². Soon afterwards the problem of the christening came up. Trumbull wrote about this

⁷⁵ HMCD, ii, 109-110, De Quester to Trumbull, London, 15 June 1609. HMCD, ii, 113, De Quester to Trumbull, London, 6 July 1609.

⁷⁶ HMCD, iv, 472, John Sanford to Trumbull, Croydon, 28 July 1614.

⁷⁷ SP 77/13 f^o, 457r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 16/26 December 1619.

⁷⁸ HMCD, ii, 381, De Nort to Trumbull, s.l., 22 October 1610.

⁷⁹ HMCD, iii, 295-296, Wragge to Trumbull, s.l., 18 May [1612 endorsed].

⁸⁰ HMCD, iii, 299, Albery to Trumbull, London, 23 May 1612.

⁸¹ HMCD, iv, 68, Melvin to Trumbull, Sedan, 19 March 1613; HMCD, iv, 84-85, Donaldson to Trumbull, Sedan, 8 April 1613.

⁸² HMCD, iii, 121, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 12 August 1611.

problem to Beaulieu in Brussels who asked Edmondes for advice, he could give none⁸³. John was christened during the month of September in the presence of Trumbull's older brother, Thomas⁸⁴. Who baptised the child is unclear.

The same problem presented itself in the fall of 1616 when Deborah gave birth to Anne. Trumbull wanted a Mr. Furbish⁸⁵ from Middelburg in the Protestant north to christen his daughter. He wrote John Corham, an English merchant in Antwerp, who conveyed his request to Maurice Browne in Middelburg. Corham was certain Furbish was eager to serve Trumbull⁸⁶. If he arrived in Antwerp before Trumbull, he would send him towards Brussels. But a problem came up. Furbish's health was poor and Maurice Browne contacted Thomas Potts, minister of the English garrison in Flushing. He could not help Trumbull because the schedule for the next Sunday was full, he was to preach and had to perform a marriage ceremony. He nevertheless promised to come on Sunday 22 September if Furbish had not recovered by then⁸⁷. On the 24 September it was still not clear who would come and Corham wrote:

If you had come here, as you had originally intended, before writing for any other preacher, I would have proposed that you invited the pastor of Lillo, who would have officiated quite as well and with less expense and trouble than the other two⁸⁸.

Again, who christened Anne Trumbull is unclear, but what is clear is that Trumbull did not have a chaplain in Brussels and had to rely on the Protestant Republic for special occasions.

Revocation was always at the back of Trumbull's mind. He gave several reasons to wish for it, religion was only one of them. In a memorandum written in 1616-1617 he admitted religion was on the top of his list, *The wante of meanes freely to exercise my religion and frequente the churche and sacraments, which he cannott doe in this idollatrows and supersitiows countrey⁸⁹*. This situation did not improve after the ending of the Twelve Year's Truce in 1621 which radically changed the contacts between the Catholic Southern Netherlands and the Protestant Northern Netherlands. After the death of king James, he again invoked religion as a reason to be revoked.

My ymportunity to comme home, should not haue ben so greate, but that here, I am compelled to liue lyke a heathen, or an Athiste, without exercise of my Religion, and Conscience, and the frequentinge of the holy Communion; wch since the expiration of the Truce, I could not procure: and if either I, or any of my familly should happen to dye, wee shall neither for loue nor monney be allowed earth to couer our carcasses⁹⁰.

⁸³ HMCD, iii, 124, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 18 August 1611.

⁸⁴ HMCD, iii, 131, Throckmorton to Trumbull, Flushing, 31 August 1611.

⁸⁵ Throckmorton refers to a Mr. Forbush, Scottish minister, HMCD, iii, 330, Throckmorton to Trumbull, [Flushing], 15 July 1612.

⁸⁶ HMCD, vi, 5-6 (letter 14), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 19 September 1616 (n.s.).

⁸⁷ HMCD, vi, 9 (letter 29), Browne to Trumbull, Middelburg, 13/23 September 1616.

⁸⁸ HMCD, vi, 10-11 (letter 33), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 24 September 1616 (n.s.).

⁸⁹ HMCD, vi, 80 (letter 188), Memorandum by William Trumbull, [1616-1617].

⁹⁰ SP 77/18 f^o 117v, Trumbull to Conway, [Brussels], 6/16 May 1625.

Trumbull got different kinds of advise: to ask to be recalled or to stay put in Brussels. John Castle, a correspondent in London, informed him that he was sorry to hear from Ballam's account that Trumbull had not been well. He wished that Trumbull would return to England to find better health and fewer worries. He goes on to say that *in this necessity of the Kings coffers, there is no worse condition then to stay abroade where there is every day a great expence and burthen, and nothing to defray it from the Exchequer*. According to Castle it would be very difficult for Trumbull's wife to collect the money owed to him if he died. It was Castle's opinion that Trumbull should return to London to support his claims. He had already done so in writing, but that was insufficient. By remaining overseas Trumbull was unable to promote himself if opportunities were presented. *Your fellowes Mr. Edm [Sir Thomas Edmondess] and Mr Calvert [Sir George Calvert] thrive and purchaze and obtayne good sutes whilst you spend and wast your marrowe from the stock*⁹¹. Trumbull seems to have taken Castle's advice to heart and began sounding some persons about his possible recall.

His main patron, secretary of state Winwood, warned him that a revocation would be untimely. Trumbull followed the advice of Winwood, but stated that if he had sufficient funds, he would be able to acquit him self properly of his duties. Castle informed Trumbull on this matter

*I must warn you that you are not likely for the moment to succeed in getting yourself recalled from your post. When Mr Comptroller presented your request to Mr Secretary the latter swore by God that you were not to return home yet. 'My opinion is that you are to handy for the Secretary ... and in this tyme of broyles and commotions in the world it is not likely that they will revoke one that is veteranus milet to employ a freswater soldier.' But you may be compensated by an increase in your allowance*⁹².

Even George Abbot felt the need to warn Trumbull about his request to be revoked from Brussel.

*But you must know that the very opinion of our remoove had like to have produced some ill effect. For one in the world, of whom you shall heare more hereafter, having resented it had thought to have placed there a creature of his owne, who should have served some purposes more tending to private ends then to the publicke good*⁹³.

Castle reiterated this a few months later. Any decisions on the future of Trumbull would have to wait until it was clear what would transpire in Madrid. London was awaiting the audience of Sir John Digby over there⁹⁴. Castle kept inquiring, but could not give any other news. Winwood had written a letter to the king who referred the matter to the Privy Council. Castle was sure that Winwood did not favour a return because of Trumbull's extensive experience. He was reported to have said, *Alass poore man, what would he do here? Here are 2 Clarks of the Counsell present that can hardlie finde support from*

⁹¹ HMCD, vi, 50 (letter 125), Castle to Trumbull, s.l., [18 November 1616].

⁹² HMCD, vi, 129 (letter 288), Castle to Trumbull, Whitehall, 6 March 1617.

⁹³ HMCD, vi, 178 (letter 405), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 10 May 1617.

⁹⁴ HMCD, vi, 237 (letter 517), Castle to Trumbull, Colman Street, 24 July 1617; HMCD, vi, 282 (letter 605), Castle to Trumbull, London, 11 September 1617.

that place. And what would be his mayntenance if there be 3 attending? Yf he had but a little proved the place, he would twenty tymes wish himselfe back at Brussels⁹⁵.

The case of the *Corona Regia* raged with all intensity. King James finally sent an extraordinary ambassador, Sir John Bennet, to the court of the archdukes, to deal with the matter once and for all. This led to almost nothing and Bennet returned to London. According to his instructions, Trumbull was also recalled at that time. Trumbull however remained in Brussels to manage his private affairs. He wrote Winwood concerning a commission given by the elector Palatine. *The Council of the Elector Palatine have given me a commission, but I do not see how I can discharge it since after Sir John Bennet's return to England I occupy noo official position here. I should be restored to my former diplomatic status as Agent*⁹⁶. He seems to have heeded Winwood's advice. He sent his wife to London in the fall of 1617⁹⁷. But Winwood's death crossed her plans. Castle and Beaulieu recommended that she should follow the advice of Edmond. On the other hand both were equally convinced that Trumbull should request to be recalled from Brussels⁹⁸. Trumbull informed Carleton that after the death of Winwood, all he wished was to be recalled and take up his duties as a clerk of the Council. Trumbull wrote *For I am nowe depyrved of all comfort at home, and support abroade; by reason that I applyed my self to him alone, & for his respect neglected the patronage of all other Saints in or. Courte of England*⁹⁹. At the end of 1617 Castle again reported that he believed that Trumbull's presence in London would succeed in an effective recall¹⁰⁰. Trumbull however was not recalled and in fact reinstated as agent. He asked the secretary of state for leave to come to London for fifteen or twenty days, so he could promote his case¹⁰¹. He got permission at the start of 1618 and remained in London for six months¹⁰².

The fall of Breda in May 1625 into the hands of the marquis of Spinola was reason enough for William Trumbull to ask for his revocation once more. Writing to the secretary of state Conway he elaborated

*I cannot for aboundance of teares, that falle from myne eyes, wade any further into this lamentable, & luctiuous discourse, God Almighty once deliuer me from this dungeon of miseryes, that I may enioye the pleasinge ayre of my natyue Country. And if there can enter any compassion in to yor. L. harte, I most humbly beseech yow, be a meanes to deliuer me out of this Purgatory, much more unsufferable, then that ymaginary fyer of the Papists*¹⁰³.

The English agent, however, what unsure what kind of reception his request to be revoked would be given in London, as he confessed to Sir Dudley Carleton. *I well perceiue, that proverbe verified in my self, that fidelis servus, shalbe perpetuus asinus. My cheefe consolation is: Patientia, Patientia, patientia. God mend it once it it be his heauenly pleasure to*

⁹⁵ HMCD, vi, 290 (letter 618), Castle to Trumbull, s.l., 18 September 1617.

⁹⁶ HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617.

⁹⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 404r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 10 October 1617 (n.s.).

⁹⁸ HMCD, vi, 325 (letter 699), Castle to Trumbull, s.l., 12 November 1617.

⁹⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 427r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 8 December 1617 (n.s.).

¹⁰⁰ HMCD, vi, 357 (letter 771), Castle to Trumbull, s.l., 27 December 1617.

¹⁰¹ SP 77/12 f^o 436v, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 13/23 December 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 439v, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 26 December 1617 (n.s.).

¹⁰² SP 77/13 f^o 3v, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 7 January 1618 (possibly n.s.).

¹⁰³ SP 77/18 f^o 140r-140v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 26 May 1625.

permitt me to dye in my owne Country¹⁰⁴. William Trumbull was to receive the following letter of secretary Conway:

Sir, I acknowledge the receipt of diuerse letters from you, and I must acknowledge to you, both from the King, the Lords, and myselfe, the greate care vigilancie, and pertinent aduertisements you haue vsed and giuen. And hauing obserued the greate desire and reason that you haue to come home, I haue informed it to his Majesty, who hath so apprehended it, as he hath sent vnto the Infanta to giue her knowledge of his retiring you for a tyme to speake with you, as will appeare more fully by the Copy of that letter herewith sent. And by this his Matie giues you leaue to come home, and requires you to do soe with what conuenient speed you can¹⁰⁵.

It did not take long for Trumbull to assemble his belongings and his family. Charles I informed the infanta that he gave his resident agent permission to return to England for a certain time. Trumbull requested his passport from Isabella and ended his letter with *Madame; de conservuer V.A. en sa digne et Ste garde, et luy donner en parfaite santé longue, et heureuse vie*. He was in Dunkirk by 11 October and crossed the English Channel for the last time, after spending what would amount to be one third of his life serving the first Stuart kings in Brussels at the court of archduke Albert and the infanta Isabella, who recommended him *homme d'entendement, et lequel pour son experience et loubles qualitez, est pour deument s'acquiter de tout ce qu'on luy pourroy encharger¹⁰⁶*. He arrived on English soil on 17 October and was lodged with his family in the house of Sir Henry Wotton at Kingston-upon-Thames¹⁰⁷.

In 1626 Trumbull was elected MP for Downton in Wiltshire. He spoke only once during Parliament and did not stand again. He was member of two parliamentary committees, according to Anderson. One to make it easier for Puritan ministers to hold livings. The second committee linked up to interests which he attended to in Brussels: considering the petition from a merchant who had been plundered by Dunkirkers. The merchant petitioned for the right to prizes in the harbour of Dover. Anderson further stresses that Trumbull must have been well respected. His two children which had been born in the Archducal Netherlands, John (1611) (known as captain Hans) and Anne (1616) were naturalized. The parliamentary bill received three readings in de Commons and was not referred to a committee¹⁰⁸.

In 1629 the former English agent was appointed justice of the peace in Berkshire and the following years he was appointed in several other royal commissions: to examine complaints about Irish causes (1629), to investigate smuggling (1632) and to inquire into the soap monopoly (1634). In 1632 he was appointed muster-master-general of England for life. Trumbull's life ended as it had begun. An exact date of his death is not known. He must have died between 20 August, when he made his will, and 9 September 1635,

¹⁰⁴ SP 77/18 f^o 145r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 10 June 1625 (n.s.).

¹⁰⁵ SP 77/18 f^o 239r, draft, Conway to Trumbull, s.m., 12 September 1625.

¹⁰⁶ SP 77/18 f^o 240r, Trumbull to Conway, s.l., 22 September 1625; Archives du Royaume, Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience, from now on PEA, 2065, Trumbull to Isabella, Brussels, 4 October 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 243r, Isabella to Charles I, Dunkirk, 22 October 1625 (n.s.); SP 77/18 f^o 245r, Trumbull to Conway, Dover, 17 October 1625.

¹⁰⁷ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 124; Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1625, 130; BL Add. 72441, Trumbull to Trumbull, Dover, 2 November 1625.

¹⁰⁸ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 124-125.

when he was buried in the church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. The contents of his London lodgings was valued at £ 134 1s. 4d. of which clothes and cash amounted to £ 100. Furthermore there was an outstanding debt of £ 150 owed to the deceased. The forty books in London were worn and were only valued at 1s per book. The estate at Easthampstead was valued at £ 1428. Ca. £ 260 was farm stock and produce and £ 225 silver plate. The paintings he had were of no great value and only amounted to £ 30. His display of pistols, muskets, halberds, pikes and swords were worth £ 15. The tapestry hangings in the two state rooms amounted to £ 30 and the bed furniture for £80. While the books in London were only valued a shilling a piece, his collection of books in Easthampstead was valued at £ 150. At his death Trumbull had property in Berkshire (Easthampstead), Yorkshire (East Harlsey), Buckinghamshire (Wraysbury) and Kent (East Peckham, Yalding, Watlington, Tudeley, and Brenchley).

In his will he left it to his wife to decide where he should be buried. She got Easthampstead for life, not widowhood, which would have been customary, argues Anderson. *Jewells plate bedding linnen brass pewter and all other my housholde stuffe whatsoever* were also for his wife and would pass to their three children if she remarried or after her death. It was up to Deborah to distribute these among their children. William, the eldest son, was to have all the property in Yorkshire, Buckinghamshire and Kent immediately. He was to receive the property in Berkshire after the death of Deborah. All the books and papers would also pass to his eldest son. William had to pay his younger brother an annuity of £ 50 while he remained in Oxford or until he found *some other honest vocation*. The amount was to be doubled after the death of Deborah. William was also to pay Anne £ 1.000 when she married or within six months after the marriage and a further £ 500 after their mother died. Elizabeth, their other daughter, had died in her twenties after years of illness¹⁰⁹.

As farre as that money will stretch, diplomatic compensation in the Jacobean era

The compensation a diplomat could expect for his services is a complex business. Different kinds of compensation can be discerned: the per diem diet, an expense account and non-monetary compensation. Based on the evolution of the salary of the Spanish ambassador in England (£ 300 at the start of the reign of Henry VIII, over more than £ 600 at the beginning of the reign of the Virgin Queen, to about £ 1.300 in the reign of James VI/I) Mattingly states that this

*was not the income of a wealthy bishop or a great nobleman, but it was quite that of a prosperous merchant or a well-to-do country gentleman. It would run to a household of twenty or so, a certain amount of entertaining, and a good appearance at court, though without lavish ostentation*¹¹⁰.

This is based on Spanish figures, the situation for the English ambassadors and agents differed.

A diplomatic representative usually received a per diem diet and the equivalent of a modern day expense account. Ambassadors and agents complained extensively about

¹⁰⁹ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 125, 128-129.

¹¹⁰ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 202.

their salary. European diplomatic correspondences are interlarded with pleas about their difficult financial position. Lee mentions several examples: Sir Thomas Edmondes in Paris, Dudley Carleton in The Hague and Sir John Digby in Madrid¹¹¹. Bell, however, argues that caution is needed when researching these complaints. Bell did research on the diplomatic compensation during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. The basis for diplomatic reward was the diet, a per diem amount. The diet depended for a large part on the status, which was a combination of position in the realm and assigned diplomatic rank. Bell concluded that resident ambassadors were usually paid five marks (66s 8d) by the day, special or temporary embassies on average no more than 40 shilling/ £ 2 a day, special ambassadors four marks (53s 4d) a day. He concludes that low-ranking representatives usually got no more than 20 shilling/ £ 1 a day for their first mission. For agents and chargé d'affaires, he goes on, there can be no generalizations about their wages¹¹². The diet was paid by the Exchequer three months in advance during the reign of Elizabeth. Moreover the Elizabethan government, contrary its continental counterparts, paid regularly and on time. Most diplomats also got reimbursed for expenses, *extraordinaries*, which covered transportation, communication and intelligence. During the reign of Elizabeth this kind of compensation made up between the 16 and 63 per cent of the total cash reward a diplomat could expect. There was a large continuity with the ascension of James to the English throne. Moreover, in theory, the situation for agents and chargé d'affaires improved¹¹³.

When Edmondes sailed for England in September 1609 he kept in close contact with senior secretary William Trumbull, who he had left behind in Brussels as chargé d'affaires. Although Trumbull was handling the affairs of state, he was still on the payroll of Edmondes, who paid him with bills of exchange¹¹⁴. By the beginning of November Edmondes procured from Salisbury a warrant for an ordinary entertainment for Trumbull¹¹⁵. He was to receive 20 shilling per day (£ 365 per year, the amount the Spanish ambassador in London received at the start of the reign of Henry VIII a century before), the standard fee for a secretary left behind to manage the affairs until the arrival of a new ambassador¹¹⁶. William Beecher, who was chargé d'affaires in Paris from October 1609 until May 1610 also got 20 shilling a day. There were others who got less. John Dickenson¹¹⁷, chargé d'affaires of the English king in the Republic of the United Provinces got in the same period as Trumbull a total of £ 38 for 76 days, which amounted to no more than 10 shilling a day. When Trumbull's rank changed from chargé d'affaires or resident secretary to agent he did not get an increase in allowance. This, however, was not exceptional. Other agents also retained the same fee. Francis Cottington, who had been one of the secretaries of Sir Charles Cornwallis, resident ambassador in Madrid (January 1605-October 1609), was left behind as agent (October 1609-August 1611) with a per diem diet of 20 shilling. John Dickenson, who had received 10 shilling by the day as

¹¹¹ Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', 1277-1278; Hamilton and Langhorne also mention this practise, Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practise of Diplomacy*, 56.

¹¹² Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation', 3-6.

¹¹³ Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation', 6-8; Henneke, 'The Art of Stuart Diplomacy', 271;

¹¹⁴ HMCD, ii, 156, Edmondes to Trumbull, London, 5 October 1609.

¹¹⁵ HMCD, ii, 177, Edmondes to Trumbull, Blackfriars, 2 November 1609.

¹¹⁶ HMCD, ii, 187, Beaulieu to Trumbull, London, 16 November 1609; Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', 1279; Others of the same rank as Trumbull got as much: William Beecher in France,

¹¹⁷ Gavin Alexander, 'Dickenson, John (c.1570-1635/6)'.

chargé d'affaires with the Dutch, became agent in Düsseldorf, Kleve, and received the appropriate 20 shilling per day.

Until the death of Salisbury, although not punctual, the payment of Trumbull's salary was regular. While during the Elizabethan age it was paid in advance, Trumbull's per diem diet was paid in the middle of the trimester, e.g. at the start of February for the months January till March 1610, on the 4th of August 1610 for the months July, August and September, on the 16th of November 1610 for the months September, October and November¹¹⁸. The worsening financial situation of the kingdom had dire consequences for the payment of the salaries.

Initially John Searle handled Trumbull's financial affairs in London, but from August 1610 onwards it was John More. John More delivered a detail account of what he had received and disbursed for the period between August 1610 and January 1612. In total he received £ 498 2s. and disbursed £ 489 8s., so he owed Trumbull still £ 8 14s¹¹⁹. The situation deteriorated after the death of Salisbury. In November 1613 John More reported that he awaited the payment of the arrearages for nine months every day¹²⁰. It was one thing to assign a diet and cover some expenses directly; the other question concerns the regularity of pay. Unlike during the Elizabethan age, in the Jacobean period diplomatic compensation was not paid in advance; England was one of the worst payers of its diplomatic staff in Europe¹²¹.

Trumbull was not reimbursed for his expenses, but raised the question early on. In June 1611 John More informed him that nothing could be done at that moment, but that these kinds of expenses would be reimbursed to all diplomats at once, to avoid jealousy¹²². But the story did not end there. From 1613 onwards Trumbull tried to improve his financial situation by asking for an increase of his ordinary entertainment, an allocation of an allowance for extraordinary expenses and he furthermore wanted to become a clerck of the Privy Council. He could not achieve this by himself and his merits. He had to look for patrons who would further his cause. He looked to the subsequent secretaries of state, the archbishop of Canterbury and the king and his favourites.

After Cecil's death the reward a man received depended much less on his service than on his connections, argues Lee¹²³. Salisbury was not replaced immediately as principal secretary of state. During that time Sir Robert Carr, (since March 1611 viscount Rochester and from November 1613 earl of Somerset) royal favourite, acted as personal secretary to the king. He could be the key to the solution of Trumbull's financial problems. Trumbull's letter of 26 February 1613 could be his first letter to Rochester. *My humble Suite is that yor L: will vouchsafe to receive me into yor. honorable patronage; and as yor L: hath an universall reputation to be a protector & furtherer of all Just,a and reasonable pretencions*. He requested an

¹¹⁸ HMCD, ii, 233, Searle to Trumbull, Blackfriars, 8 February 1610; HMCD, ii, 340, More to Trumbull, London, 16 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 396, More to Trumbull, London, 22 November 1610; HMCD, iii, 217-218, Account from August 1610 to January 1611, s.l., HMCD, iii, 217, More to Trumbull, London, 9 January 1612.

¹¹⁹ HMCD, iii, 217, More to Trumbull, London, 9 January 1612.

¹²⁰ HMCD, iv, 252, John More to Trumbull, London, 13 November 1613.

¹²¹ Henneke, 'The Art of Stuart Diplomacy', 269.

¹²² HMCD, iii, 85, More to Trumbull, London, 5 June 1611.

¹²³ Lee, 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', 1281.

allowance to cover his expenses. Trumbull mentioned Francis Cottington who had the same rank and had been employed for a shorter time who got his expenses reimbursed¹²⁴.

The original reaction of Rochester seemed to have been favourable. Although Rochester did not know Trumbull, he would try to assist him¹²⁵. Apparently Rochester promised Trumbull to get an increase in his wages and a proper position in England at his return. Rochester, however, proved to be an unreliable patron¹²⁶. John More informed Trumbull that Dudley Norton and Francis Cottington had been sworn in as clerks of the Privy Council in July 1613. According to More this decision was taken in the absence of Rochester. As he could not secure the release of Sir Thomas Overbury Rochester left the court at Farnam and retreated to Whitehall¹²⁷. This was confirmed by Rochester's secretary, John Packer. Packer reminded Rochester of his promise to Trumbull and what a surprise this news would be to the English agent in Brussels. He replied that Norton had only been sworn in for *countenance* and only would exercise his clerkship in extraordinary circumstances, *but to expect till some of his reversions fall*¹²⁸.

This news must have troubled the agent in Brussels and he wrote two letters. Trumbull reminded the royal favourite of his promise on the 18 August and mentioned the lack of an expense account again. The next day he wrote to the king,

*I will nor presume to perscrybe any reward for my paines, but only implore yor mats favor, that for my extraordinary diboursments, there may be such allowance made me, both for the tyme paste, and to comme, as hath ben given to other men of my rancke, for the lyke occacion (regard beeing had to the tyme of or. employments, respectyvely) or any other way wch may seeme more agreeable to yor matie good pleasure, and the easing of yor great charge*¹²⁹.

To secure the clerkship Trumbull turned to his former master Edmondès for help. Jean Beaulieu, Trumbull's erstwhile fellow-secretary in the Edmondès embassy household, acted as intermediary. Edmondès was willing to resign his place as clerk, but he had promised already to someone else, Devick, but as his success was improbable and Devick had all but given up, Edmondès did think himself half released of his promise. There were others, however, who wanted the place. William Herbert (1580-1630)¹³⁰, third earl of Pembroke, had sent his secretary, Leeche, to procure the clerkship for £ 400. Edmondès was unwilling because of his promise to Devick. Leeche now talked of a composition with Devick, of which Trumbull was duly notified. Edmondès advised Trumbull to contact his friends in England and confessed that the clerkship probably

¹²⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 264v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 26 February 1613.

¹²⁵ HMCD, iv, 134, Rochester to Trumbull, Greenwich, 10 June 1613.

¹²⁶ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain. The parallel careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton, 1609-1625', 213-214. John Chamberlain explicitly informed Carleton that he had 'leaned too long upon a broken staffe', which referred to Somerset.

¹²⁷ HMCD, iv, 170, More to Trumbull, London, 24 July 1613; for the Overbury affair see Bellany, *The politics of court scandal in early modern England : news culture and the Overbury affair, 1603-1660*; Somerset, *Unnatural murder: Poison at the court of James I*.

¹²⁸ HMCD, iv, 176, Packer to Trumbull, Salisbury, 7 August 1613.

¹²⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 316r-316v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 18 August 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 320v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 19 August 1613.

¹³⁰ Stater, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke (1580-1630)'.

already had been reserved for him. A letter of Sir Thomas Lake assured him that much¹³¹. Trumbull wanted to facilitate the entire enterprise and obtained a promise from his former master, Edmondes, that he would resign his place to Trumbull¹³², but this news reached Rochester after he had rebuked Trumbull for his aspirations.

Rochester's rebuke was harsh:

Men of your cast especially can but hope, unless your merits be extraordinary, to have the ordinary course kept with you, which is to be remembered in those places which are of a size and capacity with the person ... This is to show you how your desires mus come not so stuffed, which because the like may be followed as a leading cast t many¹³³.

Trumbull wrote amply to explain himself and justify his request:

The humble Suite I made, by my petition, was not, (I protest upon my salvation) to open a gappe to other men; but rather to followe mr. Cottington, and others, who have had allowance for their extraordinary expencs (as I specified in the paper I sente yor La.) and that, not to enrich myself, but to pay my debte, and supply my puching necessityets wch dayly encrease, through the chargeablenes of my restles employment: wch (as I will at any tyme, take my corporall oathe) hathe coste me above 150 l. yearly above my ordinary entertainments, for the space of fower yeares, already passed.

Were my owne meanes such, as they could furnishe me in any sorte to beare the burthen of those extraordinary chargs; or this place so well affected to his matie, as I could gayne any thing for love. I should thincke my self too happie, and would forbear to importune his matie, and yor L: But I lyve in a clymate where my Religion is most odious, where all his mats ill affecte subiects, and fugityves, are fostered; and where I must wth monney purchase the good looks of men wth whome I have to deale, at a second, or third hand.

Trumbull did not ask money to enrich himself, only to pay his debts. For the past four years these expenses had surpassed his his annual income of £150. Furthermore he was not opening the floodgates for demands of others, he was only asking what others of the same rank already got, c.q. Francis Cottington¹³⁴. Edmondes and Winwood tried to move Somerset to procure an extraordinary allowance for Trumbull, but Edmondes did not think that would happen speedily. As for the post of clerk of the Privy Council, Trumbull kept trying to secure it. Although Hill argued that *Trumbull must have given up all hope of support from his supposed patron*, he kept mentioning his situation in his letters¹³⁵. Even after the rebuke by Rochester he kept writing letters, e.g. 6 October

If it may please his Sacred matie, of his spetiall grace, and favor, upon Sr. Thomas Edmondes his resignation, to admitt me into his place of Clarcke of the Counsell, I shall be the more obliged, and better enabled, to pray for his happines, and to doe his matie service. It will give me a little

¹³¹ HMCD, iv, 192-193, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 8 September 1613.

¹³² SP 77/10 f^o 334r-334v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 23 September 1613.

¹³³ HMCD, iii, 195, Rochester to Trumbull, s.l., 10 September [1613 endorsement].

¹³⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 338r-338v, brief van Trumbull aan Rochester, Brussels, 6 October 1613.

¹³⁵ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 215.

*more luster among this formall people, and (as I conceive, under humble correction) shall not any way encrease his mats. charge*¹³⁶.

In the end the clerkship of the Privy Council was obtained swiftly compared to the expense account. James consented in October 1613, but the only obstacle was the price¹³⁷. Originally Edmond's had set the price was set at £300, but later on he wanted more than that, £ 400. In the end he settled for £ 350¹³⁸. The last hurdle was red tape. Edmond's sent his patent via Mr. De Vic [presumably Devick] to hand in but at the Rolls it became clear that *the patent might not lawfully be cancelled by other than Sir Tho. Edmond's own hand, and that in presence of some English gentlemen authorised to take the same cancellation by writ under the Great Seal*. These formalities were fulfilled and the form together with the patent was sent back to Paris¹³⁹. News of Edmond's arrival in London reached Paris by the beginning of February and Beaulieu duly informed the English agent in Brussels¹⁴⁰. Trumbull was granted the clerkship on 24 February 1614 and sworn in on 17 October 1615 while on leave in England¹⁴¹. Trumbull had succeeded to increase his income by £ 50.

Trumbull also tried to move other important figures in the kingdom, especially George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, *one of Trumbull's warmest supporters in England*¹⁴², to further his case at court. Abbot had mentioned Trumbull's precarious situation to James and had received the following answer, *For Mr. T. his Maty. saith that he is a very good, diligent and discreet servant, and he hath taken order to give him that which may content him*¹⁴³. Abbot promised to try and move for an expense account for Trumbull, but also mentioned that money was scarce¹⁴⁴. Trumbull's requests for an allowance for his expenses and an increase of his per diem diet were never going to be timely.

After the failure of the formal union between England and Scotland (1606-1607) and the debacle of Salisbury's Great Contract to supply the king with money (1610), James wanted to avoid calling a parliament. Strategies to secure enough money were developed to achieve this. Parliament would not be called unless as a last resort, only if there was no other option left to solve James's financial problems. The cash stricken James had to find new ways to get money. The historian Thrush labels this decade between 1611 and 1620 as the Jacobean Personal Rule. Policy was aimed at avoiding calling a new parliament¹⁴⁵. This strategy had serious financial implications for the king, but also for his servants such as William Trumbull.

¹³⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 338r-338v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 6 October 1613.

¹³⁷ HMCD, iv, 232, Packer to Trumbull, Royston, 22 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 232, Rochester to Trumbull, Royston, 22 October 1613.

¹³⁸ HMCD, iv, 192-193, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 8 September 1613; HMCD, iv, 208, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 2 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 240, More to Trumbull, London, 29 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 254, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 18 November 1613; HMCD, iv, 271-272, More to Trumbull, London, 19 December 1613; HMCD, iv, 457, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 13 July [1614 endorsement].

¹³⁹ HMCD, iv, 296, More to Trumbull, London, 22 January 1614.

¹⁴⁰ WM, iii, 495, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 10 February 1613.

¹⁴¹ Chancery Patent Rolls/1978 n^o 4; APC 1615-1616, 306;

< http://www.history.ac.uk/office/privycounc_intro.html#list>.

¹⁴² Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 215.

¹⁴³ HMCD, iv, 239, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 20 October 1613.

¹⁴⁴ HMCD, iv, 290, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 January 1614.

¹⁴⁵ Thrush, 'The Personal Rule of James I, 1611-1620'.

The best hope for Trumbull was Winwood¹⁴⁶. On the 29 March 1614 Winwood, *honest, zealous, and moderately intelligent*¹⁴⁷ was sworn in as secretary of state. He had been a diplomat in the United Provinces. John More spoke to Winwood shortly after his inauguration about the problems Trumbull had. The new secretary, however, thought it would be incongruous to meddle in bills from before his service but he promised to *move the king upon Somerset's recommendation thereof to him* but he acknowledged Trumbull had good reason to press for an allowance for his extraordinaries¹⁴⁸. Furthermore, the king's strategy to find funds outside parliament was failing in 1614. King James had grown obsessive to obtain a substantial dowry for a marriage between Charles and Christine of France, but this plan failed¹⁴⁹. The growing problems of the Exchequer are mentioned in the letters Trumbull got from England and it even was public knowledge among the English refugees residing in the Southern Netherlands¹⁵⁰. James had been assured by two of his councillors, Thomas Howard (1561-1626)¹⁵¹, first earl of Suffolk and William Herbert, third earl of Pembroke, that *the Commons would supply his financial needs in return for various bills of grace*¹⁵². These two opposed the idea of a Catholic bride for Charles. As a result James summoned Parliament, but was soon disillusioned with it. At the end of June Trumbull had already learned that parliament was already or would shortly be dissolved¹⁵³. Early in July, nine weeks after opening it, the king dissolved parliament, that became to be known as Addled Parliament¹⁵⁴, which *left the financial crisis farther from a solution than ever*¹⁵⁵.

Winwood recommended Trumbull's service to the king that same July and stressed the poorness of Trumbull's entertainment and the lack of his personal fortune. According to Trumbull's own testimony his personal estate only yielded £ 10 more than at the start of the reign¹⁵⁶. The king acknowledged the good services done by Trumbull. Winwood also said he had provided a place for Trumbull as clerk of the Privy Council. Winwood however told the king that Trumbull had paid for that position, *and prayed him to have regard to your worth and to bestow on you the graciousness of his favour. Your ambition was not great, nor did you fly at any high pitch. I prayed him to be mindful of you, which he promised*¹⁵⁷. More's colleague moved Somerset about the same time. He stressed that Trumbull had taken on a great charge for the post of letters, a charge for which other ambassadors received an allowance. Winwood, More went on, would be able to inform Somerset about the fitness of an allowance¹⁵⁸. But 1614 did not bring the agent in Brussels

¹⁴⁶ HMCD, iv, 342, Edmondes to Trumbull, 18 March 1614.

¹⁴⁷ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 225.

¹⁴⁸ HMCD, iv, 357, More to Trumbull, London, 31 March 1614; HMCD, iii, 387, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 22 April [1614 endorsement].

¹⁴⁹ Croft, *King James*, 92.

¹⁵⁰ HMCD, iv, 400, More to Trumbull, London, 12 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 409, More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 24 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 292, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 January 1614.

¹⁵¹ Croft, 'Howard, Thomas, first earl of Suffolk (1561-1626)'.

¹⁵² Thrush, 'The Personal Rule of James I, 1611-1620', 88.

¹⁵³ SP 77/11 f^o 93r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, 30 June 1614.

¹⁵⁴ For the Addled Parliament, see Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*.

¹⁵⁵ Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*, 150.

¹⁵⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 30r-30v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616.

¹⁵⁷ HMCD, iv, 457, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 13 July [1614 endorsement].

¹⁵⁸ HMCD, iv, 459, Packer to Trumbull, Theobalds, 14 July 1614.

relief, after the failure of parliament the main problem for the Crown was to pay its daily expenses¹⁵⁹.

The king and his Privy Council had to find money by means other than a parliament. A dowry was still one of the possibilities but there were other techniques. One of them was a successful benevolence, which yielded about £ 65,000. The breaking of the monopoly of the Merchant Adventurers by using a scheme devised by Sir William Cokayne on the other hand ended in utter failure. This programme was prospected as a certain way to increase the income of the king by £ 40,000 by the year. In 1615 the king sold the Cautionary Towns of Brill and Flushing for £ 250,000 back to the United Provinces. Although these were windfalls which helped the crown avoid bankruptcy, it had become clear to the Privy Council that the best course of action would have been to lower the imposition, to which Parliament had protested, to help facilitate an agreement in parliament¹⁶⁰.

In July 1615 Trumbull turned again to his sovereign, but his timing was poor, because by *June 1615 the King was in more desperate straits than ever*¹⁶¹. He argued his case stating that his allowance was very small in contrast to his expenses, which he detailed. The Catholic Low Countries were expensive. Brussels was the center of Europe and was therefore a major diplomatic post. He had a regular correspondence not only with other English ambassadors throughout Europe but also with the Protestant princes and other allies of king James. It was his duty as a representative of the English crown to receive English visitors. Secret intelligence could not be obtained without money. Besides all that, he had to travel through the dominions of the archdukes when they were absent from Brussels in order to further the interests of James's loyal subjects¹⁶².

Trumbull's expenses kept augmenting, and he mentioning it incessantly without getting a satisfactory answer¹⁶³. Others like Francis Cottington and William Beecher had gotten such an allowance¹⁶⁴. Trumbull's luck seemed to change in May 1616. To put pressure on the government in London, Trumbull frequently stated that he wanted to be revoked, because, due to lack of funds, he could not perform his duties as he should.

My condition (as I hope) cannott be woorse at home, and my endevors there, wth Gods assitance, and the ayde of my friends may be meanes sufficient to gett me food, & apparrell. I once more humbly beseech yor. hor. (if it is possible to ridd yor. self of this ympportunity, and

¹⁵⁹ Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*, 150.

¹⁶⁰ Croft, *King James*, 94-96.

¹⁶¹ Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*, 153.

¹⁶² SP 77/10 f^o 115r-115v, Trumbull to James I/VI, Brussels, 21 July 1615. This letter is put between those of 1614 although the date on the document is clearly 1615.

¹⁶³ SP 77/11 f^o 178r-178v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, Brussels, 28 October 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 340r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 June 1615; SP 77/11, f^o 115r-115v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 21 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 370r-370v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615; SP 77/12, f^o 30r-30v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 49r-49v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, s.l., [13 March 1616]; SP 77/12 f^o 98r-98v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 May 1616; HMCD, iv, 410, More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 28 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 470, More to Trumbull, s.l., 27 July 1614; HMCD, v, 33 (letter 82), More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 8 October 1614; HMCD, v, 143 (letter 308), More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 February 1615; HMCD, v, 257 (letter 520), More to Trumbull, Greenwich, 26 June 1615.

¹⁶⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 30r-30v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616.

deliver me out of this servitude, of begging, wch. Is as contrary to my naturall disposition, almoste as death it self.

It was the time that his Privy Seal was to be renewed. If the king and the secretary of state thought it wise to keep their agent in Brussels, then they should renew his Privy Seal and double his salary (as had been done for Cottington who had less seniority). At the end of his request Trumbull asked Winwood for an answer and advice concluding that

*Dignus est operarius mercede sua*¹⁶⁵, *I doe not aspire too much; neither am I willing to want those things wch. Are necessary. My meanes, and my patience, are both ended together: he that observed the one, & knoweth the other; cannott in equity blame me, when at the end of eleven yeares absence, and seven yeares continuall emplumt. I doe desyer either competent meanes to lyve, or to be revoked*¹⁶⁶.

While his per diem rate was renewed but not increased, Winwood was given autorisation to obtain a yearly allowance for Trumbull to cover his extraordinary expenses¹⁶⁷. The amount differed in different letters; it would be £ 100¹⁶⁸ or £ 200¹⁶⁹. On the matter of his revocation, Winwood wrote at the end of December 1616, *There is a rumour circulating here that you intend to ask for your recall. Before you actually doe it, you shall doe well to advise with your friends, for I feare at your retourne you will finde litle to give you good contentment*¹⁷⁰. Trumbull took this advice to heart, but went on to state, *But I assure you that if I were paid sufficient money to enable me to live in the manner required by my office and status, then no man would serve the interests of His Majesty with greater diligence and loyalty*¹⁷¹.

Getting an allowance was one thing, but procuring payment proved to be an entirely different matter. John More notified Trumbull in February 1617 that he had good hopes that the allowance for 1616 would shortly be paid¹⁷². Winwood advised him to postpone the matter of doubling his salary until the return of James VI/I out of Scotland¹⁷³. Winwood lobbied for Trumbull, first for a regular payment and secondly for an increase. Unfortunately for Trumbull his most conscientious patron died in October 1617. Trumbull was instructed to address all his dispatches to Sir Thomas Lake, who had been appointed junior secretary in January 1616¹⁷⁴. Trumbull reiterated his wish for an increase in his per diem diet. Lake promised him £ 100 by the year more. Trumbull thanked Lake for this, but argued that he was know *the moste anchient of all his mats. servants employed abroade*. He had lived there for two thirds of a lifespan without getting one penny increase in his ordinary entertainments. Cottington, Beecher and others did get an increase. Trumbull could not find in his conscience one reason why he should be treated

¹⁶⁵ 1 Tim. 6, 19; *The Labourer is worthy of his hire*.

¹⁶⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 98r-98v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 May 1616.

¹⁶⁷ HMCD, v, 521 (letter 1100), More to Trumbull, Greenwich, 31 May [recte 1 June] 1616.

¹⁶⁸ HMCD, v, 533-534 (letter 1128), More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 June 1616.

¹⁶⁹ HMCD, v, 548 (letter 1156), More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 10 July 1616.

¹⁷⁰ HMCD, vi, 79 (letter 186), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 31 December 1616.

¹⁷¹ HMCD, vi, 112 (letter 258), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 February 1617.

¹⁷² HMCD, vi, 116 (letter 265), More to Trumbull, [London], 21 February 1617.

¹⁷³ SP 77/12 f^o 285r-285v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14 March 1617.

¹⁷⁴ HMCD, vi, 317 (letter 675), Lake to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 October 1617.

differently¹⁷⁵. Abbot agreed that Trumbull should ask an increase but cautioned him. The king wanted to economize and was highly critical of any plan to the contrary. Buckingham was the best way to try and obtain the increase¹⁷⁶. John Wolley, Trumbull's servant sent to England, advised his employer to ask that his salary would be doubled or even tripled¹⁷⁷. John Chandler, an English merchant in Antwerp, reported in a letter to Trumbull in April 1618 that there was news that he would take up his post again in Brussels after the *Corona Regia* debacle¹⁷⁸. Chandler glad to hear is because his per diem diet would be increased and he would get a knighthood¹⁷⁹. Trumbull, however, did not get a knighthood¹⁸⁰. He nevertheless obtained the increase in 1618, this doubled his per diem diet to 40s./day, but payment thereof, as could be expected, was a problem.

It was the Exchequer that paid the wages of the diplomats. William Trumbull's money was usually procured through a London agent: until February 1610 John Searle and afterwards John More. The money was provided to Trumbull using intermediaries with bills of exchange. They could be merchants like James Monger, messengers in Trumbull's service like Henry Ballam or the postmaster, Matthew de Quester. Payment, as seen, was highly irregular. During the sixteen years Trumbull was agent of James to the archdukes he sometimes had to wait months (up to fifteen) to get his salary. Several times he sent one of his embassy staff to try and collect his money. When the bearer of a letter returned empty handed Trumbull was *compelled by my pincing necessityes, to send him backe agayne to sollicit the payment of my ordinary entertainments; untill the tyme shall afford me some extraordinary reliefe*¹⁸¹. Trumbull planned to send his servant Marsham, once returned from Douai, to England *to sollicitte for the payment of my entertainments*¹⁸². It happened that Trumbull got an advance on his salary. At the start of August 1610 John More tried to contact Bingley to get Trumbull's money. Bingley however was absent, but More sent Trumbull a letter of exchange for £ 60. A fortnight later More received £ 92 from the Exchequer. After deduction the commission for Bingley and his servant, for Wardour and his servant and for Sir William Bower and his servant, and after deduction the money Trumbull got in advance, More sent Trumbull another letter of exchange for £ 30 at the end of August¹⁸³. Henneke states that an ambassador had to find other ways of obtaining money to perform his duties: loans and letters of exchange.

Trumbull was able to obtain money by loaning. In August 1616 he gave Lyonel Wake, an English merchant in Antwerp, a letter of recommendation thanking him *for the supplying my wants wth monney when I cannott procaire payment of my Allowance at home*. In May 1617 he thanked Winwood for the payment of his arrears. With this money he could pay his debts, *as farre as that monney will stretch*¹⁸⁴. A month after the death of

¹⁷⁵ HMCD, vi, 333 (letter 718), Lake to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 28 November 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 441r-441v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 18 December 1617.

¹⁷⁶ HMCD, vi, 349 (letter 754), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 December 1617.

¹⁷⁷ HMCD, vi, 408 (letter 886), John Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 19 April 1618 (n.s.).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. *Infra* Chapter 5.

¹⁷⁹ HMCD, vi, 403-404, John Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 12 April 1618 (n.s.).

¹⁸⁰ McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ii, 137.

¹⁸¹ SP 77/12 f^o 98, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 May 1616.

¹⁸² SP 77/12 f^o 258v-259r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21/31 January 1617.

¹⁸³ HMCD, ii, 347, More to Trumbull, London, 16 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 358, More to Trumbull, London, 30 August 1610.

¹⁸⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 330r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 25 May 1617.

Winwood, Trumbull corresponded with Buckingham. The execution of a plan to kidnap Erycius Puteanus, the alleged author of the *Corona Regia*, was suspended due to a lack of money and the absence of six good horses. Trumbull states that he had used up all his credit, but the main reason why all failed was that he did not receive the money owed to him. The payment of the arrears, amounting £ 600, would provide sufficient funds¹⁸⁵. The situation did not improve in the following years. In April 1620 the English agent wrote a letter recommending Lionel Wake, writing, *I am by his love, more then 500 li sterlinge on the debtors side on his book, uncertaine when I shall haue meanes to paye him, and yet I am more confident of his helpe, in case of necessity, then of any other mans on this side of the Seas*, which the English agent again confirmed in November 1621¹⁸⁶. Sir John Digby gave Trumbull £ 300 for his expenses while they were together on an mission in Mainz¹⁸⁷. It is clear Trumbull had many debts in the Southern Netherlands, according to his own account. When archduke Albert died in July 1621 there was a possibility that he would be recalled. Before that would happen Trumbull requested that he would be paid all the money that was due to him in order to pay his debts in the Southern Low Countries¹⁸⁸. Apart from the financial implications this also meant that this tainted his and the king's reputation.

Writing letters of exchange that had to be paid by the Exchequer were popular with ambassadors, but not so popular in London. In October 1613 More confirmed that he would pay the £ 50 Trumbull had spent in his name to Mr. Monger. He further promised to continue to do this in the future¹⁸⁹. In October 1617 Trumbull had to give at least £ 100 to a person known to the secretary of state,

*those summes I shalbe forced to charge upon mr. More by exchange. My credit is already at the Stake for it; and I moste humbly beseech yor. hor. this tyme, to preserve my poore reputation; wch I esteeme at a farre greater rate, then my estate, & fortunes*¹⁹⁰.

The situation did never improve for the English agent in Brussels, on the contrary. Because of the collapse of foreign policy James had to end his Personal Rule three years after the start of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). The king summoned parliament twice after 1620: in 1621 after the invasion by Philip III of the hereditary lands of Frederick V, the elector Palatine and in 1624 after the failure of the Spanish Match¹⁹¹. This, however, did not improve the financial situation of the king.

The London government, on the other hand, tried to economize by extending the period diplomats had to stay at one post, changing the rank of a diplomat for a short time (resident to extraordinary and again to resident). One other way for the diplomat himself to get by was by help from the host court¹⁹².

¹⁸⁵ HMCD, vi, 323-324 (letter 694), draft, Trumbull to Buckingham, Brussels, 9/19 November 1617.

¹⁸⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 158v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 August 1616; SP 77/14 f^o 80r-80v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 24 April 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 552v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 30 November 1621.

¹⁸⁷ SP 77/14 f^o 321v, Trumbull to Calvert, Mainz, 3/13 April 1620.

¹⁸⁸ SP 77/14 f^o 268r-268v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 3 July 1621.

¹⁸⁹ HMCD, iv, 233-234, More to Trumbull, London, 23 October 1613.

¹⁹⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 409r-409v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 29 October 1617.

¹⁹¹ Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624'; Croft, *King James*, 110-116 en 122-125.

¹⁹² Henneke, 'The Art of Stuart Diplomacy', 282-284.

Rumours sometimes reached Trumbull that what he wanted was considered excessive. He would always take the time to contradict this. In February 1625 he wrote that

I should be charged to burthen his matie. wth more extraordinaryes, then many others his mats servants employed aboade. Farre be it from me to haue such a thought: though I am lefte desolate, and haue not one penny to releuee my wantes: nor to buy bread, and sustain my family; but wth such meanes as are taken yp at Interest, and upon the creditt of my person, not my goods, wch are poore, & contemptible.

He went on to say that he had not set foot on English soil in seven years. No man had to endure that, unless he were a fugitive. In all that time Trumbull's *skores* were never made *even* in the Exchequer. Conway, according to Trumbull, as secretary of state was the patron of all the servants of the English king serving abroad. Trumbull pleaded that he would use his as well as the king's authority to get the payment of the arrears and the permission to return to England for some time, or a total revocation. He concluded the matter by stating that once this assignment should be finished, and for him the sooner the better, he did not expect he would get much and that he would be forced to beg for bread, unless of course he was mistaken in what the Privy Council would assign to him¹⁹³. In March following, ten days before the death of king James, he resumed his argumentation stating

I am no hypocrit, the thoughts of my harts, are written in my forehead, I haue hetherto lyved; and by Gods mercy assuredly hoped to render my laste breath, a true, (though a most unwoorthie servante) to his Diuine Matie. My most gracious Souueraigne, and my natyve Country. If any ministers abrode, have ben cautious (I speake of those of my rancke) to spare his mats. Unnecessary charges. I dare bouldely say, and can proue it demonstratyvely; I am he. But if his matie his ministers of State, and I have been ? (enseed) by cycophants, that haue preferred their private benefitt before his mats. Service, (though wth creeping and under other forted tytles putt upon my accompt by ymputation) I am blameless, and my long, long absence, may plead for my juste excuse. By the unevincible tyle of seniority, I am the eldest of all his mats servants of my condition, employed in forraine parts, I never yet summis labijs, tasted of his universall, and unexpressable bounty; directly, or indirectly. All I possesse in office, is by purchase, not of reward. Lande I haue nowe, but that wch was either bought wth my patrimony, or lefte to my wife by inheritance; and yet both joynedd together doe not much exceed such a contemptible Somme, as for shmae I dare not expresse in wryting. I envye no man I desyer but a competency, what haue I donne more then others, that his mats incomparable bounty, is wthholden from me, more then from the meanest of his household. Let my ignorances be excused, (a naturall fuid???) and for the reste I expose my self to the moste malignant accusations of my bitterest enemyes. The most ympudent diuell in hell (I am suer) dares not taxe me of corruption, or concussion, leste the manifest pouerty? of my wretched estate, after so many years service, should prove him a lyer.

If I may be judge, I haue deserued no lesse (if there can be deserte in that kynde) towards his matie then M. van Male hath or could meritt of this Princesse; for lesse then half the tyme I haue ben abroad; saueing onely; that I haue not (wch I am suer is not his pats. Pleasure I should)

¹⁹³ SP 77/18 f^o 22r-22v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, February 1625.

*debauche so many here to become fugetyues, and enemyes to their Prince and Country; as he hath donne*¹⁹⁴.

In April 1621 Trumbull informed the secretary of state that the arrearages due to him for his *entertainments and fees* already amounted to £ 1.100. Furthermore he reminded the secretary that he had requested land in Ireland¹⁹⁵. The final document which informs of his financial arrangements with the English government is titled *Monies due to William Trumbull Esq. late his Mats. Agent wth. the Archduke*¹⁹⁶. From that document it is clear that Trumbull did not receive his diet or his allowance for his expenses. The diet, £2/day had not been paid since July 1623. The treasury owed Trumbull in total 1.828 pounds sterling for the period between July 1623 and December 1625. The allowance for expenses was 75 pounds sterling every trimester, which had not been paid since April 1623, amounting to a total 775 pounds sterling. Another 600 pounds are mentioned for transportation and another 100 for the mourning of king James. The Exchequer owed Trumbull in total 3.303 pounds sterling in 1625. In 1629 he reminded his son William who was travelling through Europe that he was still awaiting payment of his arrearages, but it is unclear if he referred to outstanding debts from his time as agent or newly accumulated debts, e.g. for his service as clerk of the Privy Council¹⁹⁷. Although it was a large amount, even by modern day standards, Trumbull was able in 1623 to pay the debt of his brother-in-law, William Downe, £ 200¹⁹⁸.

There were other sources of income for an ambassador or agent like Trumbull. Gifts were one possibility. Trumbull rendered some services to Frederick V, elector Palatine of the Rhine in 1613, and was rewarded with a golden chain¹⁹⁹. By November 1613 Trumbull had decided to sell what he had called *one of the greatest boons in the world*. Lionel Wake, one of the English merchants in Antwerp, showed the golden chain to a goldsmith and it would yield 31 florins. Eventually Trumbull sent the chain to England in the hope to get a better price. By 19 December the chain was in London but Trumbull had to wait until after Christmas²⁰⁰. A few weeks later More reported back to Trumbull and informed him that it was worth £ 96 10s²⁰¹.

In December 1615 the English agent thanked Elizabeth, the electress Palatine, *for that pretious picture it pleased your Highnes to bestowe upon me and shall remayne in my poore cabinet, esteemed the richest jewell of my possessions*. A month later Trumbull thanked her husband, Frederick, for his gift²⁰². In spring 1617 Trumbull received a ring with a diamond from the prince of Brandenburg, George William. Jean Libigny, who wrote the letter to

¹⁹⁴ SP 77/18 f^o 42r-43r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 17 March 1625.

¹⁹⁵ SP 77/14 f^o 80r-80v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 24 April 1620.

¹⁹⁶ SP 77/18 f^o 263r, *Monies due to William Trumbull Esq. late his Mats. Agent wth. the Archduke*.

¹⁹⁷ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 127; BL Add. 72441, Trumbull to Trumbull, s.l., 29 August 1629.

¹⁹⁸ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 116; BL Add. 72425, Downe to Trumbull, s.l., 11 April 1623.

¹⁹⁹ HMCD, iv, 58-59, draft, Trumbull to [Frederick V], Brussels, 10/20 March 1613.

²⁰⁰ HMCD, iv, 271-272, More to Trumbull, London, 19 December 1613.

²⁰¹ HMCD, iv, 284-285, More to Trumbull, London, 7 January 1614.

²⁰² HMCD, v, 386 (letter 805), draft, Trumbull to Elizabeth, 23 December 1615); HMCD, v, 395, draft, Trumbull to Frederick V, s.l., 1 January 1616.

be sent with the ring asked Trumbull to *accept the enclosed diemond and wear it as a token of his gratitude and of further favours*²⁰³.

Patronage or the art of the courtier

Besides the per diem diet, the expense account and possible gifts, there were also less tangible rewards: workings of influence, aura of legal immunity, allure of status, involvement in the rarified affairs of state²⁰⁴. Bell agrees with Mattingly concerning the appeal of being an ambassador. *The trappings of grandeur, a place in the great events of the day, proximity to the exalted of Europe, and the honor of being a confidant of and an advisor to one's own sovereign no doubt had tremendous appeal*²⁰⁵. This can be called symbolic capital, which was an integral part of the system of patronage. One of the strategies that could be followed to secure the help of a patron was to help them in their art collecting. Trumbull's – minor - role in art collecting in England in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, provides us with an important clue. No detailed study exists on this subject, apart from a few case studies²⁰⁶. Diplomats who played their part in the art collections of the associates of James VI/I could expect their due in two ways: a fee and help for preferment. Robert Hill studied the careers of Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton from the viewpoint of patronage.

*Both men also engaged in sending works of art to England, not only to Prince Henry and Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and to leading courtiers such as Somerset, Salisbury, and the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke, but also to lesser members of the aristocracy*²⁰⁷. *Gifts were designed to keep the client in the foreground of his patron's conciousness. While the failure to make appropriate offerings might diminish a client's chances of promotion, the presentation of them was not an automatic guarantee of advancement*²⁰⁸.

Hill states that Trumbull, as well as Sir Dudley Carleton, turned to the same patrons: Salisbury, Rochester (afterwards Somerset) and Winwood. After the death of Winwood in October 1617, Carleton succesfully applied himself to becoming a client of Buckingham. Trumbull, Hill argues, neglected this opportunity.

It is difficult to ascertain in what way Trumbull tried to engratiate himself, if he did so at all. Hill argues that Trumbull only saw this as his duty as agent of the king. For Carleton, on the contrary, it was a specific stratagem for promotion²⁰⁹. Trumbull did serve on several occasions as intermediary. While he still was Edmond's senior secretary he was employed to procure the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Chamberlain, respectively Salisbury and Thomas Howard, earl of Suffolk, with tapestries. Salisbury

²⁰³ HMCD, vi, 123 (letter 276), Libigny to Trumbull, Cleve, 8 March 1617 (n.s.).

²⁰⁴ Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation', 1-25.

²⁰⁵ Bell, 'Elizabethan, Diplomatic Compensation', 16; Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 328 (controleren).

²⁰⁶ The only case-studies I have come across for the period of Trumbull's embassy are, Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain'; Hill and Lockyer, "'Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office" Revisited' and Howarth, 'William Trumbull and art collecting in Jacobean England'.

²⁰⁷ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in Early Stuart Britain', 211.

²⁰⁸ Hill and Lockyer, "'Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office" Revisited', 30.

²⁰⁹ Anderson, 'The elder William Trumbull; a biographical sketch', 124; Hill, 'Works of Art as Commodities. Art and patronage; the carreer of Sir Dudley Carleton 1610-1625'.

wanted *Triumphs of Petrarch and Jacob* and wanted one of the *Acts of the Apostles* and on of the *Labours of Hercules*²¹⁰. Salisbury also called on Trumbull for the gardens of Hatfield House. He commissioned plants and trees in the Southern Low Countries. Sir John Throckmorton wrote Trumbull in November 1611 that they had only arrived at Middelburg, therefore he put them on another ship, which would leave for England the following day²¹¹. Until 1612 Salisbury was the most important patron for people seeking advancement in office. It was under the Lord Treasurer that Trumbull became the king's agent in Brussels. Trumbull did not only act as intermediary, but also delivered Salisbury at least one present: a book. John Finet reported back that *it was so well accepted, as it must [be taken] along with us to the (sic) Bath*²¹². Salisbury however died a few weeks later (May 1612). Trumbull had to look for new patrons. He had already assisted prince Henry, the heir apparent, with his art collection in the early months of 1612. According to Hill the Brussels agent alerted the court of the prince that some pictures and sculptures had become available. Trumbull was later instructed to buy them²¹³. Wilks states that Trumbull also recommended Francesco Petrozani, an Italian craftsman concerning some telescopes²¹⁴. Trumbull even wrote Henry directly in August 1612:

There is nothing which hitherto hath hindered me from tendering unto your Highness the unfeigned offer of my humble and faithful service, but the consideration of your greatness and my want of merit. By nature I am born subject to the great king of Great Britain, your H.'s most worthy father and by grace adopted to serve his Maty. As his agent with the archdukes. I should think it of being known to your Highness and employed in your commissions while I reside in these parts. But being ignorant wherein my service may be agreeable to your H. I do in all humility beseech you by the hand of your H.'s secretary or clerk of your council to direct my zealous intentions and they shall endeavour to witness the sincerity of my dutiful affections towards your H. being the heir apparent to my country, the imitator of your father's several virtues and the expectation of the better part of christendom.

Trumbull sent him with this letter a book of policy and government, *as the first sacrifice and earnest penny of my unfeigned devotion*²¹⁵. Unfortunately for Trumbull prince Prince Henry died just a few months later in November 1612. Trumbull had lost two patrons in one year.

He had to turn to the new rising star at the Jacobean court Robert Carr, the viscount of Rochester, the king's favourite. Before the death of Henry, Sir Thomas Overbury, who was Rochester's confidant, had contacted Trumbull in September 1612,

²¹⁰ HMCD, ii, 3, Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 4 January 1606; HMCD, ii, 434, Middleton to Trumbull, London, 27 February 1606.

²¹¹ HMCD, iii, 174, Throckmorton to Trumbull, Flushing, 4 November 1611.

²¹² HMCD, iii, 285, Finet to Trumbull, London, 27 April 1612.

²¹³ HMCD, iii, 238, Finet to Trumbull, Whitehall, 14 February 1612; HMCD, iii, 268, Finet to Trumbull, London, 3 April 1612.

²¹⁴ Wilks, 'The picture collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (ca. 1587-1645) reconsidered', 168.

²¹⁵ HMCD, iii, 349, Trumbull to Henry, [Brussels], 10 August 1611.

*if upon the death of any great man in that country, you can help my lord of Rochester to any good bargain of excellent hangings at the second hand, or pictures or any household stuff which they have there better than ours, it would be a very acceptable service to my lord*²¹⁶.

Trumbull did not miss this opportunity and reported the following month. He promised to keep an eye out for *some excellent hangings, pictures, or housholde stuffe* for Rochester. An excellent opportunity, as Trumbull already mentioned in his letter, presented itself when the Charles III, first duke of Croy, fourth duke of Aarschot and prince of Chimay, died childless in 1612²¹⁷. An inventory drawn up after his death listed 234 paintings. Trumbull reported back and mentioned that some of the paintings would be sold. Trumbull was ready to help Rochester, but due to the imprisonment of Overbury in April 1613, his efforts come to nothing. In the fall of 1613 however Rochester's interest was renewed, as is evident from a letter John Packer, his new secretary. In it he informed Trumbull that he should send word about the duke's *jewels, plate of agate, crystal*. Trumbull did as instructed and sent a three-page inventory²¹⁸. But the secretary had to inform Trumbull that Rochester had found nothing *a son gout*²¹⁹.

As argued before, Rochester did not prove to be the reliable patron Trumbull had hoped. John Chamberlain (1553-1628)²²⁰ wrote Carleton in April 1615 concerning Rochester, *you have leaned too long upon a broken staffe, that cannot or will not, or (I am sure) hitherto hath not geven support to any that relied upon it*²²¹. Others however were also interested in the duke of Aerschot's belongings. Robert Sidney (1563-1626)²²², the viscount de Lisle and later first earl of Leicester, was one of the interested. He wrote Trumbull while in Spa. *I should be glad to hear what will become of the d. of Aerschot's stuff*. He reiterated his question six days later²²³. He specified three weeks afterwards that he was not looking for *pictures or medals nor hangings of very great value*. Lord Darcy was also interested in the inheritance of the late duke, especially the tapestries. Sir Thomas Lake on the other hand was more interested in his books, as was the archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, who eventually wanted to buy four books²²⁴. To substantiate this Hill quotes from the published Downshire manuscripts stating, *I have perused the list of the manuscript books to be sold out of the library of the late duke of Aerscot, and with to buy four ... [otherwise I] find nothing I much desire*. HMCD however states,

I have perused the catalogue of the late duke of Arscott but fint nothing I much desire, for I have a library at Lambeth not much inferior to that of any private man in Europe, for which the

²¹⁶ HMCD, iii, 369, Overbury to Trumbull, Theobalds, 15 September [1612 endorsement].

²¹⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 213v-232r, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 8 October 1612.

²¹⁸ This inventory is included as appendix one, at the end of Hill's article.

²¹⁹ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 213-214; HMCD, iv, 255, Packer to Trumbull, Royston, 18 November 1613.

²²⁰ Finkelpearl, 'Chamberlain, John (1553-1628)'.

²²¹ Hill and Lockyer, "'Carleton and Buckingham: the Quest for Office" Revisited', 20. Quoted from McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, i, 592.

²²² Shephard, 'Sidney, Robert, first earl of Leicester (1563-1626)'.

²²³ HMCD, iv, 154, Lisle to Trumbull, Spa, 25 June 1613, HMCD, iii, 158, Lisle to Trumbull, Liège, 1 July 1613.

²²⁴ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 215;

*see is beholding to my last predecessor, and I continually increase it. But if that manuscript of Cardinal Wolsie's [Thomas Wolsey] treaty at Calais be to be had, buy it for me*²²⁵.

This discrepancy can possibly be imputed to the difference between the original manuscripts and the fact that HMCD are more calendars than exact transcriptions.

The one man who had seen the paintings of the late duke was Thomas Howard (1585-1646)²²⁶, fourteenth earl of Arundel. Much to the surprise of Hill he showed no interest in the sale. This *genuine aristocratic connoisseur at the Jacobean court* travelled the Low Countries in 1612²²⁷. Howarth, and Hill after him, found a letter written in Antwerp at the start of August 1612 thanking Trumbull *for your own pains in Brussels* and thanking Lionel Wake for his in Antwerp. Howarth assumes this letter to be from the earl of Arundel. This however is a faulty conclusion. The letter is from Thomas Arundell, baron Arundell of Wardour who was commander of the English regiment in the archdukes service²²⁸. That same year Trumbull seems to have been instrumental in sending some trees to the domains of the countess of Arundel, Alatheia. His servant German Marsham reported in November that the trees had been delivered to the countess²²⁹. The earl reported back in May 1613, while he joined Elizabeth, daughter of king James who wedded Frederick V, elector Palatine, to the Palatinate. The Low Countries were famous for its horticultural nurseries, and Arundel ordered plants for Highgate. As he arrived at their destination he wrote Trumbull,

*You will hear from Mrs. Panton at Highgate how the trees you sent prosper; and if they like the ground I would have you send some over in good time before Michaelmas a month, with good roots and speedy carriage to fill up those walks that want, or may day*²³⁰.

While Arundel was in the Low Countries he spotted a painting which he wanted to acquire in 1617. In a letter of Tobie Mathew the first paragraph was written by the Earl. He had seen a painting in the merchant's house in Antwerp six years ago. Others present at that time were Lionel Wake, an English merchant in Antwerp and the painter Hendrik van Balen. The painting was attributed to Raphael, but was in reality painted by Sebastiano del Piombo. Arundel described the painting as,

*It was a man sittinge in a chayre sayde to be an Ambassador, an other man deliveringe him a letter bare headed; beyonde a prospective of a logia of white marble pillars; beginde the Ambassador is a mans heade but much lesse, which was sayde to be Rafaelles owne picture. It is but halfe length*²³¹.

²²⁵ HMCD, iv, 513, Abbot to Trumbull, Croydon, 31 August 1614

²²⁶ Smuts, 'Howard, Thomas, fourteenth earl of Arundel, fourth earl of Surrey, and first earl of Norfolk (1585–1646)'.

²²⁷ See, Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle*; Howarth, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel*.

²²⁸ HMCD, iii, 340, Arundell to Trumbull, Antwerp, 7 August 1612 (n.s.); Howarth, *Arundel and his Circle*, 228 (n. 6).

²²⁹ HMCD, iii, 394, Marsham to Trumbull, London, 5 November 1612.

²³⁰ HMCD, iv, 119, Arundel to Trumbull, Gaulstein, 31 May 1613; Howarth, *Arundel and his Circle*, 63-64.

²³¹ HMCD, vi, 343 (letter 739), Matthew to Trumbull, York House, 12 December 1617. Although almost the entire letter is written by Matthew, this paragraph was written in Arundel's own hand.

Tobie Mathew (1577–1655)²³² gave further instructions. Trumbull was to request the painter to travel to Liège. The painting was thought to have been in the possession of a Flemish merchant in that city, Reyner Cynaten. If Van Balen could not go, Arundel would be willing to pay £ 50 for it. Matthew, however, thought that he might be persuaded to offer 500 Brabant Florins. It could also have been bought by Taxis in Brussel. If so, Trumbull had to buy it and await further instructions²³³. The English agent reported back that the painting was in the hands of the General of the Post, Taxis, whom Howarth identified as the Postmaster of Antwerp. He had bought it in Antwerp for £ 130, and esteemed its worth £ 200. He would not part with it. Trumbull offered to buy other pictures through the agency of Nobiliers. He suggested that if Arundel was able to acquire the Mary Magdalen which had been in prince Henry's collection, it could be exchanged for an equestrian portrait of emperor Charles V²³⁴. Arundel, according to Howarth, *instructed his long-suffering protégé to keep on making offers until the Postmaster succumbed. This he eventually did, and so one of the great group portraits of the Renaissance came into the collection*²³⁵. This picture of *Ferry Carondelet and attendants* can now be seen in the Thyssen collection in Madrid²³⁶.

Arundel also turned to Trumbull to buy other paintings, sculptures and help for the development of his gardens. In April 1618 Lionel Wake reported that paintings for Arundel were ready to be sent over, but he feared they were too fragile, so he suggested making a case for them. Arundel wrote Trumbull in the fall of 1619 for some sculptures which his agent, Thomas Coke, had not been able to get. The gardener that Arundel was eager to get was Benedetto. According to Trumbull's secretary, John Wolley, he was willing to go and excepted £ 3 for his expenses, which was in April 1618. He accepted £ 3 for his expenses but did not arrive until October 1618²³⁷.

Others that used Trumbull's services in the Southern Netherlands were Sir Thomas Lake (secretary of state, 1616-1619), Grey Brydges (1578/9–1621)²³⁸, fifth baron Chandos, and Thomas Windsor. Sir Thomas Lake was interested in ready made hangings, *fair and good work*. If none could be found which met his requirements, Trumbull had to talk to a good master. Trumbull contacted his friend Lionel Wake in Antwerp, who informed him the following month that he had spoken with Van der Goes²³⁹, who told him none could be found with a depth of seven el. They would have to be made and this would take about six months. Trumbull seems to have reported back to Lake, who informed him at

²³² Loomie, 'Matthew, Sir Toby (1577–1655)'.

²³³ HMCD, vi, 343 (letter 739), Matthew to Trumbull, York House, 12 December 1617.

²³⁴ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 218.

²³⁵ Howarth, *Arundel and his Circle*, 67.

²³⁶ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 217.

²³⁷ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 218; HMCD, vi, 404 (letter 879), Wake to Trumbull, Antwerp, 12 April 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 410 (letter 891), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 25 April 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 415 (letter 905), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 9 May 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 417 (letter 909), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 16 May 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 427 (letter 926), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 13 June 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 509 (letter 1102), Coke to Trumbull, Highgate, 16 September 1618; HMCD, vi, 535 (letter 1156), Wolley to Trumbull, London, 5 October 1618; Howarth, *Arundel and his Circle*, 65-66.

²³⁸ Warmington, 'Brydges, Grey, fifth Baron Chandos (1578/9–1621)'.

²³⁹ Presumably Alexander or Henry Van der Goes, Antwerp merchants.

the start of 1614 that he would get back to Trumbull at a later date. But there is no letter in the Trumbull papers after January 1614 concerning tapestries for Lake²⁴⁰.

While in the Southern Netherlands on a visit to Spa Chandos wanted Trumbull to help him find some *hangings*. He was going to send the measurements of each room. Trumbull possibly employed Anthony Wither(s), an English factor in Antwerp, to get some information for Chandos. Wither replied to Trumbull's letter of the beginning of September that there could be found no tapisteries with those measurements. They would have to be made, which would take about six months. And *my Lord* should inform *whether he will have them of imagery great or small or forest work, and whether the history be divine or humane*²⁴¹. While Wolley was in charge of the Brussels embassy in the first half of 1618 he reported to Trumbull on the paintings and the armour requested by Thomas Windsor. He was looking for an opportunity to send the paintings over and had spoken with the armourer who *promised me to packe it up as it should be*. He sent the lot to England at the end of March 1618²⁴².

One who could have been important for the further career of Trumbull was Sir Dudley Carleton, resident ambassador in Venice (1610-1615) and afterwards in the United Provinces (1615-1625). The correspondence while he was at The Hague with his counterpart in Brussels was extensive, but stops abruptly after the two men were recalled to London in 1625. Carleton, then already viscount of Dorchester, was promoted, because of his connections with Buckingham, to secretary of state in 1625. A letter from Peter Paul Rubens, the famous Flemish painter, to Trumbull, concerns a painting for Carleton. The painting for Carleton had been finished. If the whole painting had been done by the artist, its worth would have double the current value. Trumbull and Lionel Wake often figured as intermediary between Carleton and the famous painter²⁴³.

Lisle and Chandos could never be the useful patrons necessary for preferment. Abbot was one of the warmest supporters of William Trumbull. He succeeded Bancroft as archbishop of Canterbury in February 1611. A year later he wrote his first letter to Trumbull requesting information²⁴⁴. Thomas Albery reported from London in July 1612, that the archbishop *is much indebted to you for your intelligences. I doubt not but you will one day find him ready to further your advancement*²⁴⁵. Abbot did not neglect to inform the English agent who his true patrons were or should be. Trumbull, after a long process,

²⁴⁰ HMCD, iv, 212, Lake to Trumbull, Whitehall, 5 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 243, Lionel Wake to Trumbull, Antwerp, 11 November 1613; HMCD, iv, 282, Lake to Trumbull, Whitehall, 5 January 1614.

²⁴¹ HMCD, iv, 497, Chandos to Trumbull, Spa, 19 August [1614 endorsement]; HMCD, iv, 501, Chandos to Trumbull, Spa, 21 August 1614; HMCD, iv, 507, Wither to Trumbull, Antwerp, 6 September 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 6 (letter 15), Chandos to Trumbull, Rees, 5 [*recte* 4] September 1614.

²⁴² HMCD, vi, 383 (letter 838), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 22 February 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 396 (letter 860), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 15 March 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 398-399 (letter 867), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 29 March 1618 (n.s.).

²⁴³ SPP 77/14 f^o 14r, Trumbull to [Carleton], s.l., 7 February 1620 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 16r-17r, Wolley to [Carleton], 8 February 1620 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 58r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 7/17 March 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 228r-228v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 17/27 October 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 244r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 19/29 November 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 268r, copy, Rubens to Trumbull, s.l., 26 January 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 272r-272v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 18/28 January 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 287r, Trumbull to [Carleton], [Brussels], 6 March 1621 (n.s.).

²⁴⁴ HMCD, iii, 257-258, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 20 March 1612.

²⁴⁵ HMCD, iii, 331, Albery to Trumbull, London, 16 July 1612.

got a promise for a more regular payment of his salary and also for an expense account. According to the archbishop, in May 1617, it was due to Sir Ralph Winwood²⁴⁶.

Winwood was perhaps the most important patron of Trumbull after the death of Salisbury. Winwood, although not a great art collector, seems to have ordered some paintings portraying continental rulers. He requested Trumbull at the beginning of June 1617 that these would be sent over as soon as possible²⁴⁷. Trumbull sent him three paintings in August 1617: one of the emperor, one of the Spanish king and one of archduke Maximilian. The ones of archduke Albert and his wife the infanta Isabella, would be sent over shortly afterwards²⁴⁸. Trumbull was still looking for a picture of archduke Ferdinand, the new king of Bohemia, which could only be found in the collections of the archdukes and of Ambrosio Spinola (1569-1630)²⁴⁹. In September 1617 the pictures of Ferdinand and the archdukes followed. If these were not to the liking of Winwood, Trumbull promised to *provyde yow as many more to be made by the best Painters of these parts, and withdrawe the others for myne owne use*²⁵⁰. Unfortunately for Trumbull Winwood died a little over a month later. Trumbull was all too aware what this entailed for him. He wrote his counterpart in The Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton, a few months later: *For I am nowe deprieved of all comfort at home, and support abroade; by reason that I applyed my self to him alone, & for his respect neglected the patronage of all other Saints in or. Courte of England.* John Bennet, who had worked with Trumbull as an ambassador extraordinary in 1617 commented on the death of Winwood. Bennet was glad Trumbull had been given permission to return to England to deal with his public business and his private affairs, *for I doubt much whither your surviving frends bee so well affected to you as some that are dead*²⁵¹.

The obvious new patron, for anyone seeking advancement, was George Villiers, then earl of Buckingham. Hill argues that several of Trumbull's friends in England informed him thereof. John More was ordered by the king to give Buckingham all of Trumbull's dispatches from the last six months adding, *who I hope will prove a good friend and patron*²⁵². This was reinforced by George Abbot on 19 December who advised Trumbull about his request for an increase in his salary. *Your best course would be to write to the Duke of Buckingham about your claim, and I shall doe what I can to support it. But I would advise you to create the impression that you rely exclusively on him in this business*²⁵³.

Trumbull did correspond with Buckingham. During the life of Winwood one of the ploys which had been considered to secure satisfaction for the libel *Corona Regia* was the kidnapping of Erycius Puteanus, considered to be the author of that infamous pamphlet. Winwood's last letter to Trumbull a few weeks before his death, instructed Trumbull to go on with the project²⁵⁴. According to Lockyer these were the *apprentice years* of

²⁴⁶ HMCD, vi, 178, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 10 May 1617.

²⁴⁷ HMCD, vi, 195 (letter 430), Winwood to Trumbull, Greenwich, 4 June 1617.

²⁴⁸ HMCD, vi, 268 (letter 579), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 27 August 1617.

²⁴⁹ Brants, 'Spinola (Ambroise)', 424-426.

²⁵⁰ HMCD, vi, 281 (letter 604), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 10/20 September 1617.

²⁵¹ SP 77/12 f^o 427r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 8 December 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 353 (letter 763), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 24 December 1617.

²⁵² HMCD, vi, 321 (letter 685), More to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 4 November 1617.

²⁵³ HMCD, vi, 349 (letter 754), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 December 1617.

²⁵⁴ HMCD, vi, 302 (letter 642), Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 3 October 1617.

Buckingham as royal favourite²⁵⁵. *Corona Regia*, as we will see later on, was close to the heart of king James and provided Buckingham with an excellent opportunity. Trumbull was officially informed by Sir Thomas Lake of the death of Winwood. Henceforth he should direct all his dispatches to Lake. Trumbull however kept in contact with Buckingham concerning the scheme to kidnap Puteanus. Two letters to Buckingham are still extant, both are dated in November 1617. In the last one of the 29 it seems that Trumbull was instructed to drop the scheme²⁵⁶.

Hill convincingly argues that Trumbull did not heed the warnings of his friends. A friend of Trumbull, John Castle, wrote in 1622,

*you absurdly stray in your means if your Ora Pro Nobis be not directed to the right saint. I have no conceit of those petty ones, who for their own selves can obtain no grace except they bow and beseech at the shrine of the great one. Direct your suit to His Majesty by his hand, if you will think to prosper ... He will glory in your dependence on him, and will, I doubt, be an enemy unto you if you seek to carry it without him*²⁵⁷.

Trumbull did manage, according to Hill, to pen one flattering letter to Buckingham in May 1624 because he had discovered a possible plot against Buckingham:

*I have sometimes assumed the boldness to write to your Grace and had a will to perform that duty oftener if I had not been kept back by my natural bashfulness and fear of being guilty of the fault of importunity: which to your lordship (overcharged with affairs) ... would have proved irksome to you and on my part be inexcusable. Your Grace may ask why I rather do it now that heretofore. With your lordship's permission, I answer the times and occasions are not always alike. Then I had nothing but generalities. Now I have something which (in my poor understanding) may cast a reflection upon His Majesty's sacred person, your lordship's, or the office you worthily possess*²⁵⁸.

He further asked for the mediation of the duke in July 1625, a few months before his return to England²⁵⁹. He did mention Buckingham in some of his letters to secretary of state Edward Conway (c.1564–1631)²⁶⁰. At the end of his term in 1625 he requested the secretary's help concerning a reversion. He already had a servant in England who remained there for nine months, John Wolley. This cost him a lot and he began to wonder if this would be worth while. He kept pressing Conway about his *poore, & tedious Suite*. In several letters he mentioned the duke, writing that *I doubt not my L. Duke of Buckingham, will vouchsafe me his Gr. Favorable, & potent mediation* or later *I most reuerently*

²⁵⁵ Lockyer, *Buckingham: the life and political career of George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628*.

²⁵⁶ HMCD, vi, 323-324 (letter 694), draft, Trumbull to Buckingham, Brussels, 9/19 November 1617; HMCD, vi, 335, draft, [Trumbull] to [Buckingham], [29 November 1617 endorsed]; the last letter was a reply to Buckingham's of 12 November, which no longer exists.

²⁵⁷ Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 220; Lockyer, *Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham*, 113.

²⁵⁸ Quoted in Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 220; SP 77/17 f^o 115, Trumbull to Buckingham, 7 May 1624.

²⁵⁹ Quoted in Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain', 220; According to Hill, SP 77/17 f^o 191, Trumbull to Buckingham, 12 July 1625, but it should be SP 77/18.

²⁶⁰ Kelsey, 'Conway, Edward, first Viscount Conway and first Viscount Killultagh (c.1564–1631).

begge my L: Dukes, and yor. Hors. Potent, and fatherly remembrance and intercession. In June 1625 he reported that he expected the return of Wolley to England. He hoped to *heare some comfortable newes, from yor. L: touching my particuler*²⁶¹. Trumbull understood that Buckingham was the key to succeeding in his suits. He however never applied himself, as Carleton did, at ingratiating himself with Buckinham²⁶².

Did he think himself to old to seek a new office as Anderson suggests? Or did he find *the whole business of soliciting patronage so demeaning*, as Hill argues? We can only guess at the logic behind Trumbull's behaviour. William Trumbull was never noted for his ambition, according to Anderson, which provides us with an important clue²⁶³. Trumbull admitted that much in a letter written in 1621 to John Woodford, who was then employed by James Hay, viscount Doncaster:

*I thancke God my ambition is prescrybed within the lymitte of my present fortune. Higher I desyer not to clymbe; well foreseeing that the greatest men, have often tymes the greatest falles, and well knowing, and freely confessing myne owne insufficiency, and want of meritt. It shalbe enough for me, at my retourne home, either to exercise the Clarkshipp of the Counsell; in case I may doe it, without reproch of beeing incapable for that office; or by his Majesties favour having but meanes to eate, and cloath me, and my familly, with a little to bring up my children in my rancke, to lyve retyred, and in some cottage to spend the reste of my dayes, in prayers for our Prince, and Country*²⁶⁴.

What is clear is that Trumbull never offered his services expecting something in return, a point which Anderson and Hill both stress. Furthermore Howarth argues that Trumbull *found negotiating terms for paintings, or indeed tapestries, a mildly distasteful and time-consuming affair*, but he does not elaborate, nor how he gets to this conclusion²⁶⁵. There is no evidence he charged for his services, according to Anderson he left that to Lionel Wake²⁶⁶. Whatever the reasons, Hill concludes that Trumbull's *failure to cultivate the Duke was to cost him dear*. The king promised Trumbull in February to provide for him on his return.

What was his reward for years of faithfull service? Thomas Birch described Trumbull's career succinctly in 1749: he was envoy to the archducal court for fifteen years after the departure of Edmondess,

and discharged that post with great abilities and integrity, and a thorough zeal for the interest of his country, and of the Protestant religion; though he met with no other reward for his

²⁶¹ SP 77/18 f^o 1v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 13 January 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 7, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 24 January 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 12r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 10 February 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 39r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 10 March 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 42r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 17 March 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 46v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 31 March 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 170v-171r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 23 June 1625.

²⁶² Besides the articles already mentioned, see also Hill and Lockyer, "'Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office" Revisited'.

²⁶³ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 124.

²⁶⁴ Quoted in Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 124; Trumbull MS. Min. IV, 140, Trumbull to John Woodford, 1 July 1621.

²⁶⁵ Howarth, *Arundel and his Circle*, 67.

²⁶⁶ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 121-122; Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in Early Stuart Britain', 217.

*long services, that the place of Clerk of the Council, in which he died at London in September 1635*²⁶⁷.

The Clerkship of the Privy Council was not so much a reward. He had bought it from Sir Thomas Edmondes in 1614 for £ 350. After his return he settled in his duties as clerk. The four clerks worked in a rotation for six weeks which gave them periods of leisure. To ensure continuity the terms of each clerk overlapped a week with that of his predecessor. Trumbull was appointed senior clerk of the Privy Council on 29 January 1626²⁶⁸. Trumbull lived over a barber's shop in Westminster when he was on duty with only the bare necessities, which for Trumbull included forty books. Trumbull was never knighted, which was customary for a man of his seniority as a diplomat and a clerk of the Privy Council. Anderson argues that Trumbull perhaps wanted *a more tangible reward*²⁶⁹. Trumbull applied for one more diplomatic post in the autumn of 1626 as candidate for the Levant Company in Constantinople as successor of Sir Thomas Roe. He nearly won the election despite Charles I's preference for Peter Wiche²⁷⁰. In fact he received Easthampstead Park on the edge of Windsor Forest from the king. He had to pay only 40s. per year (his per diem diet in the latter years of his mandate in Brussels had been 40s.) on condition that he maintained 200 deer for royal sport. In 1626 he was appointed Keeper of Easthampsted Walk. By October 1626 the family lived in the house although it took almost three more years to get all the formalities in order. After his death his eldest son petitioned to get Easthampstead Park at the same terms as his father with the privilege of felling timber and freedom from forest laws. All the deer were destroyed during the English Civil Wars and after the restoration William Trumbull the Younger petitioned the king to have the clause of the 200 deer annulled, which was granted. The price changed at that time, from 40s to £10 per year²⁷¹. Easthampstead Park remained property of the descendents of the English agent of the seventeenth century: subsequently owned by William Trumbull the Younger (1594-1668), Sir William Trumbull (1639-1716), William Trumbull (*d.* 1760), Mary Trumbull who married Col. Martin Sandys (*d.* 1768), their daughter Mary (1764-1836) who married Arthur Hill (1753-1801), second marquess of Downshire, their son Blundell Sandys Trumbull Hill (1788-1855 of 1845). Easthampstead Park was sold after the Second World War to Berkshire County Council. Subsequently it was a training college for teachers, the Berkshire College of Education, an Educational Centre which housed an Adult residential College and a comprehensive school. Finally it developed into a Conference Centre with a comprehensive school. Arthur Francis Nicholas Wills Hill, ninth marquess of Downshire was born in 1959. In 1989 his father sold the Trumbull Papers of which a large part was acquired by the British Library.

²⁶⁷ Birch, *An Historical View of the Negotiations Between the Courts of England, France and Brussels, From the Year 1592 to 1617*, 308-309.

²⁶⁸ APC 1625-1626, 330.

²⁶⁹ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 125; McClure (ed.), *Letters of John Chamberlain*, ii, 137, 142.

²⁷⁰ Anderson, 'Trumbull, William (1576x80?-1635)'.

²⁷¹ Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: A Biographical Sketch', 125; CSPD Charles I 1628-1629, 42; "Parished Easthampstead", *A History of the County of Berkshire*, iii, 77-80.

Chapter 2 Defending English interests

Cloth trade

The main issues resolved by the Treaty of London in 1604 were commercial. All difficult matters, e.g. English refugees in the Archducal Netherlands or the position of English Catholics in their native country, remained unresolved. Trade between the Low Countries and England, due to the proximity of both, grew extensively during the Middle Ages¹. Due to the start of the religious conflict and the rebellion against Philip II the economic situation in the Netherlands changed significantly. Eventually the North evolved to a Protestant republic and the South remained loyal to the Spanish monarch. Alexander Farnese (1545-1592), duke of Parma and governor-general of the Southern Netherlands from 1578 to 1592, recovered several important cities from the Protestant rebels such as Antwerp which had been the economic heart of the Netherlands. The Republic closed the Scheldt and hastened the further decline of the once prosperous city.

The Somerset House Treaty was an opportunity for the archdukes to recover some of the English-Flemish trade. But as the negotiations leading up to the treaty did not include the United Provinces, the Scheldt remained closed. Before the temporary conclusion of the hostilities between the Republic and the archdukes in 1609 with the signing of the Twelve Years' Truce, king James VI/I was instrumental to help the princes of the Southern Netherlands in their quest to get full access from the sea to Antwerp. The archduke's ambassador in London, the duke of Hoboken, raised the question in the spring of 1606. The re-establishment of full commercial relations between England and the Southern Netherlands was one of the objectives of the Treaty but remained unsatisfactory on the part of the archdukes. Hoboken considered it necessary for James to force the United Provinces to deliver free passage to ships bound for Antwerp. This discussion was not limited to London. The English ambassador subsequently discussed the matter with archduke Albert and Jean Richardot (1540-1609)², president of the Privy Council since 1597. Albert stressed the partiality of English justice as his subjects and those of the Republic were treated differently. Richardot took a legal point of view and told Edmondes that the lack of English trade in the archducal ports constituted a breach of the treaty, which he himself had help negotiate. Edmondes underlined his master's willingness but urged that it was beyond reason to expect the king to go to war over this³.

Even after 1609 the Republic retained control of the Scheldt. The closure was however never hermetical. Shipping to and from Antwerp remained possible through a system of passports and licences⁴. Foreign communities which had given Antwerp much of its splendour in the sixteenth century began to return after Farnese had recaptured the

¹ Boone, 'Les toiles de lin des Pays-Bas bourguignons sur le marché anglais (fin XIVe-XVIe siècles)'; Doran, *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century*; Harding, 'Cross-Channel Trade and Cultural Contacts: London and the Low Countries in the Later Fourteenth Century'; Munro, 'Anglo-Flemish competition in the international cloth trade, 1340-1520'; Wright, 'Trade between England and the Low Countries: Evidence from Historical Linguistics'.

² Brants, 'Richardot (Jean)', 274-280.

³ SP 77/8/2 f^o 25, Minutes to Edmondes, 2 March 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 49r-51v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 11 March 1606.

⁴ Van Houtte, 'Déclin et survivance d'Anvers (1550-1700)', 712, 718, 719; Craeybeckx, 'Les industries d'exportation dans les villes flamandes au XVIIe Siecle, particulièrement a Gand et a Bruges', 416.

city in 1585⁵. The English community was represented in Antwerp with their own residence, the English House. This caused trouble in 1607. The house was assigned to the Jesuits by the magistrates of the city. Edmondes interpellated archduke Albert about this, but he was not forthcoming. The house was of no use to the English as there was no or little English trade in Antwerp, the archduke alleged. Naturally if this changed they would be given a new residence⁶.

Paramount to the English economy was the cloth trade. The most comprehensive study of the cloth trade and its importance during the reign of king James is still Astrid Friis' *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade. Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects* published in 1917. During the sixteenth century cloth export amounted to 70.86 % of the total export, wool 8.11 %. During the reign of king Henry VIII the average number of cloths exported was 122.353. By the beginning of the new century it was about 130.000 cloths every year. In 1606, during the first years of the reign of king James VI/I, about 125.000 cloths were exported by English traders from London. Originally foreigners dominated the export of English cloth, but their influence decreased steadily during the sixteenth century. While still half of the cloth export was dominated by foreigners ca. 1550 this number fell to a mere three per cent by the start of the seventeenth century⁷.

One of the most prominent and important companies that developed in England was the Company of the Merchant Adventurers⁸. These Merchant Adventurers concentrated on the trade with the Netherlands and the northwest of Germany. The importance of the Merchant Adventurers for the cloth export cannot be exaggerated. Of the 125.000 cloths that were exported in 1606 the Merchant Adventurers exported 95.608 (more than 75 %), of which 76.124 were undressed. During the previous reign attempts had been made to increase the number of cloths that were finished (*ready dressed*) before exporting them. An important statute concerning this is the statute of 1566. For every nine undressed cloths one ready-dressed cloth should be exported. The English government was never able to fully enforce this statute.

Friis concentrates on what she calls the Low Countries, but in fact she limits her study to the Republic of the United Provinces. There are but a few references to the South. The most revealing entry is a report Mr. Withers⁹ made before a parliamentary committee investigating the crisis in the cloth trade in April 1621. Friis states,

Mr. Withers was again questioned. The decline of the cloth exports to the Archduke's Country was undeniable. In 1601 it amounted to 8000-9000 cloths, but now from 3000 to 3600 less were

⁵ Van Houtte, 'Déclin et survivance d'Anvers (1550-1700)', 721.

⁶ SP 77/8/2 f^o 74r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 April 1607.

⁷ Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project. Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects*, 12, 47 and 61; Supple, *Commercial crisis and change in England 1600-1642*, 33; Supple gives a good summary of the Cockayne project and of the crisis of the first half of the 1620s, see especially pp. 33-72. For the crisis, see also, Gould, 'The trade depression of the early 1620's', 81-90.

⁸ Besides the books quoted in the footnotes, see also Bisson, *The merchant adventurers of England : the company and the crown, 1474-1564*; Sutton, 'The Merchant Adventurers of England : their origins and the Mercers' Company of London!'; Wiegandt, *Die Merchant Adventurers Company auf dem Kontinent zur Zeit der Tudors und Stuarts*.

⁹ This presumably is Anthony Wither(s), one of Trumbull's correspondents who was a merchant in Antwerp.

*sold. The causes for this were hardly quite realised, but the high impositions levied since 1612 were supposed to have contributed thereto. It was also stated that the fashions had changed so that the women in Flanders did not use so much cloth in their dresses as before*¹⁰.

According to these numbers the exports to the archducal Netherlands amounted to 6.4 to 7.2 per cent of total exports, not inconsiderable. The Low Countries had a centuries old history when it came to cloth manufacture. Cities like Bruges, Ghent and Ypres had been the early examples to reap the benefits of this industry. This had changed by the seventeenth century. Historian Victor Brants describes the cloth industry during that century in the Southern Netherlands as depressed. While remedies were sought, *l'industrie allait de plus en plus à la ruine, transplantée en grande partie en Angleterre, où l'avaient attirée les faveurs du roi*. Despite all this, hope remained that it was possible to turn the fate of the ailing industry. In January 1611 the archdukes requested the cities to send competent delegates to constitute a committee to investigate this matter more thoroughly. Delegates from eighteen cities from the provinces of Brabant, Flanders, Arras, and Limburg gathered during the months of March and April¹¹. The revival of the cloth industry in the dominions of the archdukes would necessarily entail negative consequences for England. Trumbull reported to Salisbury that some people were pressing archduke Albert to forbid the importation of English cloth into Flanders and Artois. *But, the English agent added, the discreeter sorte of people holding those propositions for impossibilityes; (concerning the want of meanes to fournish these countries wth sufficient numbers of clothes, and shippes), expecting that nothing of moment would happen*¹². A month later there was more reason for concern. The principal motivation behind the prohibition of English cloth was pretended to be the restoration of the once thriving cloth making industries in Flanders and Artois. This was presented to Albert and Isabella by *some renegades of our nation and other decayed persons of these countries*. They offered to pay the archdukes, according to Trumbull's information, to compensate for the loss of the customs paid by *our English Company*. Now Trumbull was convinced that this plan would become a reality unless the English king intervened¹³.

Instructions from London were not forthcoming, which worried Trumbull. His former master, Edmondes, understood the amazement of Trumbull at the lack of interest in their home country. He could think of two reasons why James's government was not more sensible to this issue. Or they thought the archdukes would not go through with the plan, as Trumbull originally thought, or even if the project was put into action, it would not harm English interests. He clearly disagreed with this strategy adding, that

it hath been always our custom to seek still to put off the time and never to endeavour the preventing of mischiefs till they be fallen upon us, which maketh that afterwards they are not either at all remedied or at the least not without great difficulty.

He advised his former senior secretary to address archduke Albert or his ministers and let them know that

¹⁰ Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project*, 406.

¹¹ Brants, *Albert et Isabelle*, 198-199.

¹² SP 77/10 f^o 57r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 27 March 1611.

¹³ HMCD, iii, 62-63, draft of Trumbull to [Salisbury], Brussels, 24 April 1611.

*you were bound in duty to represent unto them how great a violation the same would be of the treaty, wherein as your diligence will be fully justified, so upon the certifyeing of their answer into England it will be a means to make them there more sensible of that which is fit to be further done therein*¹⁴.

Trumbull was kept informed of the deliberations in Brussels by some of his friends, whom he never identifies. Rather than awaiting a copy of the proceedings, he notified Salisbury. The whole purpose of the project was *the restoring of manufacturers to these Countryes: the setting of 200 thowsand people in woorke*. An unavoidable effect would be the weakening and the impoverishment of the dominions of James, who was still seen as the *capitall enemy* of Spain and the house of Habsburg. According to Trumbull's information the main party behind this project were the Jesuits¹⁵. Trumbull, as usual, remains extremely vague about where he gets his information.

Salisbury's reply is dated 25 August 1611 in the HMCD, which is impossible as he refers to Trumbull's dispatch of 28 August. Salisbury reminded Trumbull not to expect replies unless there was something of immediate consequence. Concerning the cloth business he stated,

*For the banishment of English cloths, the remonstrance in favour of our merchants, which you sent with yours of Aug. 28, carries that sense in opposite of what is or may be urged to the contrary, as howsoever they begin so roughly, we think they will advise before they come to conclusion, lest upon examination and stop of commodities mutually transportable we return them their own measure to their disadvantage*¹⁶.

Salisbury, as Edmondes had partially predicted, clearly presumed that the archdukes would not go through with the plan. Trumbull agreed and was convinced that a final decision would have to be postponed until the passport of Merstraten in Dunkirk was completed. Two years ago this man had got a passport to import 12.000 English cloths in the dominions of the archdukes. The completion of the passport would take another two or three years¹⁷. Salisbury's second letter appreciated what Trumbull undertook. The Lord Treasurer formulated two questions. Could the archdukes do this without breaching the treaty? It is clear from the archival records in Brussels the matter was debated extensively in the Privy Council of the archdukes, tracing all possible treaties¹⁸. And secondly, they had to ask themselves if *they can raise answerable profits* and can if they can furnish themselves with enough cloth and wool. The one thing the archdukes needed to put their plan into execution was wool. The main supplier of wool had been England. The export of wool out of the English realm had been prohibited on several

¹⁴ HMCD, iii, 128, Edmondes to Trumbull, Paris, 29 August 1611.

¹⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 110r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 August 1611.

¹⁶ HMCD, iii, 127, Salisbury to Trumbull, Salisbury House, 25 August 1611; this date is incorrect as Salisbury refers to Trumbull's letter of 28 August.

¹⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 122r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 24 September 1611.

¹⁸ PEA 405/3. This number contains papers relating to the Treaty of London (1604) and the problem of the import of English cloth in the dominions of the Archdukes (February 1612).

occasions, but it was a prohibition that had proven difficult to enforce. Salisbury took this into account and informed Trumbull that

*In the mean time you shall be vigilant all you may, to discover who are the abettors and instruments in the cunning fraud you write of, and therein to make use both of friends and money that, the sore thoroughly searched and the corruption cleared, the cure may follow more speedily and soundly*¹⁹

These seem to be the first clear, although limited, instructions Trumbull received on the matter of the cloth trade. Trumbull reported on the scheme developed to smuggle wool out of England. Under the cloak of transporting wool from one English port to another, it was frequently transported to Dunkirk or other Flemish ports. To bypass controls woolsacks were cut in two. One part was sold in the countries of the archdukes; the other half was brought back to England. As only the number of the woolsacks had been recorded, there appeared to be no change in the eyes of customs²⁰.

The archdukes and their ministers were well aware of the dependence of the cloth industry on English wool. According to some of them in April 1612 Albert and Isabella contemplated the obligation that for every piece of cloth a certain amount of wool should be brought in. Trumbull did not only report this possible new turn but suggested a remedy. For every piece of linen imported in England, king James could require that a certain amount of flax should be imported, although this was of inferior quality than the English wool. Besides the argument of reviving the cloth industry Trumbull had discovered an additional contention behind the project: the return of the staple of the Merchant Adventurers to Antwerp. They had left the city in 1569 and had eventually settled in Middelburg which they used as staple town for the Low Countries²¹. According to Trumbull the Southern Netherlands wanted to use the project as leverage to get the Merchant Adventurers to relocate their staple from Middelburg back to Antwerp. James could then use his authority with the United Provinces in the opening of the Scheldt²².

A proclamation was issued 14 April 1612 (n.s.). Trumbull reported it five days later to the secretary of state and sent an abstract, as he had not yet got hold of a copy. The abstract had been dictated to Trumbull by someone who had read the original document three or four times. He hoped to see the original, signed by Albert, and to send a copy with his next dispatch, *if a friend do keep touch in his promise*²³. The English agent was able to make good on his promise. Albert proclaimed that the passport granted to Nicolas van Merstraten (May 1610 concerning 10.000 English cloths) had to be served, but that after that time no new passports would be given to import English cloth into Flanders. White

¹⁹ HMCD, iii, 199, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 12 December 1611; for the English internal regulation of wool trade see, Bowden, 'The regulation of English internal wool trade'.

²⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 159r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 20 November 1611.

²¹ Baumann, *The Merchant Adventurers and the Continental Cloth-trade (1560s-1620s)*, 195; for the Merchant Adventurers in the previous century see also Ramsay, 'The cloth trade at London in mid-sixteenth century: the Merchant Adventurers and their rivals'.

²² HMCD, iii, 279-281, draft, Trumbull to [Salisbury?], Brussels, 22 April 1612.

²³ HMCD, iii, 273, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 9 April 1612.

cloth could only be entered into his dominions through Antwerp, which was in the province of Brabant, where they could be coloured and afterwards sold as before²⁴.

The passports were fully completed by the summer of 1612. Some 140 pieces surplus were still in Dunkirk and Ostend. Trumbull informed the king, *I will dilligently observe what course the Archd. shall nowe take for the continuance of commerce betweene yor. Mats. vassallss, and his people*²⁵. Albert wanted that these cloths would be sent back to England²⁶. What further happened in this case is unclear.

The death of the earl of Salisbury in May 1612 did not entail new instructions for the English agent in Brussels. As the king decided to act as his own principal secretary of state, Trumbull addressed his dispatches to his sovereign. In July he repeated the intention of the archdukes to banish English cloth, or at least *those wch are dyed in the woolle, and dressed in England*, which amounted of two thirds of what was sold in the dominions of the archdukes. Trumbull was assured by a minister of the archdukes, whom he did not identify, that a decision had yet to be taken. Trumbull sent the king a detailed report of the conversation which ended without result. Trumbull accused the archduke of not abiding by the treaty, and the minister accused the English king of the same thing. In the end the minister gave Trumbull the advice to propound the question to Albert himself. In the meanwhile Trumbull concluded his letter by requesting instructions on how he should behave in this matter²⁷.

King James took a personal interest in the matter and replied forthwith. He had instructed his Privy Council to consult with English merchants; Trumbull would be informed of its decision. But the English agent had not to await the results of this conference; he had to request an audience with the archduke²⁸. Trumbull did as instructed and was received by the archduke at the end of August. Trumbull grounded his argument on three rationales. First, he mentioned the causes and antiquity of the good relations between England and the Low Countries in the past. The so-called Malus Intercursus Treaty ratified in 1506 was central to his discourse. In 1496 Philip the Fair (1478-1506) had restored commercial relations with England (Magnus Intercursus), but he was forced to revise it in 1506 which led to Malus Intercursus²⁹. It stipulated, *que les draps d' Angre. ne pourroyent provisionnellement ny perpetuellement, directement, ny indirectement estre baniz, hors les païs de pardeça: sauf tant seulement au Comté de Flandres pour les vendre en detail. Et si l'on pretendoit les defendre en lad. Province*, then it was to be agreed upon. The English were also to be notified in advance of such a move to give the English merchants the time to set their affairs right. Secondly he drew the attention to the geographical position of both countries, *being the most commodious of all Europe for interchangeable trade*. Finally, Trumbull referred to several treaties dating back to Philip the Good and ending with the Treaty of London.

²⁴ SP 77/10, f^o 179r, *Copie of the Archdukes Ordonnance concerning English cloth*; this ordinance is not published in series of *Recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas*, Brants, *Règne d'Albert et d'Isabella 1597-1621* (*Recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas. Recueil de anciennes ordonnances de la Belgique*); I have thus far been unable to locate the ordinance in the national archives of Belgium in Brussels.

²⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 203r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 15 July 1612.

²⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 204r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 22 July 1612.

²⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 204r-205r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 22 July 1612.

²⁸ HMCD, iii, 346-347, James VI/I to Trumbull, Apthorp, 5 August 1612.

²⁹ See note 1 of this chapter.

I did also, by way of prevention, assure him that if any man had made sinister and untrue complaint of certain pretended improvements in your M.'s customs, which might prejudice the common amity or the trade of his vassals, they were much to be blamed for their lewd dealings.

But neither the archdukes nor their subjects had ever launched a formal complaint about this.

Albert listened carefully and requested Trumbull to put everything into writing. The English agent consulted a lawyer in Brussels, presumably referring to Jean Thymon³⁰, and an important English merchant to draft a remonstrance³¹. Although Trumbull was promised a reply within the week, it took months³². A new element was added when a passport was given to Richard Verstegan (1548x50–1640)³³ to import 2.000 pieces of cloth. Verstegan, according to Trumbull, was *a favourite of the Jesuits*, which could not entail much good for the Protestant English merchants. Arblaster describes him as *a collector, editor and distributor of news, as a publisher, proofreader, editor, writer, reviewer and engraver of books, and as a book dealer, buying books for the English colleges or arranging secret shipments to England*³⁴. This passport costed double of the usual standard and was only valid for eight months. After that time English white cloth, as coloured cloth, would be banned perpetually³⁵. Arblaster concluded that Verstegan was the only person permitted to import English cloth into the countries of the archdukes from June 1612 until early 1613. Verstegan, however, was not alone in this venture. Other English Catholics who were in Antwerp joined the unofficial consortium. Arblaster mentions several who were involved in the cloth trade in Antwerp who corresponded with Trumbull: Daniel Skinner, John Corham and Lionel Wake. Not the entire community profitted from Verstegan's licence³⁶. Not only the Merchant Adventurers but also other English and Flemish merchants protested against this monopoly. The monopoly only lasted until 1613 when negotiations with the States of Zeeland to reopen the Scheldt failed, but also because king James considered the monopoly a breach of the 1604 treaty³⁷.

Trumbull kept pressing for an answer to his memorial, but only received excuses to explain the delays such as the absence of Balthasar de Robiano (ca. 1552-1618), the Treasurer-General³⁸. Eventually de Robiano informed the apparently ever patient Trumbull that deliberations had finished and a written answer would be delivered shortly³⁹. It took an additional month before Trumbull was able to report back to king James on this matter. In it three points were tendered. The response was extensive. First, the archduke wanted to prove that English cloth already had been banned

³⁰ Cf. *Infra*.

³¹ HMCD, iii, 360-361, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 3 September 1612.

³² SP 77/10 f^o 219r-220v, *Mr. Trumbulls remonstrance to the Archduke about our English cloathes*, [Brussels], 5 September 1612.

³³ Arblaster, 'Verstegan [Rowlands], Richard (1548x50–1640)'.

³⁴ Arblaster, *Antwerp & the World. Richard Verstegan and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation*, 49.

³⁵ HMCD, iii, 360-361, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 3 September 1612.

³⁶ Baetens, *De nazomer van Antwerpens welvaart: de diaspora en het handelshuis De Groote tijdens de eerste helft der 17^{de} eeuw*, i, 231; Voeten, 'Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het handelsleven te Antwerpen tijdens de eerste jaren van het Twaalfjarig Bestand (1609-1612)', 98.

³⁷ Arblaster, *Antwerp & the World*, 97-99.

³⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 224r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 September 1612.

³⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 233v-234r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 29 October 1612.

perpetually from Flanders by previous declarations. Secondly the *Malus Intercursus* Treaty of 1506 was criticized. And finally they enumerated the instances by which James VI/I had breached the Treaty of London. Trumbull refuted each point extensively.

Considering the first point he focused his argument on the differences between England and Flanders. It was improbable, he argued, that the sovereign and independent monarchs of England would maintain ties of amity and trade with the Counts of Flanders (furthermore, who were dependent on the French king until about 1530⁴⁰) unless upon good and profitable, or at the very least indifferent, conditions. Such conditions were evident when the treaties between the English crown and the Counts of Flanders were studied. The English agent summed them up by stating that all the treatises of Philip the Fair (1478-1506), his predecessors and successors, stipulated *a free, and an unlymitted comerce, and entrecouse of trade, betweene the subiects of both Princes wth all kinds of wares, and in all plac whatsoever, without restriction, or limitacon*. If there were treaties that forbade the import of English cloth, he was sure these were the result of hostilities. England could follow suit if that was the case. On several occasions the exportation of wool had been prohibited by Acts of Parliament. These Acts were without a doubt more authoritative than Edicts. Edicts were made in the Privy Council; Acts of Parliament were made by representatives of the whole realm. Trumbull also stressed the importance of English raw materials for the economy of Flanders, without which Flemish wealth could never have been accumulated.

The argument against the validity of *Malus Intercursus* was unconvincing, the beleaguered agent riposted. The treaty had been upheld for over a century, except during times of war, and was furthermore reiterated at several points in the sixteenth century. Article 22 of the 1604 Treaty stated that all the treaties and agreements between the English crown and the Burgundian House, *shall retayne their anchient force, and aucthority*. Trumbull further iterated that there were official ways to launch a complaint about excesses or if one of the parties did not abide by a treaty. In that scenario a conference should have been summoned to resolve all the outstanding issues. The archdukes, however, never had formulated a complaint. Moreover, they neglected to forewarn the subjects of James VI/I of their intention, because they had banished English cloth secretly.

As to whether James had violated the Treaty of London by augmenting customs Trumbull confessed he could not give a satisfactory answer as he had not been in England for a long time. Nonetheless, the English agent was doubtful that the subjects of the archdukes had to pay more than those of other monarchs. The prohibition of the archdukes, then again, was made especially against English cloth, cloths from Germany, Spain, France and Liège could enter the country as freely as before. After enumerating some smaller aspects, Trumbull concluded that king James had shown his goodwill in 1604, 1607 and 1609, respectively the Treaty of London, the procuring of free passage for some Spanish ships that had been driven into the port of Dover and the Twelve Year's

⁴⁰ The Peace of Madrid (1526) between François I and Charles V severed the feudal ties between Flanders, Artois, Tournai and France, although the French influence in the north had already waned in the previous centuries with the Burgundians at the head of the Low Countries.

Truce, all eternal monuments written in the historyes of these tymes, to witnes unto all future ages, his mats. care, and Christian zeale, to maintaine quietnes among his neighbors⁴¹.

Trumbull did not work alone. He enlisted some English merchants to obtain relevant documents that would further the cause. John Chandler, an English merchant in Antwerp, reported at the start of November (n.s.) that he did not think the papers Trumbull requested would easily be obtained. Secretary Ewins, responsible for the papers concerning the Treaty of Bruges, insisted that he had to abide by the formalities and the exceptional charges had to be paid⁴². A month later Chandler sent a copy of an edict of Philip the Good concerning English cloth⁴³. John Forde left the treaty of 1573 in the hands of Deborah, Trumbull's wife. He had not found the one of 1554. According to the clerk of the court de Grote it could probably be found in Bruges. Forde would look into that possibility. Several between Henry VIII and Charles V only confirmed *amity and friendship* but did not specify anything concerning cloth trade. He was willing to send them if Trumbull wished it⁴⁴.

Mary Gilpin, presumably the wife of George Gilpin, who was secretary of the Merchant Adventurers in Antwerp by 1564, also sent Trumbull copies of some treaties from The Hague. George Gilpin was also a diplomat of Queen Elizabeth I stationed at different times in the Low Countries and to the emperor. He died in September 1602, possibly in the Netherlands⁴⁵. The Merchant Adventurers, the widow Gilpin informed Trumbull, had a book which had belonged to her husband. It, she was sure, contained information on a number of treaties and privileges. She was convinced that it would yield useful information⁴⁶. Another contact was Anthony Matton in Ghent who replied that he had been unable to find any concordat made between England and Flanders about cloth. His brother, the clerk of the town, had taken great trouble. *He hopes to find some clue if anything has taken place and to try if any old men of experience have any recollection*⁴⁷.

The instructions James VI/I had promised at the start of August 1612 did not come speedily. Only two letters from members of the Privy Council can be found in the Trumbull papers: one from George Abbot and one from Lord Northampton. Abbot informed Trumbull of a meeting of the Privy Council with some merchants, who requested the Lords to be not too *solicitous in it, but to attend the further event and seemed to conceive that the archdukes' attempt would cool of itself, or they would right themselves another way*⁴⁸. Northampton had studied several treaties and found only uncertainties which left him wondering what course could be taken,

but no course shall be left unsought that may stop the current of this bravery, encouraged, as I believe, from Spain or else this archduke would not have been so hasty to set this rest before all the

⁴¹ SP 77/10 f^o 239r-242v, *Considerations vpon the Archds. Answere, delivered to me [Trumbull] the 25 of November 1612.*

⁴² HMCD, iii, 390-391, Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 9 November 1612 (n.s.).

⁴³ HMCD, iii, 424, Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 11 December 1612 (n.s.).

⁴⁴ HMCD, iii, 413, Forde to Trumbull, Brussels, 20 November 1612.

⁴⁵ Bell, 'Gilpin, George (d. 1602)'.

⁴⁶ HMCD, iii, 425, Gilpin to Trumbull, The Hague, 2 December 1612.

⁴⁷ HMCD, iv, 56-57, Matton to Trumbull, Ghent, 17 March 1613 (n.s.?).

⁴⁸ HMCD, iii, 370, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 17 September 1612.

*cards had been drait through. So soon as matters will be brought to they will be brought to their true touch ... and sent over to your prosecution*⁴⁹.

George Abbot made clear in a meeting with Hugh Perry (*d.* 1635), a wealthy London mercer and alderman, what had happened. The Privy Council, according to the archbishop, did not think the archduke would proceed with the matter. Abbot, however, disagreed. Albert maintained and permitted the foundation of English Jesuit colleges in St. Omer, Douai, Malines, Louvain and Brussels, which was a matter of great importance to the English state. Archduke Albert would certainly not be afraid to proceed in a matter of lesser importance as the banishment of English cloth⁵⁰.

Besides Trumbull's task as intermediary between the governments in London and Brussels he also kept in contact with the Company of the Merchant Adventurers. He acted as an adviser or delivered instructions. His correspondent was John Kendrick (*bap.* 1564-1624), who had factors in Antwerp, Middelburg and Delft. Kendrick exported dyed and dressed broad cloths to the Low Countries⁵¹. After several years of trading in the Low Countries he returned in the fall of 1612 to England. Trumbull commended him to James because of his religion and his loyalty towards king and country. Trumbull thought him also the ideal person to advice in this matter of the banishment of English cloth⁵². The Merchant Adventurers, according to Kendrick in a letter to the English agent, were discouraged with the lack of action that was undertaken in London. Not once had the Company appeared before the Privy Council.

To test the effectiveness of the prohibition they instructed John Wheeler (*d.* 1617)⁵³, secretary of the company in Middelburg, to send five or six pieces of English coloured cloth to Antwerp. They wanted to see how the archduke would react. The cloths had to be transported by the Scheldt to Antwerp and delivered to John Corham, an English merchant in Antwerp and partner of Lionel Wake, considered

as the fittest man in their opinion to be trusted with this business in confidence of your sufficiency and willingness to do them this service as also of your secrecy in the carriage thereof, according to the oath which you have taken to the fellowship.

He was instructed to pay all the duties to the

officers or farmers appointed for the receipt thereof, that the cloths for any such default thereof be not found, or made, confiscate, and if they shall be detained or seized as being brought in against the restraint or otherwise, then you are to take sufficient witness how matters are carried and to protest by a sworn notary, according to the manner used in that place, against the seizers or detainers of the said cloths for all cost and damage that may fall out or arise by reason of the

⁴⁹ HMCD, iii, 443-444, Northampton to Trumbull, s.l., 25 December 1612.

⁵⁰ HMCD, iv, 12, Perry to Trumbull, London, 13 January 1613.

⁵¹ Jackson, 'Kendrick, John (*bap.* 1574, *d.* 1624)'; see also Baumann, *The Merchant Adventurers and the Continental Cloth-Trade (1560s-1620s)*, 349-350; Jackson, 'The Kendrick bequests: an experiment in municipal enterprise in the woollen industry in Reading and Newbury in the early seventeenth century'.

⁵² SP 77/10 f^o 224r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 September 1612.

⁵³ Wauchope, 'Wheeler, John (*d.* 1617)'; in 1601 he had already written a defence of the Merchant Adventurers against what was called *straggling trade*; Wheeler, *A treatise of commerce, wherein are shewed the commodities [sic] arising by a wel ordered ... Trade ... such as that of Merchantes Adventurers is proven to bee, etc.*

said seizure or detention contrary to the treaty of peace, amity and mutual commerce lately concluded between his Maty of Great Britain and those princes and between those princes and the States of the United Provinces.

He could not do anything secretive or illegal, otherwise they could be rightfully confiscated⁵⁴. Corham, whom Trumbull knew since at least 1609, enlisted the English agent to be better able to discharge himself of his duties. *Now for that I would not fail in the least about clearing them here in all tolls, I entreat your assistance, being better informed of kind of bringing in of clo[ths] upon such terms then myself⁵⁵*. The exchange of letters between Brussels and Antwerp took only days. After Corham's original request, he sent Trumbull the letter of Wheeler/Holliday (Halliday)⁵⁶. After receiving additional instructions he repaired to the tolls to discover the cloths had already been confiscated⁵⁷. Corham delivered Trumbull a detailed report of what had occurred. He presumed that there was already a request for advice before the Council of Finances. Trumbull could now intervene in Brussels. A decision followed in February 1613, which Corham interpreted as,

That I am to pay all the charges as well that by me as that due the officers of the License and that not in prejudice of the pretended confiscation of the sd. clo. which is to say the officers need not let pass other clo. that shall be brought in the like nature so that this grace shall be no warrant to any more.

But he was uncertain he was correct, so he requested Trumbull *to have it expounded by the Finances themselves⁵⁸*. A fortnight later Corham was still unsure about the meaning and wrote *my opinion is that it is set down so darkly upon occasion to make a double interpretation thereupon, for how can it hang together that the clo. shall be sent back, and yet pay all the charges and the two-thirds part of the value of the clo⁵⁹*. Trumbull equally failed in obtaining an interpretation from the Council of Finances. Jacob Van Opham, one of the controllers in Antwerp, told Brownlowe, a colleague of Corham, that *the cloths were praised, divided and sold there 2/3 parts*. The remaining one third had been sent to Corham, but he had to pay all the charges for it, *by which you may perceive V[an] O[pham] is a better interpreter of the duke's decrees than the Finances*, which implies that the Finances finally had delivered their interpretation. Corham requested Trumbull to send him the original or an authenticated copy⁶⁰. The English therefore was not instrumental in the proceedings of this ruse of the Merchant Adventurers. It was John Corham who enlisted Trumbull mainly as an adviser because of his intimate knowledge of proceedings in the countries of the archdukes.

⁵⁴ HMCD, iii, 403-404, copy, Halliday to Corham, Middleburg, 9 November 1612. The first part of the letter is written by John Wheeler who forged the signature of Halliday as best as he could. The last part of the letter was in the hand of Halliday himself.

⁵⁵ HMCD, iii, 406, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 14 November 1612.

⁵⁶ Halliday or Holliday must have died before September 1613 as his widow, Mary (*d.* 1614), married Sir Arthur Ingram at that time, see Healy, 'Ingram, Sir Arthur (*b.* before 1571, *d.* 1642)'.
⁵⁷ HMCD, iii, 408-409, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 26 November 1612 (n.s.).

⁵⁸ HMCD, iv, 43, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 3 March 1613 (n.s.).

⁵⁹ HMCD, iv, 55, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 15 March 1613 (n.s.).

⁶⁰ HMCD, iv, 68-69, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 20 March 1613 (n.s.).

Eventually Corham was summoned to appear before the court about the five pieces of coloured English cloth. Again he requested Trumbull's advice. Had he heard anything? Could he pass on information to be better able to answer their questions? A few days later he wrote *I understand the cause of my being "daged" was to get away my third part, which is now held up again until V. Opham's further pleasure be known*⁶¹. The last letter Corham wrote about the five cloths mentioned that he had finally had access to Van Opham who wanted him to pay £ 10 for the cloths. He was unwilling to explain why he had to pay this. Corham cited a passage from the order of the archduke: *enpayant les frais raisonnables engedres a cause du saissement desdits draps seulement*. Corham again appealed to Trumbull asking him to talk to de Robiano⁶². What eventually happened is unclear.

Not only Trumbull and the English government protested the prohibition to import English cloth, some of the archdukes' countries also objected. The main advocates of the project were Flanders, Artois and Hainaut. They wanted a complete ban, but if that could not be achieved they would be content that for every piece of cloth a certain amount of wool had to be brought in⁶³. Although Trumbull did receive little instructions, James had given to order to decrease the trade between England and the Southern Netherlands. Antwerp was one of the first cities to complain. According to Trumbull's dispatch the Antwerp magistrates went to the archduke. They informed him that his prohibition of English cloth had dire consequences for their city. They asked him to rescind his previous proclamation. Albert, however, did not yield. Trumbull advised his sovereign that only an *interdict of vente of his manufactures in yor. Mats. dominions* would be the only thing would help⁶⁴. Trumbull received no answer or further instructions.

Encouraging to Trumbull was the fact that the Council of State of the Southern Netherlands agreed with the magistrates of Antwerp and the States of Brabant and delivered Albert a remonstrance of 60 articles stating the losses and inconveniences. Trumbull enumerated the most important points. He made a difference between the negative consequences of the prohibition and the positive aspects the trade between the two countries would entail.

King James could banish the manufactures from the Southern Netherlands. As the exports always had exceeded the import of English cloth, this would have a negative impact on the dominions of the archdukes. Furthermore, this could be the small spark that served as a prelude to further hostilities. These countries lacked the means and the strength to surmount these. Clothing the inhabitants of the Archducal Netherlands was difficult without the trade from England. Since the prohibition Antwerp dilapidated more and more. Many left the city because no work could be found and left for the realm of the English king, the United Provinces or other areas in Europe. The main profit of the trade between the subjects of James and Albert had to do with the United Provinces and the Scheldt. James could use his authority with the Protestant North to convince them to allow free trade over that river. Furthermore the Company of the Merchant Adventurers, currently in Middelburg, could be persuaded to re-establish themselves wholly or partially in Antwerp.

⁶¹ HMCD, iv, 86-87, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 9 April 1613; HMCD, iv, 89, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 22 April 1613 (n.s.).

⁶² HMCD, iv, 102-103, Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 9 May 1613.

⁶³ HMCD, iii, 230, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 30 January 1612.

⁶⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 260v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 11 February 1613.

After this they threatened *that in case the Arch: would not heare; & redresse their greevancs; they should be disabled henceforth to supply his wante wth monnyes; as they had donne hetherto; or give him anymore contributions.* This argument was debated and approved in the three Collateral Councils. Now it was up to Albert.

Trumbull received information of some of his friends that the archduke and some of his ministers were starting finally starting to listen. The only problem could come from Flanders, which wanted to promote its own cloth manufacture. But their opposition could easily be broken, argued Trumbull, by prohibiting their manufactures for a time, then *they would soone be forced to stryke the sayles of their arrogance, and to content their greedy apetyte, wth such equall and indifferent condicions. as yor. Matie. should thincke fitt to affoord them.* The English agent again requested for instructions but this time he was more specific. How should he behave himself towards the magistrates of Antwerp, *wth whome in secrett I doe holde good quarter, and intelligence; fynding them in exterior professions, ready co concurre wth me for the carrying on of this dessegnie to a wished conclusion*⁶⁵. In spite of an additional letter to the king's favourite, Rochester, the following day, Trumbull did not receive any instructions. In his letters the English agent apologised for keeping returning to the matter. It was not, he assured, because he had any private interest in the business. His only concern was the welfare of his country. Trumbull knew James VI/I cared about his reputation and added,

*all christendome nowe standing at a gaze to beholde what resolution his matie will take, to redresse the wrongs donne to his subiects by these Princes in prohibiting their trafficke. Their greatest power consisteth in opinyon, and not in reall meanes, at this instant*⁶⁶.

The lack of instructions from James VI/I or his immediate circle does not mean the English agent did not have information about what occurred in the English capital. Trumbull was kept apprised of what happened in London by informants. John Kendrick, a member the Company of the Merchant Adventurers, whom Trumbull already had recommended as an adviser in this affair, wrote the English agent ample letters. Kendrick's first letter was written shortly after his return to London, November 1612. According to him it took James until the start of 1613 to take the matter seriously. The Privy Council discussed the affair and summoned Sir Thomas Lowe, governor of the Merchant Adventurers (since 1613) and of the Levant Company (since 1605)⁶⁷, and other English merchants. Kendrick again feared further delays as the Privy Council wished to study all the relevant treaties. They appointed Sir Julius Caesar (*bap.* 1558, *d.* 1636), Sir Roger (sic) Dunn [Sir Daniel Donne] (1544/1545-1617) and Sir Christopher Parkings [Perkins] (1542/3-1622) to study these,

who, I fear, will make longer work of it than were fit in a matter of this importance, the same having already been too long neglected, and I fear unless you from thence now and then put a spur

⁶⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 272r-273v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 2 April 1613.

⁶⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 280v-281r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 3 april 1613.

⁶⁷ Baumann, *The Merchant Adventurers and the Continental Cloth-trade (1560s-1620s)*, 351-352.

*unto it, there will be no resolution taken in haste, for I see we have lost our old courage and magnanimity and are indeed afraid of our own shadows*⁶⁸.

On his way to Flushing during the spring of 1613 Trumbull received credible information of some friends that the archduke would *send some man of sufficiency to England to discover whether it may stand with yor. Maty.'s good liking to enter into a new conference for compounding of such differents and disgusts*. Awaiting what would happen he was suspending all possible overtures concerning the normal resumption of trade. Trumbull requested his master if such a conference was considered desirable. To resolve the conflict concerning the prohibition of English cloth in the Southern Netherlands Jacob De Somere (mid-sixteenth century-1623)⁶⁹ was sent to England in May 1613. Trumbull described De Somere, years later in March 1621, as a good friend. Born in Ghent he had been brought up in England and spent some time in Germany during the troubles which swept through the the Netherlands in the sixteenth century⁷⁰. The main issue was the possibility of the remove of the staple of the Merchant Adventurers from Middelburgh and what measures were necessary to resume normal trade between England and the Archducal Netherlands. Trumbull reported that according to *some confident friends* De Somere was *well affected to the common quiet, and desirous to maintain the amity between your Maty. and these princes*. De Somere arrived back in Antwerp at the end of the month⁷¹. His return was cause for meetings to determine what to do. John Kendrick informed Trumbull that he left without much satisfaction. The Merchant Adventurers had already decided to remain in Middelburg, although he admitted that this in time could change. Archduke Albert, according to De Somere, was willing to allow the import of English cloth and other commodities, which was a necessary condition to consider the remove from Middelburg. It was Kendrick's wish that Trumbull would keep him informed. Meanwhile Kendrick kept Trumbull apprised of what happened on the other side of the Channel, sending a copy of a reply he had written to De Somere⁷².

De Somere did not fail to contact William Trumbull upon his return. Although he was sure the English agent already had been informed of the result of his voyage, he wanted to acquaint Trumbull firsthand with what had occurred. De Somere set out his case for a staple at Antwerp. To remove part of the staple from Middelburg would not endanger that city. All trade between England and the United Provinces would still use that city. It seemed unreasonable, according to de Somere, to refuse a staple in Antwerp because of Middelburg. James VI/I entertained good relations with the North but also with the South. Having a staple in the United Provinces and not in the Archducal Netherlands was proof of bias. To facilitate the return to normal trade relations he had already written to William Towerson and Kynricz [John Kendrick]. Now he wanted the

⁶⁸ HMCD, iv, 5-6, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 4 January 1613; Houlbrooke, 'Dun, Sir Daniel (1544/5-1617)'; McCoog, 'Perkins, Sir Christopher (1542/3-1622)'; Wijffels, 'Caesar, Sir Julius (*bap.* 1558, *d.* 1636)'.
⁶⁹ Roulez, 'De Somere (Jacques)', 771-772.

⁷⁰ SP 77/14 f^o 303r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 24 March 1621 (n.s.).

⁷¹ HMCD, iv, 119, Brownlowe to Trumbull, Antwerp, 30 May 1613.

⁷² SP 77/10 f^o 291r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 13 May 1613; HMCD, iv, 120-121, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 2 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 125-126, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 5 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 134-135, Brownlowe to Trumbull, Antwerp, 11 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 142, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 17 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 142-143, copy, Kendrick to De Somere, London, 17 June 1613.

help of Trumbull to recommend the matter to king James and his ministers. If necessary De Somere was willing to return to London. He also thought it would be advantageous if Trumbull spoke to the Treasurer⁷³.

Archduke Albert intended to send De Somere back to England, with

power & aucthority, not only to accommodate all difference between yor. Matie, and them, about matters of commerce: but also by preegnaant reasons (as they give out) to prove, that the erecting of a Staple at Antwerp, shall no way preiudice the Staple now setled at midlebourg in Zelande.

Trumbull wrote a letter of recommendation to the archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, mentioning that Jacob de Somere was of the reformed religion and had studied at Cambridge⁷⁴. De Somere kept in contact during his abode in England, writing in October 1613 of a conference he had with the earl of Northampton⁷⁵. The situation normalised at the end of 1613. As the archdukes were in need of money, their officers suggested the awarding of passports to import *good quantities of mingle coullors Englishe Clothes*. Trumbull had not found out if this appeal had been successful⁷⁶.

By February 1614 Kendrick reported that, *After a long and tedious suit unto the lords we procured licence to treat with De Somere*. The Privy Council had given permission on 23 January 1614⁷⁷. Kendrick anticipated problems with the demand for freedom of worship at the English House. De Somere had not the authority to grant this. According to Kendrick there was no possibility that the Merchant Adventurers would relinquish this right. The only possibility was if Trumbull was able to convince the Privy Council or the archbishop to be less strict on that point⁷⁸. Trumbull seems to have taken away all hope that the archdukes would grant this request, but Kendrick told him that the Merchant Adventurers would be satisfied *to have it private in our English house, not to admit any thereunto but those of our company, and to have our doors locked up when it is performed, in which manner I hope it will not be denied*⁷⁹.

One of the reasons why the prohibition of the archdukes did not produce much official correspondence between London and Brussels could be the cloth project that was underway in England. The commissioners and subcommissioners of the Treasury were always on the lookout to find new revenues. One of the possibilities was the prohibition of the exportation of undyed and undressed cloths from England. Those cloths were sent to the Netherlands to be dyed and dressed and were afterwards sold for great profits. Dyeing and dressing them in England would give the English those profits. This project was already formulated in 1606 by William Cokayne, but it was only the death of Salisbury that provided him with the perfect opportunity. By sending it to the Treasury and to the king personally he was able to catch the attention of James. Friis argues that,

⁷³ HMCD, iv, 126-127, de Somere to Trumbull, Albertuspolder, 16 June 1613 (n.s.).

⁷⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 300v-301r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 186, draft, Trumbull to [Abbot], Brussels, 28 Augustus 1613.

⁷⁵ HMCD, iv, 221-222, De Somere to Trumbull, London, 11 October 1613.

⁷⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 370v-371r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 December 1613.

⁷⁷ Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade. Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects*, 406.

⁷⁸ HMCD, iv, 310-311, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 12 February 1614.

⁷⁹ HMCD, iv, 339, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 17 March 1614.

The project appealed to James, not only in its fiscal aspect but far more in its political aspect. His vanity was flattered by it for it was his ambition to acquire the reputation of being a great statesman. Would it not enhance the glory of his name for all time if he succeeded in carrying into effect the prohibition against the exportation of undressed cloths? In spite of the indefatigable efforts of his noble progenitors Henry VII, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth, abt. 60 p.c. of the cloth exported from London still left the country undyed and undressed⁸⁰.

The scheme was discussed in the Privy Council as well as in two committees during the spring and the summer of 1613. In December the English king gave the second committee the task of working out the practical details. Kendrick reported that this new project caused the negotiations with De Somere to be deferred until it was known what would become of it. De Somere returned to the Archducal Netherlands⁸¹. In July 1614 the Privy Council left it to the king to come to a final conclusion. Meanwhile the exports of cloth in that year, 127.200, had exceeded all past figures and was unequalled in the period. The Merchant Adventurers were responsible for the export of 100.000⁸². James approved the project but authorised the Company of the Merchant Adventurers to continue their trade until 2 November 1614. The Privy Council enacted three proclamations. The first one of July 1614 stated that after 2 November 1614 *no undyed and undressed cloths* were to be exported. Every Englishman could trade with the countries which formerly belonged to the privilege of the Merchant Adventurers if they registered in the books of Alderman William Cokayne (1559/60–1626), the driving force behind the project, and William Baineham⁸³. The second proclamation (September 1614) forbade the export of sheep, wool, fleece and fuller's earth. This enumeration was increased by a third proclamation to include woollen-yarn (November 1614). The export trade of the Company of the Merchant Adventurers ended between the start of November and the start of December 1614. *The projectors* [of the Cokayne project] *could thus without interruption conduct their negotiations with Stade and build up the framework of their company*. Again it was not the king or his officials who informed Trumbull of this decision. Correspondents in Antwerp and in London kept him apprised: Anthony Wither, Thomas Newport and Arthur Aynscombe in Antwerp and John Kendrick, Thomas Albery, John Brownlowe and John More in London⁸⁴. Cokayne's company obtained a provisional patent (November 1614) to trade with the countries the Merchant Adventurers used to trade with.

Before the new company started trading the archduke again had ordered Antwerp and the other ports to refuse the entry of English cloth into his dominions after the end of February⁸⁵. In April ensuing, however, he authorised a new passport for the importation

⁸⁰ Friis, *Alderman Cokayne's Project and the Cloth Trade. Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects*, 240.

⁸¹ HMCD, iv, 339, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 339; HMCD, iv, 343-344, De Somere to Trumbull, Antwerp, 28 March 1614 (n.s.).

⁸² Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642*, 34.

⁸³ Aldous, 'Cokayne, Sir William (1559/60–1626)';

⁸⁴ HMCD, iv, 305, Wither to Trumbull, Antwerp, 17 February 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 314, Newport to Trumbull, Antwerp, 18 February 1614; HMCD, iv, 321, Aynscombe to Trumbull, Antwerp, 28 February 1614; HMCD, iv, 333, Brownlowe to Trumbull, London, 12 March 1614, HMCD, iv, 338, Albery to Trumbull, Westminster, 15 March 1614, HMCD, iv, 339-340, Kendrick to Trumbull, London, 17 March 1614.

⁸⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 15r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 16 February 1614.

of English cloth. The customs that had to be paid were excessive; it had never been higher since the conclusion of the peace in 1604, according to the English agent⁸⁶. The next entry of the passport was in July. Trumbull was not sure what motivated the archdukes: their lack of money or their wish to attract the English merchants back to Antwerp⁸⁷.

When the Addled Parliament assembled in 1614 to alleviate the king's financial plight, it got diverted

*not only to disputes of the new impositions, but to the examining of all particular patents as come in their way, especially for that dyeing and dressing cloths, to which point your interdicting of our white cloths did first induce us*⁸⁸.

According to John More one of the reasons why this project of dyeing and dressing cloth before exporting it was the banishment of English cloth Trumbull had reported on during the previous months and years. Trumbull's task did not change due to the project. He kept sending information about the attitude of the archdukes towards the project of alderman Cokayne. As the members of the Privy Council had foreseen at the outset of the King's Merchant Adventurers, the new Company which replaced the Company of the Merchant Adventurers, the United Provinces retaliated by prohibiting the import of died English cloth in their countries. The archdukes intended to do the same, but this had not yet been done by November 1614⁸⁹.

The difficult economic relations between the two Protestant allies could entail a silver lining for the Southern Netherlands. By the end of 1614 it became clear that Antwerp again profiled itself as the ideal staple town for the new company. The two cities that were favoured by the company were Hamburg and Stade⁹⁰. No decision had been taken, but the king had assured that those at Middelburg would remain there⁹¹. Early 1615 Trumbull mentioned the willingness of Antwerp to become a base of operations for the New Company to the secretary of state, Sir Ralph Winwood who was at the helm since the spring of 1614⁹². It took another year and a half for a serious opportunity to present itself. This arose due to the disagreements between Holland and the King's Merchant Adventurers. They considered moving partly or as a whole to Antwerp which, according to Trumbull *for want of trade doth sensibly, and very much decay*. Trumbull interviewed Peter Peckius (1562-1625), deputy-chancellor of Brabant since 1614⁹³, on the subject. It had become clear that Antwerp needed the English trade to restore its once glorious past. According to Trumbull this could mean that the English merchants would be welcomed *upon indifferent, & reasonable conditions*. As always he requested instructions⁹⁴. Winwood

⁸⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 28v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 7 April 1614.

⁸⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 100v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 5 July 1614.

⁸⁸ HMCD, iv, 409, More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 24 May 1614.

⁸⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 181r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 3 November 1614.

⁹⁰ In both cities the Company of the Merchant Adventurers had already held their staple in the previous decades, see, beside the works already cited, also Ramsay, 'The settlement of the merchant adventurers at Stade, 1587-1611'.

⁹¹ HMCD, v, 206 (letter 432), Throckmorton to Trumbull, Flushing, 3 May 1615.

⁹² SP 77/11 f^o 239v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19 January 1615.

⁹³ Brants, 'Peck (Pierre)', 784-792.

⁹⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 134r-134v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 July 1616.

was much more on top of things than James or Rochester had been. He took an interest and wrote ample instructions to Trumbull within a fortnight. The secretary of state had conferred with king James who found the proposition agreeable upon some conditions, but there were difficulties, of which religion was the main obstacle:

Provision should be made that our marchants, freely and boldly within the precincts of their owne howse, may exercise the profession of their owne religion both by publicke prayers and sermons. Next, care must be taken that the factors of our marchants be not debawched and corrupted by the priests and Jesuitts.

A second difficulty centred on the dispute between the North and the South about the Scheldt. Winwood and James could not believe that the United Provinces were willing to open the Scheldt to free trade, without which Antwerp was largely inaccessible. Finally, it remained uncertain whether the importation of dyed English cloth would be permitted by the archdukes. Notwithstanding these difficulties Winwood instructed Trumbull to encourage any conversation about this, *particulary if they are sanguine enough to suggest sending commissioners here to confer with our merchants and submit proposals, which would have to be acceptable to them and to His Majesty*⁹⁵.

The archduke apparently did not want to take a decision without consulting the Spanish king, Philip III, and sent his confessor to Spain. Antwerp as staple town for the newly erected King's Merchant Adventurers had some powerful supporters in the Catholic Low Countries: Peter Peckius; the marquis of Spinola; Engelbert Maes (c. 1547-1632)⁹⁶, the president of the Privy Council; the Treasurer of the Council of Finances and other councillors. Peckius informed Trumbull that in August 1616 the magistrates of Antwerp and Jacob De Somere were in Brussels to solicit an answer of Albert which they were promised to be delivered shortly. Trumbull on the other hand feared that the delays were due to the lack of power of Albert and Isabella. Possibly they could not take such a decision without consulting Spain. Further more, Flanders could present more problems. This province yielded large contributions to the archduke. By centralising English trade in Antwerp he would harm this western province⁹⁷.

Trumbull enlisted Jacob De Somere again whom he described as *a very hable, and sufficient marchante*, further as *a favor. & director* of this business, but more importantly the best man *to give it forme and beeing*. After meeting Trumbull he contacted Treasurer-General de Robiano who knew that this was Antwerp's only chance. Trumbull visited de Somere a few days later and found de Robiano in his company. The English agent stressed the multiple advantages free trade would have. The best course of action, he added, was sending representatives to treat with the members of the new company. This, however, was not within the jurisdiction of the city, but had to be approved by the archdukes. Both men were interested in what conditions the English king stipulated for a return to Antwerp.

⁹⁵ HMCD, v, 565-566 (letter 1201), Winwood to Trumbull, Kerby, 30 July 1616.

⁹⁶ Tierenteyn, 'Maes (Engelbert)', 131.

⁹⁷ SP 77/12 f^o, 149r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 August 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 125r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 August 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 158r-158v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 August 1616.

The first condition was the *free, and pub. exercise of their Relligion; wthin the precincte of the English House: and the preventing of their factors to be debauched by this Clergy, in matters of their beleefe.* This also included a proper place for the English merchants to bury their dead. De Robiano and De Somere thought that this demand would cloud the judgement of the archduke and of the Spanish ministers when considering the proposition. To Trumbull this condition was non-negotiable. The English merchants enjoyed this liberty in Middelburg and Hamburg. They did not ask a church, only the liberty of conscience in their own homes. A second issue that was paramount according to the English agent was the *the venting of or. dyed clothes in these parts*, without which the English merchants would never be enticed to move to Antwerp.

De Robiano promised to inform archduke Albert of the conditions. Following this conference several more meetings took place with Spinola, Maes, Peckius, de Robiano and others. Trumbull did not await the conclusion of these meetings and contacted several of the men individually. They professed that they were happy with the possibility offered.

But it seemeth, that either they feare wee will use them as a stale, to drawe on the Hollanders; or els they wante power to conclude wth us before the retourne of the Archds. Conessr. who is reported to have commission to treate wth the king of Spaine, upon this particuler.

De Robiano also wanted Trumbull to second him in this design during an audience with the archduke. Albert appeared to be pleased and instructed Trumbull to continue *in the advancement of so good a worke.*

The first condition, freedom of worship for the English merchants, was a sine qua non. Two years beforehand this had already appeared as the main obstacle. It was decided that this could never be granted. The other difficulties were not mentioned. Trumbull knew that the design would now be unacceptable in England. He nonetheless promised the de Robiano to do his utmost endeavour in England. The Treasurer-General, according to the English agent,

pretendeth to be sorry for it: but said it was not in his might to wthstande the fatall influence of the malevolent planets wch were predominant, and opposite to the woorke of so great consequence (insinuating, as I conceived that he meant the Spanyards) who can never be beaten from the olde maxims of their gouernment, though they be obsolete, & growen out of fashion.

Trumbull wrote Winwood an ample dispatch of all the proceedings and requested instructions, advising the secretary of state that he saw two possibilities. The first one was accepting the conditions the archdukes imposed. Secondly, means could be sought to change the intention of the rulers of the Southern Netherlands. The English agent argued that the only chance for success would be to send an ambassador,

and therby gett licence for his machants to have the use of sermons, and the Sacramts. in his house; or els, to lett them content themselves, at tymes conveyent , privately; and wthout giving of

*pub. scandalle, or offence, to preayre to Lillo; Berghen op Zome, or Breda, beeing the nearest places, where liberty of Relligion is cexercised, in the Territoryes of the Unyted Provinces*⁹⁸.

Winwood avowed Trumbull for what he had done and stressed that the *freedome and liberty of the exercise of the religion by tolleration* paramount was to the proposition⁹⁹.

To improve the trade of the Archducal Netherlands de Robiano suggested to Trumbull the issuing of a declaration in the countries of the archdukes that would permit the importation of English cloth, *and all other sorte of or. staple commodityes*. The old impositions would be levied to compensate the loss of revenue the archduke got from licences and passports. The only condition would be that the English company would use Antwerp as only import site. Trumbull immediately informed de Robiano that there were two difficulties: impositions and could dressed and dyed cloth also be imported. If the impositions were too high it would all but be impossible to sell English cloth in the Southern Netherlands. De Robiano assured the English agent that these would be moderate. The second difficulty was something he had not thought of, but he was sure that a proportion of the imported English cloth could already be dyed and dressed¹⁰⁰.

Trumbull did consider the proposition carefully and requested Winwood's instructions in a second dispatch. What they proposed amounted to nothing more than what had been agreed in 1604. To speed up the process an answer was needed out of England from Winwood and from Cokayne. The instructions Trumbull got concerned the smuggling of English wool. Sir Ralph Winwood, in 1616, reiterated this problem:

*Yf you can, though it coste the Kinge deare, advertise me of these pa[r]ticularities – from what ports of England wooll is transported and who are the greatest negotiators thereof, therein you shall doe a very acceptable service both to the King and the State*¹⁰¹.

Trumbull's response, as usual when he received instructions, came swiftly. There was no doubt that great quantities of English wool were transported to the United Provinces and the Southern Netherlands. He had already looked into this matter in the past and *had sundry informations touching them, wch are nowe superannuate, though they coste me, good store of money, for wch I never had recompence*. Trumbull promised to try to discover *thoase mothes of the commen weale*. To do this he requested Winwood to return Henry Ballam, who brought him this letter, as quickly as possible. He would be sent to Flanders to *seeke out a certaine person*, which Trumbull had already employed in this case. He was now *retyred there [Flanders] into some corner by reasons of a mischance wch befell him killing a man, in a pryvate quarrell betweene them*¹⁰². What happened further is unclear.

Cokayne had written Trumbull at the start of November, acknowledging everything he had already done for the King's Merchant Adventurers. To improve Trumbull's negotiating position, the new company had decided in a meeting to

⁹⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 165r-168r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, Brussels, 2 September 1616.

⁹⁹ HMCD, vi, 31 (letter 74), Wiwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 16 October 1616.

¹⁰⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 200r-201r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 October 1616.

¹⁰¹ HMCD, vi, 31 (letter 74), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 16 October 1616.

¹⁰² SP 77/12 f^o 203v-204r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 October 1616.

wholly remove that parte of our trade which of late we have driven in the United Provinces into some parte of the Archdukes dominions, yf it shall please his Highness to vouchsafe us such conditions and termes of our residence and trade as have been graunted us and we enjoyed formerly under his Hignes predecessors, and since also in other places.

This decision had been approved by the Privy Council in September 1616. But they did not press it expecting the differences with the Republic would be overcome. As this was not the case they had now no other choice than proceed with this plan. In an addendum to the same letter Cokayne wrote:

*The Privy Council has now approved our removal to the Archduk's' dominions. But they have charged us to attend to the matter of the free exercise of our religion, at least in the English House, which they insist should be recognized by a public act. We would ask you to take up this matter and deal with it as expeditiously as possible*¹⁰³.

Trumbull took the business to heart and reported that the archduke would issue a declaration of which he sent a copy to secretary Winwood and William Cokayne. A speedy answer out of England would best serve the cause. If time elapsed, intentions could change. This declaration of the archduke would be beneficial to the English merchants, emphasized Trumbull¹⁰⁴. The English agent also informed his counterpart, Sir Dudley Carleton, in The Hague, adding that he had not received anything important out of England for the past three weeks. Trumbull explained to Sir William Cokayne what the difficulties were which would render it difficult for the new company to establish their residence at Antwerp. According to the English agent it was the intention of the declaration to entice the English merchants to come to the Southern Netherlands.

*And this beeing well accepted, & observed by or. nation, they professe a readyness of disposition, hereafter to comme to a Treaty wth them, for the reestablishing of their anchyent Residence at Antwerp*¹⁰⁵.

Trumbull at this time did not only receive an answer from secretary Winwood but also from William Cokayne. Winwood could not believe that the archdukes would readily admit dyed and dressed English cloth in their territories or that freedom of worship would be conceded. But he did not give Trumbull additional instructions. Cokayne acknowledged the receipt of Trumbull's letter and the copy of the archdukes declaration. Cokayne informed Trumbull of negotiations with the Spanish ambassador, the future conde de Gondomar, and the archdukes's agent, Jean-Baptiste Van Male¹⁰⁶, in London (he was the resident agent in London between 1615 and 1629). The Spanish ambassador made great promises¹⁰⁷. Trumbull had assessed the situation correctly.

¹⁰³ HMCD, vi, 37-38 (letter 95), Cokayne to Trumbull, London, 1 November 1616 and addendum dated 4 November 1616.

¹⁰⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 205r-205v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 November 1616.

¹⁰⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 217r-217v, Trumbull to Winwood, s.l., end of November or start of December 1616.

¹⁰⁶ Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 134-152.

¹⁰⁷ Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade. Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects*, 354 and 481.

Before receiving Trumbull's letter they already were aware that two problems could be discerned: Antwerp would be the only possible place of residence and there was no assurance that dyed and dressed cloths could be sold in the Archducal Netherlands. Trumbull added two more issues; *there is doubt of holding our liberty of religion in the English house, and also of holding our Court and government there, and the exclusion of interlopers*. The discussions proved difficult. According to the Catholic negotiators Trumbull had accepted their offers in name of the company. But they suggested the appointment of two commissioners by the Privy Council to negotiate further.

Cokayne sent Trumbull a copy of a letter from the King's Merchant Adventurers to the Privy Council. In it they outlined the main difficulties but focused on the negative consequences of accepting the confinement to the city of Antwerp. Finally, they needed assurances that dyed and dressed cloth could be sold in the dominions of the archdukes. Meanwhile Cokayne requested Trumbull to keep pressing for concessions from the archdukes and their ministers¹⁰⁸. Trumbull's efforts did not go unnoticed in Spain, reported Francis Cottington. He reported that they saw it as an important work and that Trumbull's role in it had certainly won the respect of an important minister who was a member of the Council of State¹⁰⁹.

The situation was complicated by the difficulties the new company encountered. It failed to reach its promised targets. Cokayne had guaranteed James VI/I an increase in exports, possible rise in employment and an increase in the revenue for the government of £ 40.000¹¹⁰. From the start they had experienced complications, which the Privy Council in part had foreseen, e.g. the difficulties made by the United Provinces. Between mid-summer 1615 and mid-summer 1616 the King's Merchant Adventurers had exported 6.670 dressed and dyed cloths, but afterwards, trade had virtually ceased. The following year the old company of the Merchant Adventurers was restored to its former privileges. England lost a few of its markets during the Cokayne adventure¹¹¹. The restoration of old company, according to Francis Cottington in Madrid, was no good news for the Southern Low Countries, *for it is that wych wyll doubtless divert the courses they desired in withdrawing the staple from the Hollanders and setting it in the Archdukes cuntries*¹¹². The Company revoked their members in the countries of the archdukes in May 1617. Trumbull argued that this would only prejudice England. The archduke would most probably close the Scheldt, so that only Dunkirk would be used as harbour. The only consequence according to Trumbull for the Merchant Adventurers would be *the translation of the benefitt, wch is nowe enjoyed by his mats vassalls, to strangers*. The English agent confirmed the intention of Albert. Councillors had debated the possibility of prohibiting the importation of English cloth via Middelburg and the use of Dunkirk as the only point of entry¹¹³.

The restored company of Merchant Adventurers still wanted to leave Middelburg, but had to obtain the consent of the king. In October 1620 James VI/I authorised them to

¹⁰⁸ HMCD, vi, 69 (letter 165), Cokayne to Trumbull, London, 18 December 1616; HMCD, vi, 69-70 (letter 166), The Company of the Merchant Adventurers to the Privy Council, [London], 18 December 1616.

¹⁰⁹ HMCD, vi, 65 (letter 153), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 8 December 1616 (n.s.).

¹¹⁰ Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642*, 35.

¹¹¹ Deyon, 'Manufactures lainières, XVI^e-XVII^e siècle', 27.

¹¹² HMCD, vi, 113 (letter 259), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 16 Februari 1617.

¹¹³ SP 77/12 f^o 312v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8 May 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 352v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13/23 June 1617.

negotiate with any town in the Low Countries, according to Friis. The place they eventually chose was Delft, with which an agreement was quickly reached. The possibility for erecting a staple at Antwerp seems to have been of the table at that time.

King James had been the one who had supported William Cokayne in this failed project, but he instructed Trumbull to help him in a dispute with Peter van Penen in Middelburg. Trumbull was on leave in England in the first half of 1618. When he returned to Brussels he had to stop in Middelburg where he remained between mid and end July 1618, but Trumbull's help did not procure Cokayne any relief. Trumbull hoped that he would not be blamed for this failure, *but to the unhappie disposicion of that inextricable business, wherein notwithstandinge all my travells, I was not able to prevayle*. John Wolley, Trumbull's secretary, assured him after a meeting with secretary Naunton that he was pleased with what Trumbull had undertaken to help Sir William Cokayne, even if it was without the desired result¹¹⁴.

Trumbull only mentions the cloth trade sparingly from 1618 onwards. The most important commercial news of 1618 was the plan of the archdukes and the marquis of Spinola of creating a new channel at Gravelines which would become a new harbour. Trumbull seems to have been informed by the French ambassador in Brussels, Gilbert marquis of Preaux, who was one of the French commissioners of the conference between the archdukes and France. As this channel would cross French territory they had to get permission from Louis XIII. Citing reasons of state permission was proscribed. Trumbull reported extensively on this subject in his dispatches to the Secretaries of State, Naunton and Lake and to his counterpart in The Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton. The only concern for Trumbull was that a port at Gravelines *in a tyme of waare, it would be no lesse noisome to England, and France, then to the United Provinces*¹¹⁵. In this case Trumbull only was a bystander who observed and reported to London.

Although he requested instructions on several occasions and promoted this as a case where the reputation of the king was at stake, he received in total six letters from the principal secretary of state, the king or his confidant: one from Salisbury, one van James VI/I, one from Rochester and three from Winwood. It is apparent that Trumbull did not await instructions from London and kept himself informed through several correspondents, usually merchants in Antwerp or in London. When he did receive instructions, he acted on them diligently. He procured an audience with the archduke and produced a written statement afterwards, which seems to have been the correct procedure at the court of the archdukes. The answer of the archducal government took

¹¹⁴ SP 77/13 f^o 22r-22v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Middelburg, 18 July 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 24r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Middelburg, 18 July 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 26r-27r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Ghent, 30 July 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 59r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 28 August 1618.

¹¹⁵ SP 77/13 f^o 26r-27r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Ghent, 30 July 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 30r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 5 August 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 39r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 19/29 August 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 48v-49r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 26 August 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 51r-52r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 28 August 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 62r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 11 September 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 65r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 14 September 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 69v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 19 September 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 71r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 1 October 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 73r, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 23 September 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 75v-76r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Naunton], Brussels, 23 September 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 77r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 8 October 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 79r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 30 September 1618.

months and the king seems to have lost interest in the case. Although Trumbull did not get much backing from the home front, he did help some of the subjects of James who traded with the Southern Netherlands. First there were those who were only interested in what the English agent knew. Secondly Trumbull was asked for advice and instructions by John Corham. The Company of the Merchant Adventurers wanted to discover the full significance of the archduke's order and sent five coloured cloths from Middelburg to Antwerp. John Corham requested Trumbull's advice and instructions. The English agent in Brussels gladly complied. To what effect is not known.

Henry Hunt, Thomas Albery, Colonel Boyd and Thomas Stone

Besides looking after English interests in general the ambassador/agent representing king James also had to defend the interests of English subjects in the Southern Netherlands. Salisbury said as much in May 1611, *in respect of yor owne quality being employed there for the dispatch of such affaires as concernes his matie, or his subiects*¹¹⁶. Literature on the subject is non-existent. Between 1605 and 1625 there were several cases which Trumbull attended to. Some cases were recommended by the king, the secretary of state or the Privy Council, others turned to Trumbull from their own accord. Henry Hunt, Thomas Albery, colonel David Boyd, John Morrison and Thomas Stone are several cases which Trumbull defended during his stay in Brussels. Those suits shed a light to whom Trumbull turned for help.

A legal action was undertaken by Henry Hunt, a prominent Levant Merchant and a factor of Thomas Wentworth¹¹⁷. Hunt was banished from Dunkirk by the governor of the city who had called him *a Perro lutherano*. This action was not conform Treaty of London and Wentworth complained to Salisbury during the fall of 1610. According to Wentworth the English Jesuits were the main motive behind the actions of the governor. The English Jesuits *having practised with Hunt to make him taste their heaven, and losing their labour, proclaim him to be a minister of intelligence, and one that does them evil offices*, they accused him of espionage. Salisbury was cautious and instructed Trumbull to inform himself of the truth of the case. If the accusations proved to be true and Hunt was innocent, as Wentworth claimed, the English agent was directed to submit the case to the archdukes in the name of king James. In that case the governor had no right to banish Hunt who should be allowed to stay and conduct his business. In the other case, if Hunt had caused a scandal or an outrage, Trumbull had to do nothing, Salisbury implied in his letter. Considering the partiality of the governor of Dunkirk and the great influence the English fugitives at St. Omer had on him, Trumbull was sceptic of the success he could achieve. The English agent confirmed what Wentworth had told Salisbury and stated that the only thing Hunt was guilty of was his steadfast conviction in the reformed religion. Trumbull advised Salisbury to intercede with the ambassadors of Spain and the archdukes, Don Alonço de Velasco and M. De Groote, who had been Hoboken's secretary and remained there until the arrival of de Boisshot, to further this case¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 77r, draft, Salisbury to Trumbull; Whitehall, [11 July 1611]; HMCD, iii, 80, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 11 July 1611.

¹¹⁷ For a history of the Levant Company, see Wood, *A history of the Levant Company*.

¹¹⁸ HMCD, ii, 380-380, Henry Hunt to Trumbull, Dunkirk, 20 October 1610; HMCD, ii, 384-385, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 29 October 1610; HMCD, iii, 59-60, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, [Brussels], 17

Two month later the problems, according to Hunt, seemed to be solved. The governor had grown quiet and his wife wanted to buy lace in London through Hunt. But Hunt's luck changed within a fortnight. After five days imprisonment he had been forcibly removed from Dunkirk without even being allowed to collect his belongings in his room. He was lodged outside the city gate and awaiting Trumbull's instructions. It was clear that a process would be pleaded and Hunt requested Trumbull to procure permission so he could live and trade in the city until that time¹¹⁹.

The English agent did not only keep in close contact with Henry Hunt, but he also reported meticulously to the earl of Salisbury. Mid-January 1611 he sent the secretary of state copies of several documents. The first document was a apostile written to the archdukes and their Privy Council outlining the case in general. Secondly, he added extracts from the Treaty of Antwerp (1446) and the Treaty of London (1604). Thirdly, he attached an attestation of Johanna Leunes, Hunt's landlady in Dunkirk. The document was made by Reynier vanden Perre, notary and *tabellon public*. In it she not only described Henry Hunt as reasonable and honest, but that he had shown the Catholic faith all *reverence & honneur*. Furterhmore a letter from the magistrate of Dunkirk to the archduke confirmed that Hunt was guilty *d'aucun fait ou crime*. In another copy the archducal Privy Council requested the governor to for information on the case the English agent had advanced. Finally, even the parish priest in Dunkirk acknowledged as much in the presence of the same notary as the landlady. When asked if Hunt had scandalized the Catholic Church and her ministers, he answered *qu'il ne disoit de luy mal ny bien*¹²⁰.

But all in vayne, wrote Trumbull, the March following. Henry Hunt was returning to England and Trumbul used him to deliver a letter for the earl of Salisbury outlining the entire case once more. The English agent assured the secretary of state that neither effort nor expense had been spared. In the end all the evidence in favour of Hunt did not matter because

their hatred to or. Religion is such; and the power of the Jesuitts, & aucthority of the Spanyards are so great in these Countryes; as neither reason, nor justice can prevaile, to cleare the innocent, or to remove the false impressions wch they have derived, of the said Hunts correspondence wth some ministers of his matie, for the discovering of those priests, and other ill affected persons, wch doe continually passe from hence into England, by the way of Dunkirk.

For the first time a reference was made to what Hunt really was charged with: espionage. The only way to end the entire case would have been for Hunt to convert to

April 1611 this date is incorrect, at the end the date is 14 November, which makes more sense as it follows the original letter of Salisbury.

¹¹⁹ HMCD, ii, 402, Hunt tot Trumbull, Dunkirk, 5 December 1610; HMCD, ii, 409, Hunt to Trumbull, Dunkirk, 19 December 1610; HMCD, ii, 416, Hunt to Trumbull, Dunkirk, 29 December 1610.

¹²⁰ SP 77/10 f° 5v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 16 January 1611; SP 77/10 f° 7r-7v, *Aux Archiducs Ser. Et Leur Conseil Privé*; SP 77/10 f° 8r-8v, Extacts from the Treaty of London and the Treaty of Antwerp; SP 77/10 f° 9r-9v, *Copie de l'attestation de Johanna Leunes touchant le comportement de Henry Hunt Anglois*, 28 August 1610; SP 77/10 f° 9v-10r, *Copie de la lre du Magistrat de Dunquerque a son A. touchant le fait de Henry Hunt Anglois*, 1 August 1610; SP 77/10 f° 10v, *Copie de la lre des seigrs du Consei Privé des Archeducs au gouverneur de Dunquerque*, 4 November 1610; SP 77/10 f° 10v-11r, *Certificat de cure de dunquerque*, 28 August 1611.

Catholicism. The only answer Trumbull was able to obtain was *a silent negative*. The English agent requested the intercession of Salisbury. According to Trumbull this case was not only important to Henry Hunt, but could have broader consequences. It could endanger all other faithful subjects of king James in the Archducal Netherlands. Besides a letter of Trumbull a week later, Hunt disappears from the correspondence¹²¹.

The two longest cases during Trumbull's tenure as resident agent in Brussels involved colonel David Boyd and Thomas Albery, a merchant. The colonel had fought in what Trumbull described as the late wars and had been present at the reduction of Bruges, presumably referring to the capture of Bruges by Alexander Farnese in 1584. Thomas Albery was a merchant who had lived for some time in the Southern Netherlands. Both men were claiming money from the *late troubles*. Albery propounded two claims. He had inherited from his wife an interest from the States of £10 per year. Furthermore, he had bought an obligation of the heirs of Peter Swarts worth £ 7.200. Defendants in the case of Albery were the States of Flanders, Artois, Hainault and the cities of Lille, Douai, *Brehies*, Tournai, *Tournesiz* [Le Tournaisis] and Malines. The claim of colonel Boyd concerned the money that was due to him from when served the governor-general of the Southern Low Countries. This amounted to £ 5.400 which Bruges and the Franc of Bruges (*Brugse Vrije*) still owed him.

As with Henry Hunt, legal actions of English and Scottish gentlemen in the Southern Netherlands could come with high level backing. Hunt's case was backed by Salisbury. Boyd's litigation was recommended several times to the archdukes by king James (May 1611 and May 1614). Salisbury, although he considered the royal support strong enough, wished to further it of his own accord as a *courtesie to a gentleman of his profession and meritt*. If Trumbull was able to bring it to a speedy and satisfactory end, Salisbury added, *it wilbe a service acceptable to his matie besides his owne obligation to you; and myself shalbe ready to take notice thereof*¹²². Albery's case was commended several times by king James' Privy Council (July 1610 and August 1613). The first time the letter was signed by Henry Howard (1540-1614), earl of Northampton, G. Cant, the Lord Chancellor Thomas Egerton (1540-1617), baron Ellesmere, Edward Somerset (c. 1550-1628), fourth earl of Worcester, William Knollys (c.1545-1632), Edward Wotton (1548-1628), first baron Wotton, Sir John Herbert (c.1540-1617), junior secretary of state, Julius Caesar (*bap.* 1558, *d.* 1636) and Thow. Powis. The second time the signees besides Northampton, Cant and Caesar were John Stanhope (c.1540-1621), first baron Stanhope and Sir Thomas Parry (1544-1616)¹²³.

¹²¹ SP 77/10 f^o 23r-24r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 March 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 25r-25v, Trumbull to Salisbury [Brussels], 14 March 1611.

¹²² HMCD, iii, 80, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Greenwich Palace, 28 May 1611; HMCD, iii, 209, copy, [James VI/I] to [Albert], s.l., [1611]; HMCD, iii, 209, copy, [James VI/I] to [Isabella], s.l., [1611]; SP 77/10 f^o 77r, draft, Salisbury to Trumbull; Whitehall, [11 July 1611]; HMCD, iii, 80, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 11 July 1611; HMCD, iv, 406, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 17 May 1614.

¹²³ HMCD, ii, 321, Privy Council to Trumbull, Whitehall, 10 July 1610; HMCD, iv, 183, Privy Council to Trumbull, Whitehall, 19 August 1613; Croft, 'Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton (1540-1614)', ; Baker, 'Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley (1540-1617)'; Croft, 'Somerset, Edward, fourth earl of Worcester (c.1550-1628)'; Stater, 'Knollys, William, first earl of Banbury (c.1545-1632)'; Loomie, 'Wotton, Edward, first Baron Wotton (1548-1628)'; Watkin, 'Herbert, Sir John (c.1540-1617)'; Wijffels, 'Caesar, Sir Julius (*bap.* 1558, *d.* 1636)'; Hicks, 'Stanhope, John, first Baron Stanhope (c.1540-1621)'; Seddon, 'Parry, Sir Thomas (1544-1616)'.

The second backing from the Privy Council, in August 1613, acknowledged everything Trumbull had done in the case of Albery. Trumbull was commanded to renew his plea with the archdukes or their ministers, *and if the resolution be to weary the petitioner by unjust protraction, his Maj. shall be urged to resort to those courses of redres which in justice cannot be denied.* Seven months later Trumbull reported back to the Privy Council. Folkert van Achelen, Privy Councillor, had received Trumbull's information and conveyed it to the his fellow councillors. Trumbull did not approach the archduke himself because he was absent from Brussels. The fact that it took over six months to report back on the case was not due to negligence on the part of the English agent. Despite insisting regularly he had been unable to get any answer concerning Albery. As the Privy Council had foreseen, Trumbull reported: *It would seem that they mean to detain him in an endless labour, as though he has pleaded for above three years, the representations made on his behalf by Sir Thos. Edmond and myself have not prevailed*¹²⁴. That same month Albert promised a reply during an audience. Secretary of state Philippe de Prats (-1635)¹²⁵ was going to convey it. Trumbull's draft of his letter to de Prats is still in the Trumbull papers. He requested *good and speedy justice, in accordance with the treaties of peace with his Majesty and with the merits of the case*, or he requested a written explanation on what grounds the case was dismissed¹²⁶.

Boyd's case was similar to that of Albery and Trumbull also had to turn the Privy Council to further it. Commendation by the English king in May 1611¹²⁷ was no guarantee for success. In August 1611 Boyd himself complained to the archdukes mentioning that nothing had been done since the letters of king James came to their hands. Boyd stressed that Farnese and Philip II himself had recognised his value. The archduke then gave order to the burgomaster of Bruges and other *to enter into communication with Boid and to settle with him*¹²⁸. If Boyd now expected a swift settlement, he was wrong.

In March of 1612 the case had been referred to certain commissioners, who, after nine months would pass judgement. Letters from Salisbury and the king would further the case not only in time but also in the result. The English agent thought it prudent to write new letters of recommendation and the ambassador of the archdukes in London had to be brought in. Trumbull's advise was heeded and the king wrote a new letter, mentioned by John Finet (1570/71-1641), one of Salisbury's secretaries¹²⁹. Two years later, in the first half of 1614 Boyd had already received three sentences in his favour but despite his efforts

¹²⁴ HMCD, iv, 323, draft, Trumbull to the Privy Council, Brussels, 1 March 1614.

¹²⁵ Brants, 'Prats (Philippe de)', 202-203.

¹²⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 19r, Trumbull to Somerset, Brussels, 17 March 1614; HMCD, iv, 346-347, draft, Trumbull to de Prats, s.l., 3 April 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 355, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 31 March 1614.

¹²⁷ PEA 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Greenwich, 29 May 1611.

¹²⁸ HMCD, iii, 120, *Protest of Colonel David Boid to the Archdukes, s.l., s.d.* although this is undated the HMC puts it between 9 and 20 August 1611; HMCD, iii, 121, copy, *Archdukes to Burgomaster, etc. of Bruges, s.l., 20 August 1611 (n.s.)*.

¹²⁹ PEA 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 26 June 1612; Clayton, 'Finet, Sir John (1570/71-1641)'.

to compound with them by way of amity and to recover his own by way of justice, they stop their ears, not because they have any just ground to doubt his right, but for that the Col. being a stranger, they rely upon their favour and power in this court.

Protracting a case seemed to be a well-tryed way to end a case. In the matter of Boyd it was even voiced, argues Trumbull, that they would end the process by *eternising* it. The magistrates and officers of Bruges and the Franc had great allowances out of the public treasury. Boyd, on the other hand, could not *live in these parts without insupportable expenses*. Again Trumbull advised James to recommend the case once more to the archduke, which the king did a month later¹³⁰.

Boyd, in the mean time, wanted letters of reprisal/marque, which Winwood, newly appointed secretary of state, considered a dangerous course of action, even a possible prelude to war. King James, assured Winwood, was prepared to use it as a threat. Winwood, however, did not think that procuring the money would be easy. It was an old debt involving much money. The idea of furnishing colonel Boyd with letters of reprisal was also considered by Trumbull. A friend thought it would be a good idea to give them to force Bruges and the Franc to *a reasonable and indifferent composition*. James's letter was accompanied with instructions from Winwood. The English agent first had to use *gentle means* with the archduke and those concerned, *to doe H.M.'s subjects that right which the subjects of those Provinces shall be ever sure to receive here upon like occasion*. If this proved fruitless, Trumbull was authorised to state clearly

*that his H.M. wil no longer forbear to let loose unto his said subjects the reins of executing justice here according to the right of their contracts, to which purpose you may give them a civil admonition conformable to the proviso of our ancient leage*¹³¹.

Boyd's case was also furthered in London. It is clear from Trumbull's correspondence that John Packer and John More also pitched in. In May 1614 More assured Trumbull that if anything else was needed of documentation he and Packer were going to work together and send it to Brussels without charging Boyd. Generosity which was promteped by two reaons according to More. First, their will to see justice done, and secondly because they wanted to wish Trumbull as much luck as possible in this lawsuit which had consumed so much of his time already¹³².

By mid 1614 the case of Albery had not progressed much and Boyd had not been able to get satisfaction despite a ruling in his favour. Trumbull employed a local man to help him with these kind of cases, Jean Thymon, an advocate. From Trumbull's papers it is clear that Jean Thymon was married and that his wife gave birth to a child after 11 June 1613, *My wife is at the preface of her comedy, and with God's help we shall soon have a new Christian, but not a Spaniard or Hispanified*. He was an advocate and lived in brussels. In

¹³⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 175r-175v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 March 1612; HMCD, iii, 285, Finet to Trumbull, London, 27 April 1612; HMCD, iv, 322-323, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 28 February 1614; HMCD, iv, 406, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster 17 May 1614.

¹³¹ HMCD, iv, 387, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 22 April [1614]; SP 77/11 f^o 58r-58v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 18 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 409, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 23 May [1614 endorsed]

¹³² HMCD, iv, 409, More to Trumbull, Whitehall, 24 May 1614.

March 1617 Thymon mentioned his financial difficulties. He had asked his father for help, but he had refused. Thymon was trying to find out who had discouraged his father to help him. In January 1618 he wanted to sell books for 50 florins to be able to pay his rent. Trumbull described him in January 1620 as an *as honest, as capable, & unpassionat*. He only had two faults according to the English agent: *pouerty, and weaknes caused through a liberall mynde, and a sickly constitution*¹³³.

Thymon's first letters mentioning the cases were dated in the fall of 1614. Thymon requested all the treaties of England and Scotland to look for anything relevant which could further the cases of Boyd and Albery¹³⁴. In April 1615 Thymon pressed Trumbull for a meeting to discuss Boyd's lawsuit, which suffered a further setback a year later because of the death of the colonel. According to Trumbull Boyd's opponents now were trying to exploit his demise. By the end of 1616 Thymon was more optimistic. All the papers Trumbull had sent, had been studied. *If the heirs wish to see the matter brought to a successful issue, and the case has always presented a most promising aspect, they should prosecute it with all diligence*. The heirs of Boyds seem to have lost interest in the matter or in any case did not want to pursue it further, much to the dislike of Thymon, who kept pressing Trumbull. In February 1618, while Trumbull was on leave in England, he enumerated what could go wrong in it: stressing his own mortality and that of the president, who had been appointed commissary for Boyd's legal action. If either should die, many difficulties would arise. He requested Trumbull to urge the heirs to send someone *with full power of attorney and with a well-lined purse* and fresh letters of recommendation of king James. In 1619 Thymon again requested Trumbull *d'ecrire pour la derniere fois, afin que l'on envoie quelqu'un pardeca pour faire lad. poursuite*, finishing, that is was a strange thing *que l'on les doibt presser et prier pour leur propre bien*¹³⁵.

Thymon was much less involved in the Albery's suit as is apparent from his letters to Trumbull. That was not the only difference. While Boyd had pressed for letters of reprisal, Albery had gotten them. In July 1616 a ship from Dunkirk called the 'Hope' which was on its way to Spain had been confiscated in the Downs by a ship of king James. When this became known it caused quite a *hububb* in the Archducal Netherlands and Spain, according to the English agents in Brussels and Madrid. Trumbull reported to secretary Winwood that some in the Archducal Netherlands saw this as a retaliation because neither printer nor author of *Corona Regia* had been punished. The archdukes and their Privy Council were planning to send a special emissary to England. According to the English agent Jacob De Somere, who had already been in England in 1613, was

¹³³ HMCD, iv, 120, Thymon to Trumbull, s.l. 11 June 1613 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 148 (letter 326), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., 21 March 1617; HMCD, vi, 378 (letter 827), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [January 1618 endorsed]; SP 77/14 f^o 4v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 11:21 January 1620, In the HMCD, v & vi, he is identified an advocate at the Council of Brabant and in HMCD, v, also as a pensioner of King James, but Nauwelaers's *Histoire des avocats au souverain Conseil de Brabant* does not mention him. Nauwelaers, however, mentions on page 33 a Jacobus Timon, with the date 26 April 1605.

¹³⁴ HMCD, v, 47 (letter 113), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [27 October 1614 endorsed].

¹³⁵ HMCD, v, 205 (letter 430), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [April 1615 endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 10 (letter 30), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [16 September 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 38 (letter 96), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [3 November 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 38 (letter 97), Trumbull to Fullerton, Brussels, 4/14 November 1616; HMCD, vi, 59 (letter 145), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [5 December 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 376, (letter 822), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l.; 8 February 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 379 (letter 830), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 15 February 1618 (n.s.); BL Add. 72.314, Thymon to Trumbull, s.l. 3 October 1619.

among the nominees. Writing to Sir Dudley Carleton Trumbull stressed that some in the Archducal Netherlands saw this as an act of war and threatened to lay an embargo on the English in Spain and the Southern Low Countries. Archduke Albert interceded in favour of Jehan Vuthen and his ship 'Hope'. The agent of the archdukes, Van Male, presented Albert's letter to the English king during an audience. He assured James that if Albery traveled to Brussels with the necessary documents he would receive satisfaction swiftly. The 'Hope' was released at the request of the Van Male, according to the Privy Council. Trumbull was to *seek satisfaction for Albery from the Archdukes*¹³⁶.

Winwood was much more pessimistic, adding *that if he receive there speedy justice or be returned with any satisfaction, it is more then I can hope and more then their former proceedings have given reason to expect*. The English agent was of the same opinion calling Albery's case an *immortal processe*. In September 1617, fourteen months after the episode with the 'Hope' Trumbull was convinced that *the only effective method of proceeding against these provinces is by way of reprisals*. A new argument also had been proposed to avoid paying Albery. *Alleageing that Alberys specialities were not created by their Predecessors, but by Rebels unto their Prince and State*. Trumbull, naturally, disagreed with that assessment. Albery had octroys in his possession, enabling and qualifying the States to make a contract with the predecessors of Albery¹³⁷.

While Trumbull was on leave in England in 1618, the last time he touched English soil before returning indefinitely in 1625, he requested, before returning to Brussels, instructions on several matters. The fifth item on his list read:

What shall I doe in the Processe of Collonell Boyde, descended nowe upon his heyers: And that of Thomas Albery, and other his mats vassals; espetically that of Albery wch hath already continued above the space of twelve years?

The instructions Trumbull received were only general, he was to present their cases once more to the archdukes *that order may be taken for their satisfactions, least wee be forced to relieve them by such wayes as the lawes of nations doe permitt in case of justice denied*¹³⁸. As already mentioned the case of Boyd was not further pursued by his heirs. The case of Albery was still proceeding at that time and Trumbull had to find ways to try and further it.

¹³⁶ HMCD, v, 548-549 (letter 1158), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 10/20 July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 132r-132v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 12/22 July 1616; HMCD, v, 552 (letter 1168), copy, *The Hope of Dunkirk*, [Bruges], 24 July 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 135v, Trumbull to Winwood, 17/27 July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 139r-139v, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 29 July 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 459r, Privy Council to Lord Admiral, s.l. 5 August 1616; HMCD, v, 570 (letter 1212), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 5 August 1616; HMCD, vi, 4 (letter 10), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 6 September 1616; HMCD, vi, 29 (letter 70), Privy Council to Trumbull, Whitehall, 13 October 1616.

¹³⁷ HMCD, vi, 31 (letter 74), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 16 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 405r-405v, *Instructions secretes pour les Commissaires a deputer en la cause de Thomas Albery demandeur, contre les Estatz de flandres, d'Arthois, et heynavult, de nameur, de Lille, Doway et brehies, de Tourney tournesiz et Mallines, Defendeurs*. The instructions themselves were dated 14 August 1617; but a note was added by Trumbull which is relevant in this case;

¹³⁸ SP 77/13 f^o 7r-7v, *Certain points to bee represented to his matis considerations; before my retourne to Bruxelles*, March 1618; HMCD, vi, 434 (letter 939), *Instructions to William Trumbull*, Whitehall, 16 June 1618.

An opportunity presented itself while the conde of Gondomar, who had been Spanish ambassador in London (1613-1618 and later on again, 1620-1622)¹³⁹ was in Brussels. Trumbull visited him several times,

and prayed him, as a minister well affected to the common service of both Princes, and one that was well acquainted wth the king my masters good disposicon, he would, not only towards the Archds. themselves; (wch he had formerly promised) but also towards their principall ministers, (wch I judged expedient) doe such frendly offers, as might procure his matis satisfaction from themn in those things I was commanded nowe to propose, for the furtherance of his mats affairs¹⁴⁰.

If Gondomar did anything substantial to advance Albery's claims is not clear from the correspondence of William Trumbull. What is evident is that it did not help Albery much, for in November 1618 he redelivered his petition, with some difficulty, to the James VI/I. Albery wrote Trumbull that he had already spent £ 2.200 on the case and that he *would not begin fresh proceedings there, for I could not shoulder the legal expenses*. The James finally accepted Albery's petition and *said he would heare from his agent before he would harken further to it*.

On the 14/24 December 1618 the Privy Council finally passed verdict in the case of Albery. The first case, concerning the ten pounds interest per year the States of several provinces owed him, was declared *non recepuable*. For the second case, concerning a debt of £ 7.200 they wanted the *bond*. Secretary Naunton saw this as a new tactic to delay. Trumbull had to protest *and to warn him and his ministers that any further delay or procrastination may induce His Majesty to assist Albery to recover what is rightfully his, by any lawful means within his power as King*.

In April 1619 Trumbull had consulted with a trustworthy friend and one of the best lawyers of Brussels, presumably referring to Jean Thymon. As he had been instructed by the secretary of state he wanted to know how Albery could get satisfaction. The friend was clear that as matters now stood neither the archdukes nor the Privy Council could overturn the sentence as it had been passed by a sovereign council. The only possible way would be to reopen the case by a revision, *a thing of infinite charge, & trouble*, or by a *Relevement*, which entailed even more costs and risks. A further point to consider was that the States of the Provinces, *most litigious, & cavetous generation*, now having a judgement in their favour, were unrelenting and would not part with one single penny¹⁴¹. Despite Trumbull's efforts both the cases of Boyd and Albery ended in failure.

There were other cases, which consumed less of the time of the English agent. John Morrison got the backing of James and Winwood in the fall of 1614. Several differences can be noted with the previous cases: short lived and did not involve the archduke in any way. King James asked Christopher Perkins (1542/3–1622), a diplomat,¹⁴² to write to the English agent in Brussels to further the case. Morrison had been granted the benefit of

¹³⁹ Gondomar's embassy and relation with King James has been studied extensively, see, Loomie, 'Richard Berry: Gondomar's English Catholic adviser'; Loomie, 'Bacon and Gondomar: an unknown link in 1618'; Loomie, 'Gondomar's selection of English officers in 1622'.

¹⁴⁰ SP 77/13 f^o 52r-53v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 28 Augustu 1618.

¹⁴¹ SP 77/13 f^o 222r-222v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 8/18 April 1619.

¹⁴² McCoog, 'Perkins, Sir Christopher (1542/3–1622)'.

the recusancy of several men and women in 1610¹⁴³. Morrison himself brought that letter and was going to inform Trumbull with the details. Thanks to Winwood it is clear that Morrison treated in the name of some orphans against Alexander Vandergoes [Van der Goes], Cornelis Hounds [Cornelis Hoons/Hoens] and John Herthen [Jan Hertssen], all three Antwerp merchants and interrelated. Van der Goes and Hertssen were married two sisters, respectively Maria and Jacqueline Della Faille. Cornelis Hoens later became the godfather of the granddaughter of Hertssen, Elizabeth¹⁴⁴. Trumbull worked on the case together with captain Patrick Hamilton and in a later stage with John Corham. By May 1615 the English agent had already been in Antwerp twice to settle their differences. Adriaan Van Dale, however, had been sent in secret with a book, which Trumbull does not elaborate on, to England. Following advise he got, Trumbull let Morrison return to England to hinder Van Dale, whom he described as partial and against the reformed religion and the English state. Trumbull also advised Winwood to call Bartholemew Owen, Morrison's brother-in-law and a London shoemaker, before him¹⁴⁵.

Morrison also employed Mr. King to further his case, who requested money without informing him what had been done. Morrison wrote Trumbull to receive information. He also authorised the English agent

to cause all the bookes of Jaques de la Fabio and Cornelius Houns and Alexander Vandergoose to be brought in by warrant from the Archduke, as our counsell did advise, and to arrest all the jewells that belonge to Garrett Backe in the hands of Alexander Vandergoose and Cornelius Howns and let them be arrested to your owne usse.

Furthermore, he requested Trumbull to write to Mr. Harris who had imprisoned him. Trumbull could assure that the first money he got, was going to Harris. After that, Morrison seems to have lost interest in the case. Hamilton reported to Trumbull that King was abandoning it because he did not receive any assistance from Morrison. Hamilton assured Trumbull that King was going to leave if he was not sent money and cloths¹⁴⁶.

The case, however, did not end with the withdrawal of Morrison. His brother-in-law took it up the following year. King was still helping at this time, according to a letter of Owen.

Concerninge the wrytinge which Kinge sente to be subscriybed by the Doctors of Civill lawe, they make difficulty to doe itt, but I will doe the best I canne for they have promised to subscriybe itt if I canne obtaine somme of the Sargents of the Common lawes hands.

King also requested a certificate testifying that the jewels had been pawned to the contending party, which the latter deny, but sufficient evidence is provided by the sale made by the

¹⁴³ CSPD James I 1603-1610, 591, Westminster, 8 March 1610.

¹⁴⁴ <http://home.pi.be/a479346/fragdavid.htm>; the information was based on "Staat van Goed" Jan Baptist Hertssen 08-07-1631, Weeskamer Antwerpen.

¹⁴⁵ HMCD, v, 36 (letter 89), Parkins/Perkings to Trumbull, Channon Row, 14 October 1614; HMCD, v, 55 (letter 132), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 12 November 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 327r-327v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 18 May 1615.

¹⁴⁶ HMCD, v, 268 (letter 542), Morrison to Trumbull, s.l. 5 July 1615; HMCD, v, 361-362 (letter 736), Hamilton to Trumbull, Antwerp, 28 October 1615.

widow and by their letters to her. In Antwerp it was Corham who kept Trumbull apprised of what was happening. By the end of October 1616 Henry Van der Goes formulated a proposal to settle the business between Alexander Van der Goes, Hoens and Owen. It was Corham's opinion that this settlement was the best chance of success, any further questions would protract the case. Corham advised that Owen should be empowered to receive the money and that Trumbull should write to Henry Van der Goes authorising him to pay Corham, professing that he was going to *be glad to see it, for I have need om my 800 florins*. The last that is mentioned of the case is that Bartholemew Owen had left for England and Corham promised to inform Trumbull of everything that had happened when they met each other. Presumably both men met because no written account is present in the Trumbull papers¹⁴⁷.

Englishmen not always came with the recommendation of James VI/I or members of the Privy Council. Thomas Stone sought out the English agent in Brussels in 1615 in his difference with Philipppo Comi. When it became clear in England that Trumbull was helping Thomas Stone, the earl of Arundel took interest. Writing at the start of April 1615 he thanked Trumbull for his letter of 18 March, but wished that his letter had reached the English agent before he had engaged himself in favour of Stone. If Trumbull had known Comi's reasonable demands, Arundel was sure the English agent would had *left it to the course of law and justice*, unless he could find an less expensive way to settle their differences. Although Arundel did not disapprove of the protection Trumbull gave fellow countrymen or of the commiseration he had for the decayed estate of Stone, he wanted to convince Trumbull that he was assisting the wrong man. Stone had been the own instrument in his ruin. Comi, on the other hand, had been a prosperous man in Tuscany. Arundel described him as *industrious and honest and most friendly to Englishmen, especially to Stone*. Because of Stone Arundel saw *Comi with his wife and children ruined ... his house and goods seized by his creditors, his wife sent home to her mother and himself to England as their factor to recover what he could get for them from Stone*. While both men were in England Stone promised satisfaction, but left the country secretly. Arundel did not only try to enlist Trumbull. Wolley, Trumbull's secretary, who was in London in April 1615, reported that he also approached Queen Anne. He asked her for a letter to the archduke against Stone. Although the original response had not been favourable, Mr. Yeats/Yates assured Wolley that it was only a matter of time¹⁴⁸.

Whatever Trumbull's feelings, he tried to mediate to come to an arrangement. He suggested three possible solutions: compound their differences by English law, arbitration by the earl of Arundel or settling the matter amicably. Stone at that time *was under arreste* in the Archducal Netherlands. Although a agreement was close, Comi came to prosecute the matter according to the laws of the Archducal Netherlands. Trumbull wanted to avoid a costly and long litigation, he had little luck in procuring justice in other cases, and tried to convince both parties to come to an agreement. This reconciliation was made

¹⁴⁷ HMCD, v, 448 (letter 939), Owen to Trumbull, London, 18 March 1616; HMCD, vi, 31 (letter 75), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 26 October 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 33 (letter 82), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 30 October 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 36 (letter 92), Corham to Trumbull, s.l., 5 November 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 37 (letter 94), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 10 November 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 44 (letter 110), Corham to Trumbull, Antwerp, 22 November 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁴⁸ HMCD, v, 187 (letter 386), Arundel to Trumbull, London, 5 April 1615; HMCD, v, 190 (letter 394), Wolley to Trumbull, London, 8 April 1615; HMCD, v, 201 (letter 421), Wolley to Trumbull, London, 23 April 1615.

more difficult by Camillo, Comi's factor. Camillo, in August 1615, agreed to stop the case in return for £ 2.000 but kept augmenting the amount, *shewing that he was very well practised in the rule of addition*. Comi also turned to the Privy Council of the archdukes armed with a letter of their ambassador in London, Ferdinand de Boisshot. His motion was succesful, as he got the licence *to possess himself of the person of the said Stone*. Comi got three weeks in the mean time to substantiate his case. Stone had been imprisoned for five months after that. According to Trumbull de Boisshot had exceeded his mandate as neither Stone nor Comi were subjects of the archdukes. *I am sure the Archduke would not permitt me to do the lyke in these partes*. De Boisshot, *to continewe his antipathie and disaffection against our countrymen*, wrote again in favour of Comi in October 1615. His hostility towards Stone was also noted by Thymon who sent Trumbull, on leave in England, some documents concerning the case. De Boisshot had *testified of obstacles put in against Camillo in the Court of London*, according to Stone, which was confirmed by Thymon writing that the Florentine was talking *disparagingly of English justice*¹⁴⁹.

Stone was not only advised by Trumbull but also by Edward Yates and Robert Garset, who appears on a list in 1620 as an Adventurer of the Virginia Company. Garset's reported to Trumbull, *I have so seriously handled his business here that I hope there will be an end with Comillo also 'or ells I feare some of our throts must be cut*. The Yates's offer had been accepted, the only thing left to do was to draw up the articles. It is unclear who benefited from the case. Jean Thymon charged Stone 47 florins and 12 sols for his work in the lawsuit before the Privy Council and the magistrates of Brussels, which Trumbull advanced in August 1616¹⁵⁰.

Thymon described the situation of Englishmen seeking justice in the Southern Low Countries accurately when he stated: *Justice is portrayed as being blindfolded so that she may not see anything. But to me she is invisible because she is not to be seen at all*¹⁵¹. Trumbull, sometimes fired on by London, interceded in the Southern Low Countries to help his fellow countrymen. This, however, was no guarantee for a succesful result as is especially evident from the cases of Albery and Boyd.

¹⁴⁹ HMCD, v, 207 (letter 435), draft, Trumbull to Arundel, 3 May 1615; HMCD, v, 309-310 (letter 623), draft, Trumbull to Ellesmere, Brussels, 9 August 1615; HMCD, v, 349 (letter 701), Stone to Trumbull, Brussels, 5 October 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 349 (letter 702), Thymon to Trumbull, 8 October 1615 (n.s.).

¹⁵⁰ HMCD, v, 354 (letter 715), Stone to Trumbull, Brussels, 21 October 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 358 (letter 724), Stone to Trumbull, Brussels, 28 October 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 360 (letter 728), Stone to Trumbull, Brussels, 1 November 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 384 (letter 798), Garset to Trumbull, London, 21 December 1615; HMCD, v, 385 (letter 799), Stone to Trumbull, [London], 18 December 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 10 (letter 21), *Receipt*, Brussels, 1 September 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁵¹ HMCD, v, 349 (letter 702), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., 8 October 1615 (n.s.).

Chapter 3 *The English, Scottish and Irish regiments in the service of the Archdukes*

One of the advantages Albert and Isabella got out of the peace Treaty of London in 1604 was the permission to levy troops in the kingdoms of James VI/I. British troops were already levied in the decades beforehand to serve the Republic of the United Provinces. No official levies for the Catholic South had been made, but British soldiers served in the Army of Flanders nonetheless. The regiment of Sir William Stanley had been mobilised to aid the Republic against Spain. While defending Deventer, however, Stanley and his troops defected to the Southern Netherlands and joined Alexander Farnese, the governor-general (1587). Others who turned to military service for the cause of the South were recusants seeking asylum from persecution. The first official levies took place after the Somerset House Treaty. After 1605 the British contingents were raised by contract. Archduke Albert employed at least four contractors in Ireland to recruit Irishmen for the Army of Flanders: captain Walter de la Hoyde, captain Maurice Fitzgerald, captain William Darcy and captain Thomas Preston (born in or after 1585-1655)¹.

A study of all British regiments in service of the archdukes is long overdue. Geoffrey Parker's *The Army of Flanders* mentions the British regiments only a couple of times, but does not distinguish between the English, Irish and Scottish regiments. Most interesting is his first appendix on the size and composition of the army of Flanders. British troops amounted, for the period concerned to this dissertation (1605-1625), to 2.442 in March 1607, 1.699 in March 1609, 1.468 in August 1611, 1.169 in May 1619, 1.154 in June 1620, 3.812 in March 1623 and 3.926 in April 1624². The Irish regiment is the only one which has been studied at length, with Jennings' *Wild Geese*, Stradling's *The Spanish monarchy and Irish mercenaries: the wild geese in Spain 1618-68* (1994) and Henry's *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621* (1992)³ as the most important historiographical works. Henry discerns four phases in the history of the Irish regiment during the period between 1585 and 1621, the end of the Twelve Years' Truce. In the first phase (1585-1586) Sir William Stanley (1548-1630)⁴, under orders from Queen Elizabeth I, mobilised troops to serve in the United Provinces. As Stanley and his regiment of English, Scottish and Irish soldiers defected with the rendering of Deventer to the Spaniards in 1587, a second phase started which lasted until 1604. During this period most Irish troops, but also English and Scottish soldiers, in the Spanish Netherlands were members of a regiment under Sir William Stanley. Gradually Irish companies were formed with Irish commanders as commanders; this was a policy valid for the entire Army of Flanders. Spaniards were commanded by a Spanish commander, troops from Milan or Rome could

¹ Dodd, 'The Spanish treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 628; Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road 1567-1659*, 29, 52; Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders, 1586-1621*, 27; Lenihan, 'Preston, Thomas, first Viscount Tara (b. in or after 1585, d. 1655)'. See also, Silke, 'The Irish Abroad, 1534-1691', 608-611; Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans. The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II*, 129-181, this chapter is entitled The Soldier: Sir William Stanley.

² Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 271-272.

³ See also Silke, 'The Irish abroad, 1534-1691'.

⁴ Rapple, 'Stanley, Sir William (1548-1630)'.

not serve with troops from Naples, etc.⁵. After 1604 an Irish regiment was created which was subsequently commanded by colonel Henry O'Neill (1586?-1617x21)⁶ (phase three: 1605-1610) and colonel John O'Neill (phase four: 1610-1621, although he stood at the head of the regiment until 1628⁷), both sons of Hugh O'Neill, second earl of Tyrone (c. 1550-1616)⁸. The last two phases coincide with Trumbull's tenure in Brussels in the office as senior secretary and the king's agent. The period between the end of the Twelve Years' Truce and Trumbull's revocation from Brussels and the start of the Anglo-Spanish war (1625-1630) completes the picture offered by Henry.

Levyng of troops from England, Scotland and Ireland was negotiated by Conrad Schetz, the baron of Hoboken, resident ambassador of archduke Albert and infanta Isabella in London. He obtained permission by the end of April 1605 to mobilise 2.000 Englishmen, 1.500 Scotsmen and 500 Irishmen⁹ as Edmondes reported it to his counterpart in Madrid, Sir Charles Cornwallis (1555-1629)¹⁰, at the start of June. The Gunpowder Plot in November 1605 became an obstacle for the levyng of troops. Besides the culprits which were apprehended or killed during a fire fight in England, the government of king James was seeking out possible culprits on the continent, especially in the Catholic Low Countries, which were considered a safe-haven for fleeing recusants. The most wanted among them were William Baldwin (1562-1630), John Gerard (1564-1637) and Hugh Owen (ca. 1575-1642?), respectively two English Jesuits and someone dependent on that religious order¹¹. Although introducing the concept of extradition in this period would be an anachronism, James wanted nothing less. Archduke Albert on the other hand refused to hand them over. They were, he argued, beyond his jurisdiction. The first two were Jesuits and the latter a subject of the king of Spain, which meant they belonged or to the jurisdiction of the Church or to that of Philip III.

The part the English regiment would have played in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, should it have succeeded, also has to be considered. Plans were contemplated to give Sir Charles Percy¹² the command of the regiment. Robert Catesby (*b.* in or after 1572-1605)¹³ and Sir William Windsor would have become respectively lieutenant-colonel and sergeant-major. The influence of the Jesuits had become clear in the previous months. The Society of Jesus wanted to monopolise the chaplaincy of the English regiment, as will be documented further on. The reality of the English regiment and a possible involvement in the aftermath was exaggerated. The only evidence for a possible

⁵ Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 29.

⁶ Brendan, 'Irish swordsmen in Flanders, 1586-1610. 1. Stanley's regiment 1586-1587; 2. Independent Irish companies and the regiment of Henry O'Neill, 401-410; Casway, 'Henry O'Neill and the formation of the Irish regiment in the Netherlands, 1605', 481-488.

⁷ When he took over the regiment he was still a minor. The regiment was effectively under the leadership of major Edward Geraldin and lieutenant-colonel Owen Roe O'Neill, John O'Neill took effective charge of the regiment in 1625. Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*, 5; Casway, 'O'Neill, Owen Roe (c.1583-1649)'.

⁸ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 19-20; Canny, 'O'Neill, Hugh, second earl of Tyrone (c.1550-1616)'.

⁹ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 26.

¹⁰ Kyle, 'Cornwallis, Sir Charles (c.1555-1629)'.

¹¹ McCoog, 'Baldwin, William (1562-1632)'; McCoog, 'Gerard, John (1564-1637)'.

¹² Nicholls, 'Sir Charles Percy', 237-250.

¹³ Nicholls, 'Catesby, Robert (*b.* in or after 1572, *d.* 1605)'.

invasion of England at the time of the plot, according to Lunn, was the confession of Thomas Wintour. It seems therefore a fact that there were no serious preparations for such an invasion¹⁴.

Archduke Albert was well aware that the policy in England concerning the levying of troops for the Southern Netherlands had changed in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot. The Scottish regiment, under the earl of Hume, was ordered to stay in England, Albert complained. Edmondes imputed this to the English Jesuits who wanted to corrupt every subject of the English king who joined to army to serve the archdukes¹⁵. Salisbury informed the ambassador in February 1606 about a complaint launched by Hoboken in London. Salisbury commented that since the Gunpowder Plot Englishmen who had joined the English regiment in Flanders were suspects of the plot. Because of that no one was allowed to cross the Channel and others were called back. The Spanish ambassador in London had also been told that the mobilisation of new troops in England and Ireland was put on hold. The English king awaited the response from the court in Madrid about Owen and Baldwin. Salisbury emphasized that the king had not issued a total ban, which is contradicted by the research of Henry who speaks of a total ban due to the hysteria following the Gunpowder Plot¹⁶. Salisbury assured Hoboken that the same injunctions applied to the United Provinces. Albert, however, was displeased that the United Provinces had always to be taken into consideration. They were nothing more than rebels, he thought. The 'Twelve Years' Truce was still some years away. Furthermore, he emphasized, there were daily reports arriving in Brussels of Englishmen going to serve the North. Edmondes offered a straightforward explanation for this. There were simply more Englishmen who volunteered for service to the Republic than to the archdukes, so this could not be attributed to king James¹⁷. Another reason came from Salisbury and concerned Ireland and its people. On the green island there were not enough people to work. The Irish people, he went on, were an ignorant and extremely suspicious people. Serving foreign princes meant they were prone to seduction from papists. It was the duty of king James to safeguard their bodies and their minds, the principal secretary of state argued. The lack of levies on the British Isles and in Ireland lasted until the end of 1606¹⁸. According to Parker the restriction hardly took effect until the armistice in the Netherlands in April 1607, which rendered further recruiting superfluous¹⁹. The English Parliament, which assembled in March 1606, figured as a further motivation why recruitment did not proceed as easily as expected. Sending more troops to the Catholic Low Countries would be an unwise political move for the king, suggested Edmondes. Measures were also passed that envisaged Catholics. An oath of allegiance was proclaimed in June 1606. All Catholics had to take this oath, which denied the presumed power of the pope to depose kings.

Albert remained constant in his displeasure and instructed his ambassador in London to protest. Salisbury kept Edmondes informed. He needed to emphasize that it was only

¹⁴ Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiments in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', 145.

¹⁵ SP 77/8 f^o 23r(?), Edmondes to Salisbury, 23 January 1606.

¹⁶ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 27 and 161-162.

¹⁷ SP 77/8 f^o 87r-88v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 16 April 1606.

¹⁸ SP 77/8 f^o 9v-10r, draft, Salisbury to Edmondes, 12 February 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 11r-11v, draft, Salisbury to Edmondes, 27 February 1606.

¹⁹ SP 77/8 f^o 66r-66v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 5 April 1606; Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 52.

a short postponement, long enough to appease James's subjects. The archdukes were under the impression that once Parliament was dissolved, the requested troops would cross the Channel readily. Edmondès, however, added two other conditions before this could happen: English Jesuits were to be forbidden meddling in the affairs of the regiments and there should be no distinction made between Catholics and Protestants. Sir Thomas Edmondès conferred with Jean Richardot, the president of the Privy Council.

Besides the obstacles opposing recruitment there was also a problem within the English regiment itself. Thomas Arundell, first baron Arundell of Wardour (c. 1560-1639)²⁰, had been chosen as colonel for the English regiment that had been mobilised in 1605. He slipped out of England without the permission of James and arrived at Gravelines in September 1605. Originally he was ordered to return, but eventually received permission to stay²¹. Salisbury reported that he was happy that Arundell had appointed Sir Griffin Markham (c. 1565-in or after 1644) instead of Thomas Studder as lieutenant-colonel. But, he added, Markham's track record was far from exemplary, as he was one of the conspirators implicated in the Bye Plot (1603)²². A month later Markham was requested to give up his commission. He assured the principal secretary of state he regretted his past mistakes and that lack of money was the only reason why he joined the Army of Flanders²³.

The appointment of Lord Arundell as colonel led to frictions within the English regiment. Although there was a rumour Arundell delivered passports to those who wished to return to England, Albert refused to believe such tales. The principal opponents in this dispute were Lord Arundell and Sir Thomas Studder. In the State Papers a letter is kept, written by a certain Norton to Studder (April 1606). Norton testified that he had overheard a conversation between Arundell and Edmondès, *touching no les then the Cutting of of your head*²⁴. Studder's pull on the troops seems to have been considerable as Arundell returned to the English regiment with new apparel to appease the soldiers and in the hope they would turn to him and not to Studder. If this proved unsuccessful he intended to resign his office²⁵. Fundamental to this dispute were the Jesuits. The choice of Arundell for the chaplaincy of the English regiment was a Benedictine monk, John Augustus Bradshaw (1575/6-1618)²⁶, an anti-Jesuit, as was Sir Griffin Markham. Studder and the society opposed this. Due to the intervention of the Spanish ambassador in Brussels, Taxis²⁷, and the papal nuncio, Frangipani, Bradshaw got the appointment. Studder, on the other hand, wished to rid the regiment of all those who remained loyal to the English king and wanted to create an English Regiment that was exclusively Catholic²⁸.

²⁰ Hopper, 'Arundell, Thomas, first Baron Arundell of Wardour (c.1560-1639)'.

²¹ Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiments in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', 141-142.

²² Nicholls, 'Markham, Sir Griffin (b. c.1565, d. in or after 1644)'.

²³ SP 77/8 f^o 26r, Markham to Salisbury, Brussels, 26 January 1606.

²⁴ SP 77/8 f^o 74r, Norton to Studder, 18 April 1606 (n.s.).

²⁵ SP 77/8 f^o 85v, Edmondès to Salisbury, 12 April 1606.

²⁶ Taunton, 'Bradshaw, John (1575/6-1618)', rev. David Daniel Rees.

²⁷ For the Spanish ambassadors in Brussels, see, Lefèvre, 'Les ambassadeurs d'Espagne à Bruxelles sous le règne de l'archiduc Albert'.

²⁸ Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiments in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', 143-144.

A month later the tables had turned. Arundell now pursued Studder for mutiny, which had caused great concern in Spanish circles²⁹. *El Alguazill mayor*, as Studder was called by John Sanford (ca. 1565-1629)³⁰, chaplain in Brussels during the tenure of Sir Thomas Edmondes, fled to Brussels, according to some to escape justice, according to others to plead his case with Ambrosio, the marquis of Spinola, the supreme commander of the Spanish military in the Southern Low Countries³¹.

The frictions and discontent led to reformations in the army in May 1606. Arundell and half of the officers of the regiment were discharged. Some companies were cast and others were left standing. For the time being colonel Francisco was appointed as commanding officer of the English regiment³². Edmondes sent Salisbury a detailed list:

Compagnies cast

- *The L. Arondell* [Thomas Arundell, first baron Arundell of Wardour], *Collenell*
- *Sr Griffin Markham*, *Lieutenant Collonell*
- *Sr. Thomas Studder*, *Sergeant Major*, *refourmed onely for formes sake, by reason of being found to have been cause of the late mutyning of the Regyment; But he hath assurance, that notwithstanding, he shall still hould his pensions; wch are twoe; the one of 40. Crownes by the moneth for his place of Capten; & the other of 65. Crownes more by the moneth for his place as Sergeant Maior.*
- *Sr Edward Parham*
- *Capten Roger Orme*, *Against whome they can pretend no kynde of exeptions, saving onely that he would not adheere to the faction of the Jesuittes. Besides, his compaignie was one of the fullest & fayrest, & of all othert the freest from having anie part in the late mutinie.*
- *The L. Arondel's Sonne*, [possibly, Thomas Arundell, second baron Arundell of Wardour] *A fayre Compaignie newly mustered & never as yet in service.*

Compagnies left standing

- *Sr William Winsor. Already knowne to yor L. & here more vallued for his present pretended suffrance in England.*
- *Capten Bylings. A good honest man, whose playnnes may be rather abused, then that himself is inclynable to runne evill courses; And therefore used in some sorte as a stale for the coulering of their present purposes in respect of being the antientes Capten.*
- *Capten John Blount, eldest brother to Capten James Blount & also in affection like unto him, of a mallicious & quyett spyritt, thou but of very weake & loose gouverment, & a passyionate depender upon Balwin & Owen.*
- *Capten Thomas Blount, favored for being of kinne to the other Blountes, but nothing is malliciously disposed as they are.*

²⁹ Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiments in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', 148.

³⁰ Fell-Smith, 'Sandford, John (c.1565-1629)', rev. Elizabeth Haresnape.

³¹ HMCD, ii, 7, Beaulieu to Trumbull, 14 May 1606; HMCD, ii, 60, Sanford to Trumbull, 21 May 1606.

³² HMCD, ii, 7-8, Beaulieu to Trumbull, 28 May 1606.

- Capten Rowland Stanley, second sonne of Sr. William. A simple ignorant intemperatt man, wholly gnyded according to the directions wch he receaveth from his father, & the rest upon whome he dependeth.
- Capten Roger Tyrwytt preferred to his Compagnie bu Baldwyn, & though he hath ben observed to have been heretofore of good carriage; yett nowe he sheweth to depend more immedi ally upon them.
- Capten Thomas Kingsman, a person reputed of a better resolution then anie of the rest, & forced for necessitiess sake to stay amonge them, & therefore sought to be wrought uppon by them.
- Capten John Dexter, lately preferred by Sr William Stanley to his Companie. A contemptible person for all manner of sufficiencie; onely a slave to their humors. He was heretofore employed with one Duffield into England for the burning of the navie, & made his escape by breaking of prison.
- An it is further to be noted, that all these companies, wch are allowed to stand, are much weaker then anie of the others wch are cast; save onely the two Companies of Capten John Blount, & Capten Stanley.
- There was no mention amongst these, of the discharging of Capten Trysteynes companie; because it was knowne that himself came with purpose to give over his place³³.

Edmond's comments made it clear that he thought this reformation was a ploy conceived by the Jesuits to remove all who remained loyal to the English king. Some of the men indeed had a double allegiance: the archdukes and king James. Arundell and Markham and John Blount passed information to the earl of Salisbury and captain Roger Orme and Sir Edward Parham did the same to the English Privy Council³⁴.

The reformations led to great discontent. Arundell, Markham and others repaired to Brussels, but to no avail. Studder was advanced as a possible leader of the English regiment. Studder got a patent in June 1606 to lead the regiment, which was considered a great dishonour to king James and had been accomplished despite the actions of the English ambassador and the former colonel. Arundell approached archduke Albert and Spinola. They imputed the reformations to the general weakness of the regiment and the lack of Englishmen taking service. Arundell reiterated the former arguments: it was only due to the assembled Parliament. Spinola, however, was unimpressed, it were *belli paroli et cativi fatti*. In the end Studder did not get the appointment. The pragmatic reason is perhaps the most convincing one. A large faction in the English regiment detested Studder. Making him commander would surely have meant the demise of of an already ailing regiment. Furthermore, the Spanish ambassador had relayed James' discontent about Studder to the archdukes which made him more odious³⁵. As a result, colonel Francesco³⁶, to the displeasure of Edmond's, got to lead the English regiment for the time being. Francesco was connected with the likes of Stanley, Owen and Baldwin, whom the

³³ SP 77/8 f^o 112v-113r, *Companies Cast and Remaining with the Archduke*, 29 May 1606.

³⁴ Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiments in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', 148; CSPD, James I, 1603-1610, 464.

³⁵ HMCD, ii, 9, Beaulieu to Trumbull, 14 June 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 117v-118r, Edmond's to Salisbury, 16 June 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 128r-129v, Edmond's to Salisbury, 28 June 1606.

³⁶ Possibly Jacques Franchesi/Giacomo Francesco, who died before 16 January 1611, as is apparent from SP 77/10 f^o 4r, Trumbull to Salisbury, 16 January 1611

English ambassador pursued because of their possible involvement in the Gunpowder Plot³⁷. Although Edmond's arguments did not carry much weight with the archduke, Albert, who professed to hate plots, did not think highly of the new colonel, whom at one time he was about to have beheaded³⁸.

At the end of 1606 Studder was still trying to obtain the leadership of the English regiment. But he was more a liability than an asset because it hindered recruitment³⁹. This was not the last time the English representative in Brussels was a loggerheads with Sir Thomas Studder. Leaving Brussels in 1609 Edmond's mentioned Sir Thomas explicitly as one who had plotted against the English state. Albert, as a sovereign prince, was expected to get rid of such people, not entertain them, the ambassador exclaimed. Nonetheless, Studder received double entertainment in the service of the archdukes, a pension as captain (40 crowns/month) and one as sergeant major (65 crowns/month)⁴⁰. In June 1613 the English company under his command was dissolved and the soldiers put into the Scottish company under captain Paul Raddock⁴¹.

William Trumbull's relationship with Sir Thomas Studder was troublesome, to say the least. Trumbull described him on various occasions as *myinion of or. Eng: Jesuitts, that pragmaticall impudent companyon and a man that on all sides is better knowen, then trusted*⁴². Studder had written letters to discredit Trumbull to Thomas (1561–1626) and Katherine Howard (*b. in or after 1564, d. 1638*), the earl and countess of Suffolk⁴³. Sir John Digby, representing king James at the Spanish court in Madrid was relieved in January 1616,

*Regarding Sir Thomas Studder, I am very glad that you have eluded the treacherous design which he had upon you. If ever he comes my way, he will find me as implacable in my opposition to him as I was formerly ready to assist him upon your recommendation*⁴⁴.

Digby was referring to an earlier letter in September 1615 promising to help Studder any way possible. In March 1616 punishment was proclaimed against Sir Thomas Studder by the auditor-general in the Southern Low Countries. The case did not end with that. To clear his name Trumbull requested Winwood to send him an authenticated copy or even the original of the letter Studder had written the countess of Suffolk dated 15 October 1615. Trumbull had been able to find out that Studder accused him of dispersing libels against the countess, which the English agent categorically denied⁴⁵. Winwood instructed Abraham Williams to send Trumbull the papers; he could

³⁷ Cf. *Infra*.

³⁸ SP 77/8 f^o 142r-143r, Edmond's to Salisbury, 22 July 1606.

³⁹ SP 77/8 f^o 195r, Edmond's to Salisbury, Brussels, 10 December 1606.

⁴⁰ HMCD, ii, 117-118, copy, Edmond's to Albert, [Brussel], 30 August 1609.

⁴¹ SP 77/10 f^o 300v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 June 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 307r-307v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 14 July 1613.

⁴² SP 77/11 f^o 13v-14r, Trumbull Salisbury, Brussels, 30 January 1611; SP 77/12 f^o 31r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616; HMCD, vi, 41 (letter 104), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 9/19 November 1616.

⁴³ SP 77/12 f^o 31r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616; SP 77/11 f^o 317r, *Studder's punishment*, 8 May 1615 (n.s.); Croft, 'Howard, Thomas, first earl of Suffolk (1561–1626)'; Payne, 'Howard, Katherine, countess of Suffolk (*b. in or after 1564, d. 1638*)'.

⁴⁴ HMCD, v, 339 (letter 685), Digby to Trumbull, Madrid, 16 September 1615; HMCD, v, 408 (letter 847), Digby to Trumbull, Madrid, 12/23 January 1616.

⁴⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 285r-285v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 March 1617.

keep them. Williams would, if he was Trumbull, pay no more attention to the matter⁴⁶. Nine papers can be found in the Trumbull papers dated between March and September 1617. Studder was imprisoned and subsequently banished from the Archducal Netherlands⁴⁷. In June 1617 Studder was desperate and turned to secretary Winwood. *His Majestie shall see howe muche his Agent preferes his owne endes before his Soveraynes honor and service.* Studder detailed his allegations in a long letter. Studder was ignorant of the good rapport between Winwood and Trumbull as a copy of Studder's letter was sent to Brussels⁴⁸.

Studder did not talk this time of a libel against the countess of Suffolk, but took the pamphlet that vexed king James himself, *Corona Regia*. It was Trumbull's fault that the printer had not been arrested and that the author not been disclosed. According to Studder the English agent had acted too slowly. Furthermore, he added, this matter would easily have been forgotten if it had been left alone. It would have stopped of its own accord. By persisting Trumbull endangered the honour of the king. Trumbull had sent a copy to France and to Germany to assure that news of *Corona Regia* reached the king from all over Europe,

to the ende that for the fault of some fewe he might exasperate his Majestie in generall against all Catholickes and Catholicke Princes, which is the cheefe matter of state this man showeth at, howsoever, in the meane space, he letteth the Kings honor goe to wracke.

While Sir John Bennet was sent to Brussels to get satisfaction, the English agent used all the means at his disposal

to bringe to publicke viewe matters of the like nature and to revive those buried disgracefull papers and libels, which I hearetofor had stopped in these parts and sent so long since for England to the Howardes, wech were never seene heere of manny untill nowe.

What Trumbull wanted to do was

to give me [Studder] a blowe or at least to gett some deformed sentence in his favor to bring with him into England, which this State may the rather graunt him because the Ambassador [Sir John Bennet] is departed with little satisfaction, they may hould it convenient to please the Agent.

The trouble continued in November 1617. Trumbull sent through a packet with a letter from Studder addressed to Winwood. Trumbull assured Winwood that Sir Thomas Edmondes and Thomas Arundell, the baron of Wardour, could inform him more fully what kind of man Studder was. Trumbull had been informed that Studder was sending libels against Trumbull to Scotland, where the king was at that time. Trumbull got his information from a man called Hennesgrave. When Trumbull had received that information he kept a close eye on Studder to be able to intercept the libels,

⁴⁶ HMCD, vi, 153 (letter 341), Williams to Trumbull, Whitehall, 29 March 1617.

⁴⁷ HMCD, vi, 155 (letter 346), Trumbull versus Studder, [March-September 1617].

⁴⁸ HMCD, vi, 206-208 (letter 463), copy, Studder to [Winwood], Brussels, 28 June 1617 (n.s.).

and as the privilege of my place, the lawes of God, of men & of nature doe pmit that every one should doe his beste to conserve himself; so I was invyted to open the couver of the lres directed to or hor: not knowing (I protest upon my salutation directly of indirectly) that the lres from him, to his matie, and I gave to the fellowe, that brought me them a fewe woords in yor hors. name, and as if it came from yow at Dunbarre.

Trumbull planned to use the man to acquire more information, but that plan failed. Trumbull ended with stating that because of the bad reputation of Studder, he did not think that he posed any danger,

I will humbly desyer yor hor in case his matie see, this lre, to beseech him not to take any ill ympression upon Studders caliminous & malicious informations, untill I may have seene whereof I am accused & hereunto made my answer.

Trumbull could refute anything Studder pretended⁴⁹. That same month Studder was reported to have an even more desperate plan: travel to England to inflict as much damage on Trumbull by any means possible. The English agent hoped this would not change the secretary's opinion⁵⁰. Dr. Thomas Lodge (1558–1625) assured Trumbull on this last point, *The businesse of Studder, that vagabond, is disclosed and discovered to the Lord by my frend and yours, Sir William Button, (1585-1655)*⁵¹.

Studder failed to grasp Winwood was Trumbull's chief patron and that king James was the main driving force behind *Corona Regia*. The English agent followed orders and instructions as will be seen in chapter 5. Needless to say that Studder's smear campaign did not yield anything of moment, except his own banishment. Secretary Winwood died in October 1617 and Trumbull from then on had to address his letters and dispatches to secretary Sir Thomas Lake. William Trumbull arrived in his home country in January 1618. Jean Thymon expressed the hope that he arrived safely and was now by the side of his wife. Thymon sent Trumbull word that Studder, who had been banished thrice, had taken refuge, according to some, in a monastery of the Bogards, according to others at Saint Trond⁵². While Trumbull was in England his secretary John Wolley managed the embassy in Brussels and kept his master informed on what had happened to Studder. Wolley reported the same as Thymon a day later. He was at a place called Opham/Ophal. He had a horse in Brussels which had been used on several occasions by one Rooke who travelled in the direction of Louvain. When Wolley met Rooke at the Church of St. Gudule he interpellated him:

He made some showe of beeing very sorrowfull for it, and he tould me if he had not understood that yow were offended with him, he would have come and done his duty to yow. To whome I said I was sure yow did not desire it neither would yow have anything to doe with him ... He tould me it was so fare frome his harte to doe anything that should be hurtfull to yow, that

⁴⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 422r-423v, Trumbull to Winwood or Lake Brussels, 12/22 November 1617.

⁵⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 426r, brief van Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 22 November 1617.

⁵¹ HMCD, vi, 338 (letter 728), Thomas Lodge to Trumbull, Lambert Hill, 4 December 1617; Halasz, 'Lodge, Thomas (1558–1625)'; Lancaster, 'Button, Sir William, first baronet (1585–1655)'.

⁵² HMCD, vi, 370 tletter 809), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., 31 January 1618 (n.s.).

at his last beeing with yow he did offer to imploy all his forced to make an agreement betweene yow and him. To whome I replied and tould him that yow had rather see the Roge, his Master, hanged as high as the steepel whereby wee stooode then such a thought whould enter into your harte⁵³.

The archdukes's Privy Council seems for once to have had a genuine interest in the case. Councillor de Steenhuys was reported to have said to a – further unidentified – principal gentleman that if Studder showed his face outside the monastery and inside the archdukes' territories, he would be arrested. As he did not have any luck with Winwood, Studder tried to convince Lake. To this end he sent a letter with a messenger. When the messenger returned with an unpleasing answer neither Studder nor Rooke believed the man had delivered the letters correctly. They refused to pay him⁵⁴.

Trumbull versus Studder was not the only case involving the latter. There were also cases pending with the keeper of Steenport, where Studder was garrisoned at the start of 1617, and an Italian gardener Benedetto Bellini. Thymon reported to Trumbull on the first case. The Italian priest had been found guilty of perjury. The keeper of Steenport would testify to the close relationship the priest and Studder developed while they were together imprisoned. Studder had such a sway over the priest, that the clergyman would have written down anything he was asked to. The unpaid messenger between Studder and Lake was prepared to make a statement. That same month Sir Thomas Studder demanded over 300 gilders for his expenses, on top of the expenses of the process. Wolley turned to Thymon for advice, who suggested to go the burgomaster, Mr. Scot, and the grefier. Wolley complained about the *unreasonable demand* made by *that wicked fellowe*. Studder was at that time in Brussels, not for his case with Trumbull but for the two other cases⁵⁵.

In April 1618 Studder secretly left for Spain. Rooke, his close associate, had been treated like all the others who had helped him, Wolley declared. He was left in the dark by Studder who did not even pay back the money he had lent. Spain was however not the way Studder went. In Frankfurt he had been seen by an Italian Francisco Balbani, who informed John Chandler, a merchant in Antwerp, who in turn reported this encounter to Trumbull. Studder was not on his way to Spain but to Venice. He had given Balbani the impression that he had left the archdukes' territories discontented.

He attributed the cause to 'certaine letters hee wrote into England to certaine personages of principall qualitie, which being produced were contarie to their true meaninge misinterpreted as to have beine written to the disservice and prejudice of the Archduke,

⁵³ HMCD, vi, 372 (letter 818), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 1 February 1618 (n.s.).

⁵⁴ HMCD, vi, 375 (letter 821), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 8 February 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 379 (letter 830), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 15 February 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 383 (letter 838), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 22 February 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 389 (letter 849), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 8 March 1618 (n.s.).

⁵⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 250r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 January 1617; HMCD, vi, 400-401 (letter 872), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [22 March 1618 (n.s.) endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 398-399 (letter 867), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 29 March 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 410 (letter 891), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 25 April 1618 (n.s.).

but he did not mention his dispute with the English agent⁵⁶. Studder had been able to make a contract with the Venetians for 100 ducats/month. At his arrival in Venice he visited the Sir Henry Wotton, James' ambassador there. Studder complained that there was a big discrepancy between what he was paid and his merits. He tried to enlist Wotton remedy this injustice. The *Colonello Inglese Catholico* was so arrogant he helped Wotton make his decision not to assist him. Studder was dismissed from Venetian service⁵⁷. William Trumbull's feelings will have corresponded with those of Chandler when he wrote,

It will be a relief to you to know that he is gone, and will no longer be present to exploit the patronage of important people to insult you. I hope we shall before long hear that 'the fleshe and skynne of that viper wilbe converted into an ingredient for the making of Mithridate, for I suppose he hath spitt out all his venom'⁵⁸.

The English regiment never became the spearhead of the army of Flanders. The figures Edmondes records vary from 300 in August 1606, 400 in January 1607 to 200 in September 1607, by which time the son of Sir William Stanley had taken charge of the English troops⁵⁹. The English soldiers figure only sporadically in the correspondence of Edmondes's successor, William Trumbull. Trumbull does not mention an English regiment any more, only English companies. In July 1613 he reported that the company of Studder had been dissolved and had joined a Scottish company under captain Paul Raddock⁶⁰. A next mention was after the dissolution of Parliament in 1614, the so-called Addled Parliament. Trumbull reported that he had been amazed at the early end of it. Rumours of rebellion circulated in the Southern Low Countries, which Trumbull contradicted:

To conclude: These men that learne no manner of practise unthought upon, that may any wayes undermyne, or enfeeble the foundations of yor Matie estates; have ben tampering with Sr. Edward Parkham. the 2. Captens Blountes, mr. Nevell (the pretended earl of Westmorelande) and Sr. Thomas Studder, in this tyme of trouble and confussion to raise a Regiment of Englishe. Bur Sr. Edward Parkham and the Blountes (as I am informed) have refused to medle in that bussines, unlesse the Archd. will promisse to procure them yor Mats permission and approbation.

The English regiment, in Trumbull's, opinion was a danger to all Protestant nations in Europe and could easily be deployed in England or in other conflicts, such as the Jülich-Kleve succession crises, which is contradicted by Trumbull's own reports on the weakness of the regiment. The archdukes tried to augment their numbers by luring

⁵⁶ HMCD, vi, 413-414 (letter 901), Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 7 May 1618 (n.s.); two other letters referred to this meeting in Frankfurt, HMCD, vi, 414 (letter 902), Wake to Trumbull, s.l., 7 May 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 415 (letter 905), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 9 May 1618 (n.s.).

⁵⁷ HMCD, vi, 501 (letter 1084), Wotton to Trumbull, Venice, 10/20 September 1618; HMCD, vi, 585 (letter 1265), Wotton to Trumbull, Venice, 19/29 November 1618.

⁵⁸ HMCD, vi, 413-414 (letter 901), Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 7 May 1618 (n.s.).

⁵⁹ SP 77/8 f^o 160v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 20 August 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 21r-21v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 7 January 1607; SP 77/8/2 f^o 136v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 30 September 1607.

⁶⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 300v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 23 June 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 307v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 14 July 1613.

Englishmen from the service of the United Provinces, but without much success. Archduke Albert told Trumbull he did not immediately require an English regiment and would consult with James about it during winter. Trumbull advised his sovereign that if an English regiment should be formed it should be put under the leadership of Sir Edward Parham, a man who Winwood wanted to return the following year to England⁶¹. Besides being well affected to the king, he also had a fortune in England which would provide an extra incentive to being loyal. Trumbull does not elaborate any more on the English regiment⁶².

The English and Scottish soldiers serving the archdukes were employed in the second Jülich-Kleve crisis in 1614. Trumbull reported to secretary Winwood that they were among the forces of Spinola and would possibly form the basis of a regiment under the leadership of Edmund Neville (born before 1555, died in or after 1620)⁶³, the so-called earl of Westmorland⁶⁴. Westmorland had fled to the Southern Netherlands in 1614 due to a liaison with Francelliana Townsend. Abbot warned Trumbull writing, *he is a beggar and a bankrout to a high degree ... being sued in the Ecclesiasticall court by his former wife, hee hath used strange delaies*⁶⁵. Specific references to their participation in other conflicts have not been unearthed, but it stands to reason, that these mercenaries took part in each conflict.

Like the English regiment its Scottish counterpart did not amount to much. The Scottish regiment, less than 400 men strong, was commanded by colonel Simple in June 1606⁶⁶. Within that regiment problems equally persisted. Because of the treatment they got at the hand of the archdukes and their discontent with Simple some of the Scotsmen defected to the United Provinces to the point that the Scottish regiment was almost dissolved by August 1606. By January following it had been reduced to two companies⁶⁷. After that time the Scots serving the archdukes led a shadowy existence in the diplomatic correspondence of Edmondes and Trumbull.

In the fall of 1614 the marquis of Spinola considered putting the Englishmen and Scotsmen which he had among his troops in one single regiment to be commanded by Westmorland. There were other suitors who hastened to Brussels, such as Allen Norris, a kinsman of Sir William Stanley, and captain John Blount. Norris had received a license to travel for three years from the English government in March 1603⁶⁸. On the matter of recruitment for the new regiment Trumbull noted that,

It is not intended to drawe the said company ymmediatly out of England; but first to frame it out of such of the nation as are nowe serving in the Army: and afterwards to encrease it by the

⁶¹ Cf. *Infra*.

⁶² SP 77/11 f^o 89r-89v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 30 June 1614, SP 77/11 f^o 93r, Trumbull to Winwood, 30 June 1614.

⁶³ Loomie, 'Neville, Edmund (*b.* before 1555, *d.* in or after 1620)'.

⁶⁴ SP 77/11 f^o 157r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 September 1614.

⁶⁵ HMCD, v, 78-79 (letter 186), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 December 1614.

⁶⁶ SSP 77/8 f^o 128r-129v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 28 June 1606.

⁶⁷ SP 77/8 f^o 155v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 6 Augustus 1606 SP 77/8/2 f^o 21r-21v, Edmondes to Salisbury, 7 January 1607.

⁶⁸ CSPD, James I, 1603-1610, 205.

*admitting of such men, as remove from the States of the United Provinces; and others which shalbe sente unto them by the Jesuitts, and ill affected Englishe*⁶⁹.

The few Englishmen and Scots who joined the service of the archdukes were incorporated in the English companies, as is apparent in September 1617,

*In these Provinces nowe governed by the Archdukes there be more of his Majesties vassalls poisoned in their relligion (and consequently in their alleageance and loyalty towards him) then in all the rest of Europe, not excepting Rome and Italye; for there are (besyds many private familyes of gentlemen of good worth lyving here, the Irishe Regiment and the Englishe and Scottishe Companyes) about 20 monasteryes, colleges and Seminaryes of his Majesties vassalls in these parts, which are no better then so many seedplots of practyses and conspiracyes against his Majestie his kingdoms and the Relligion whereof he maketh profession*⁷⁰.

Trumbull speaks of English and Scottish ‘companies’, while mentioning an Irish ‘regiment’⁷¹.

From 1618 onwards Trumbull mentions the Scottish regiment more frequently, because of its possible new commander, Archibald Campbell (1575/1576-1638)⁷², seventh earl of Argyll. Returning from a trip to Spa Argyll, his wife and two sons visited Brussels and converted to Roman Catholicism. The earl *pretendeth the command of a newe Regiment of his mats Subjects*. Trumbull was sure this would be detrimental to the fate of the United Provinces. He advised his Carleton (1574-1632)⁷³ in The Hague, that he should acquaint prince Maurice of Nassau (1567-1625)⁷⁴, *and either by his credit wth or Souueraigne; or the power of the P. Elector Palatine [Frederick V], dashe the Earles [Argyll] dessigne, before it come to maturity*. Trumbull added that all this should be done without use of Trumbull’s name, *because it would here make me extremely odious, and perhaps doe me no good in England*⁷⁵.

After the birth and baptism of a son, Argyll set out for Spain on 11/21 September 1619, together with a Mr. Bedingfield. On his departure he told one of Trumbull’s acquaintances that he hoped and had been assured that he would get the command of a regiment of 4.000 or 5.000 men. He also expressed the wish that before his death *he would doe some such memorable, and remarckable service for the King of Spaine, as all Europe, should ringe of his fame*. Trumbull did not only inform the secretary of state, Sir Robert Naunton (1563-1635)⁷⁶, but also Francis Cottington (1579-1652)⁷⁷, English agent at the Spanish court (October 1609-August 1611, December 1615-October 1622, July 1629-March 1631). Cottington kept Trumbull informed of the new guest of the Spanish king who arrived in Spain in November. He was defrayed by the Spanish king, for which he got 25 ducats on

⁶⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 157r, Trumbull to Winwood, 21 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 172r-172v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 21 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 8 December 1614.

⁷⁰ HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629) draft by Trumbull to Winwood from Brussels.

⁷¹ HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, 26 September 1617.

⁷² Callow, ‘Campbell, Archibald, seventh earl of Argyll (1575/6–1638)’.

⁷³ Reeve, ‘Carleton, Dudley, Viscount Dorchester (1574–1632)’.

⁷⁴ For Maurice of Nassau see, van Deursen, *Maurits van Nassau 1567-1625*.

⁷⁵ SP 77/13 f^o 70r-70v, Trumbull to [Carleton], 1 October 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 73r, Trumbull to Lake, 23 September 1618.

⁷⁶ Schreiber, ‘Naunton, Sir Robert (1563–1635)’.

⁷⁷ Pogson, ‘Cottington, Francis, first Baron Cottington (1579?–1652)’.

a weekly basis during his stay in Madrid. The renegade Scottish earl visited Diego Sarmiento de Acuña (1567-1626)⁷⁸, the conde de Gondomar and the English Jesuits, his main supporters. Rumours in Antwerp that Argyll had gotten the command of a regiment were fallacious, as Trumbull's correspondent Cottington assured that nothing had yet been decided⁷⁹.

The conde de Gondomar who was in Brussels in July 1618, was the advocate for the earl with the archdukes. He employed an unnamed courtier to sound Trumbull on the possibility James VI/I would give Argyll permission to join the Spanish forces. Trumbull only gave a general answer, hoping to find out more about their intentions. Trumbull reported the answer he got from England concerning Argyll's request. London was clear. The defector was to expect nothing at the hands of the king if he enlisted in foreign service without licence from the king. The English agent in Brussels feared that the power of the Spaniards in England was so great that this resolution would be reverted, Trumbull confessed to Carleton. Argyll promised to abide by the orders of the king, but he and his wife remained at Brussels. Argyll was summoned back to Scotland, Lake requested Trumbull to found out information about Argyll and what he intended to do, because it was *a summons which he will ignore at his peril*⁸⁰. He was proclaimed a traitor on the steps of the Mercat Cross in Edinburgh in February 1619.

News of Argyll's return to the Southern Low Countries confirmed Trumbull's suspicions. Although he had gotten an *Ayuda de costa* of 6.000 ducats he had not obtained the command of a regiment. Argyll's return journey took over a month and he arrived back April 1620. After his return Argyll did not stop soliciting for the command of a regiment, but there were others who equally wanted such a position, e.g. Westmorland. Trumbull's information lead him to think that one of them, but Trumbull did not know which one, *is thought to be in a fayre way to be advanced* at the end of April 1620. Not a fortnight later Trumbull thought it was going to be Westmorland. He furthermore was agrieved that our

*nation shalbe drawnen (if his Suite be granted) to fight one against another (as did the Sonnes of Dacmus): by the ayde, and ministry of the Caball of or. Espagnolized Jesuitts, who since the making of or. peace wth Spaine, haue donne more harme to or. Contrey, then did the Inuincible nauy, in the yeare 1588 and don Juan de Laguilar, by his descent at Kinsale in Ireland*⁸¹.

⁷⁸ Redworth, 'Sarmiento de Acuña, Diego, count of Gondomar in the Spanish nobility (1567–1626)'.

⁷⁹ SP 77/13 f^o 285r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussel, 16/26 June 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 292r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, 26 June 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 311v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, 29 July 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 315r-315v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 6/16 August 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 355r-356v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 24 September 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 363r-363v, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 30 September 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 377r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 6.16 October 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 419v-420r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 18/28 November 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 451v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 9/19 December 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 455v, copy, Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 12 December 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 465r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 30 December 1619; SP 77/14 f^o 6v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 13/23 January 1620.

⁸⁰ SP 77/13 f^o 75r-75v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, 23 September 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 92r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, 21/31 October 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 93r-93v, Trumbull to Carleton, 2 November 1618 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 95v-96r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, 29 October 1618; HMCD, vi, 617 (letter 1337), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 20 December 1618.

⁸¹ SP 77/14 f^o 92r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 8/18 May 1620.

Trumbull was referring to the crisis that was developing in the Palatinate due to the acceptance of the Bohemian crown by the elector Palatine. The suit of Westmorland was supported, according to Trumbull, by the *hollowe fathers*, the Jesuits, and *the wholle rable of or. fugi[t]ives, and ill affected Countrymen*. He was suing for the assistance of the Spanish ambassador in England to obtain James's permission to levy troops in his realms⁸². The conde of Gondomar had written, according to Trumbull, a letter in his own hand to king James to further the reconciliation between king James and the Earl⁸³. At the end of December there still was no decision which one of the two would get a regiment⁸⁴. A year later, at the end of November 1621 it became clear that a new regiment of Englishmen and Scotsmen would be levied totalling 2.000 men divided into ten companies and under the command of the earl of Argyll, Westmorland died in the Spanish Netherlands in or after 1620. Argyll, however, promised to resign his patent at the outbreak of conflict between the kings of Spain and England. Moreover, he stipulated that he would not be employed in the Palatinate, which the Catholic League under the duke of Bavaria and the marquis of Spinola had invaded in the fall of 1620. A few weeks later the number for the regiment was augmented from ten to twenty companies, which each would consist of 190 or 200 men. It would take four to six months to transport the men into the Spanish Netherlands⁸⁵.

In 1622 there was again a Scottish and English regiment, headed respectively by the earl of Argyll and by Robert Hudleston, who was appointed in May 1622 by the infanta⁸⁶. The new English and Scottish regiment was not without its problems. As in the previous period Trumbull sent reports to London on the weakness of both. At the start of 1623 he had gathered that plans were made to reform or to raise the ten weakest companies in the English and Scottish regiments. Argyll commanded but 600 men. Hudleston's command was shortlived and was soon replace by Lord Vaux. Edward Vaux (1588-1661)⁸⁷ commanded the regiment between 1622 and 1624. It counted 1.000 to 1.500 men. Twelve companies were reformed: seven Scottish and five English⁸⁸. There was also talk of new recruits for those regiments. These were granted on the condition that they would be transported by the contractors at their own expenses to Dunkirk⁸⁹.

⁸² SP 77/14 f^o 10v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 27 January 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 77r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 18/28 April 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 78r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 20/30 April 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 82r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 27 April/7 May 1620; SP 77/14 92r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Bruxelles, 8/18 May 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 94r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 11/21 May 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 100r, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 20/30 May 1620;

⁸³ SP 77/14 f^o 104r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 25 May 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 134r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 21 June/1 July 1620;

⁸⁴ SP 77/14 f^o 250r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 5/15 December 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 275v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 27 January/6 February 1621.

⁸⁵ SP 77/14 f^o 549r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 29 November 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 556v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 1/11 December 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 577r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 21/31 December 1621.

⁸⁶ SP 77/15 f^o 137r, *Infanta Isabella – appointing Robt. Hudleston to command an English regiment*, 22 May/2 June 1622.

⁸⁷ Woudhuysen, 'Vaux, Thomas, second Baron Vaux (1509–1556)'.

⁸⁸ SP 77/16 f^o 13v, Trumbull to Calvert, 16/26 January 1623; SP 77/16 f^o 17r, Trumbull to [Carleton], 17/27 January 1623; SP 77/16 f^o 58v-59r, Trumbull to Calvert, 13/23 February 1623.

⁸⁹ SP 77/16 f^o 92r, Trumbull to Calvert, 15/25 March 1625.

For a large part Trumbull only seems to have informed the secretary of state and the king of what went on in the English and Scottish regiment. At the end of his period in Brussels, and after the death of king James VI/I in March 1625 the agent also advised London. If Charles I wanted to be served by his subjects in the Army of Flanders, Trumbull requested instructions. He was sure that he could convince some of the best and most eminent captains and officers to return home. The colonels of the regiments and the Irish men altogether were another matter altogether, *for they are aboue my understandinge, and meane shortly to be dominators in their Country, as the Kinge of Spaine wrytes himself, in Asia and Africa*⁹⁰. As before the English and Scottish regiment did not amount to much in 1625. After the arrival of the conde de Gondomar in Brussels the Army of Flanders was reformed. According to Trumbull it was common sense that the king of Spain would reform two regiments which were not able to put more than 400 men into the field. The results of the reformation were two new companies: one under the command of sergeant-major Raresby, which marched towards Dixmude in August 1625, and one under Sir James Crichton [Crichton?], which remained in Herentals. There were still two other companies with subjects of Charles I: that of Allen Norris at Groenlo (Grolle) and that of Paul Raddock at Oldenseel⁹¹.

After Trumbull's departure from Brussels in October 1625, there was still a report, although probably not from Trumbull, on the English and Scottish regiment, viz. the officers and commanders of both regiments. The English regiment was commanded by Sir Edward Parham, whom Trumbull already had recommended in 1614 to king James, and counted eighteen officers, including an auditor and a sergeant-major. The Scottish regiment was still under the leadership of the earl of Argyll and twenty officers, also including an auditor and a sergeant-major⁹². With the start of the Anglo-Spanish war (1625-1630) the number of recruits from the British Isles and Ireland fell again, but recovered after the peace treaty. Throughout the 1630s, according to Parker, there was an average of 4.000 British soldiers serving in the Army of Flanders. In the 1640s recruitment again was diminished due to the Confederation of Kilkenny in Ireland and the outbreak of the First Civil War (1641-1642). This lasted until the victory of Parliament which entailed the migration of many defeated royalists and Catholics to Spain, France and the Spanish Netherlands. The English troops in the Army of Flanders returned to England together with Charles II at the Restoration after the Cromwellian Protectorate⁹³.

⁹⁰ SP 77/18 f^o 170v, Trumbull to Conway, 23 June 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 178r, Trumbull to Conway, 30 June 1625.

⁹¹ SP 77/18 f^o 184r-184v, Trumbull to Conway, 21/31 July 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 189r, Trumbull to Conway, 21/31 July 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 201v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 4/14 August 1625.

⁹² SP 77/18 f^o 257r; the same list can be found on 258r, although spelling of the personal names differ slightly. E.g. Captain Thomas Bluns becomes Captain Thomas Blunt.

⁹³ Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road 1567-1659*, 52, 226.

The Irish regiment

The only regiment that flourished during the entire period was the Irish regiment. It figures more prominently than its English and Scottish counterparts. Edmondès reported in February 1606 that it had one thousand soldiers and as many women and children⁹⁴. The recruitment of Irishmen for the archdukes's service suffered the same setback as the English and Scottish recruitment in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot⁹⁵. The numbers of Irishmen serving the Irish regiment varied throughout the period. According to historian John McGurk the Irish regiment that was formed in September 1605 counted fifteen companies with a total of 1.600 or 1.700 hundred men⁹⁶. Henry, on the other hand, counts only 1.000 men under the command of Henry O'Neill in the Irish regiment at the end of 1605. Henry stressed that these soldiers came from the Irish already serving in Flanders and Spain⁹⁷.

Looking at the figures offered by Parker on the British recruits in the Army of Flanders and those of the Irish given by Henry, it is clear that the majority serving the archdukes were not Scotsmen and Englishmen but Irishmen. The total of British recruits dwindled from 1.468 in 1611 to 1.154 in 1620. The number of Irishmen serving Albert and Isabella at that time was about 1.000⁹⁸. The period between 1606 and 1608 was characterized by exceptional growth: from between 1.000 and 1.200 in June 1606 to 1.400 in July 1607 to between 1.600 and 1.700 in November 1607, the final number delivered by Sir Thomas Edmondès. Between 1608 and 1610 the numbers dwindled to 1.000 men. This probably can be linked to the armistice in 1607 and the start of the 'Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621)s. The same tendency can be seen in the entire Army of Flanders: 63.455 in April 1588, 49.765 in March 1607 and finally 15.259 in March 1609. During that time a further cause for the decline in the Irish regiment was sickness. According to the reports of Sir Thomas Edmondès about 400 to 500 men of the 1.600 or 1.700 were sick. Furthermore, there was a directive from before 1609 from Philip III to archduke Albert which limited the Irish serving in the regiment to 1.000 men. During the Truce the numbers serving in the Irish regiment in the Spanish Netherlands was maintained a little above 1.000, but Irishmen were also serving the archdukes in other regiments⁹⁹. According to Trumbull there were 1.500 men in the regiment in August 1612¹⁰⁰, 1.020 in October 1613, 1.050 in 1614. The total of British soldiers serving in 1616 was 1.070 but this included two companies of Scots and Englishmen, respectively commanded by Paul Raddock (162 men) and Allen Norris (127 men). In 1616 there were a total of 791 Irishmen divided in eight companies serving the archdukes, which would put the number

⁹⁴ SP 77/8 f^o 25r-25v, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 February 1606; Henry, *The Irish military community in Spanish Flanders 1586-1621*, 74-94; Henry, 'Women 'Wild Geese', 1585-1625: Irish women and migration to European armies in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries'.

⁹⁵ SP 77/8 f^o 9v-10r, draft, [Salisbury] to Edmondès, 12 February 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 11r-11v, [Salisbury] to Edmondès, 27 February 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 50r-50v, Edmondès to Salisbury, 7 March 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 12r-12v, [Salisbury] to Edmondès, 21 March 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 66r-66v, Edmondès to Salisbury, 5 April 1606.

⁹⁶ McGurk, 'Wild Geese. The Irish in European armies (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries)', 39.

⁹⁷ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 62-62 and 167-168.

⁹⁸ Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 271-272; Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders, 1586-1621*, 65-66.

⁹⁹ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 66.

¹⁰⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 215v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 19 August 1612.

in 1616 to a total of 1.080, so the letter writer must have made a mistake adding up¹⁰¹. Philip III's directive was considered restrictive in August 1616. Archduke Albert wanted to accept the company of Roderick O'Donoghue, which came from France, into his Irish regiment, but the number of 1.000 soldiers had already been reached.

After the end of the Truce in 1621 the numbers serving in the Irish regiment soared to 2.500. A year later the total of British troops was 3.812; again it is clear that the Irish regiment was most prominent among the British regiments serving the king of Spain and the infanta Isabella. Edmondes had already mentioned the prominent position of the Irish regiment in 1607, complaining to Albert that the Irish regiment got the best treatment compared to the regiments of all other nations¹⁰².

With the start of the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621) it seemed not unlikely that the Irish regiment would be disbanded. Colonel Henry O'Neill had already voiced his worries to Philip III in 1608 when significant numbers in the Irish regiment were sick or leaving. *It is of great importance to the service of Your Majesty and the benefit to our country that the Irish regiment should be preserved.* Until his death in 1616 he pestered, according to Henry, the Spanish Council on the *conservation*, pay and living quarters of the Irish regiment. He also obtained support from pope Paul V for this cause¹⁰³. Parker's assessment for the rise and fall of British troops also applied to the Irish regiment. Between 1632 and 1646 at least five further Hispano-Irish regiments were created. A fresh migration was caused by the conquest of Ireland in the 1650s by Cromwell¹⁰⁴. Jennings discerns an Irish regiment in the Spanish Netherlands until at least 1684¹⁰⁵. After the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659), between France and Spain, a number of Irish regiments in the Netherlands were sent to Spain to strengthen the forces engaged against Portugal, according to Parker¹⁰⁶. There are few references in which conflicts the Irish regiment, like its English and Scottish counterpart were employed. Brendan Jennings argues that they must have been employed in each and every one of them. They certainly were at the Battle of Nieuport (1600), the siege of Ostend (1601-1604), they helped Spinola capture Grolle and Rheinberg and helped him in his attempts to enter Veluwe (1606), they were present at the siege of Bergen-Op-Zoom in 1622 and defeated with Spinola Ernest of Mansfeld near Fleurus that same year. With Spinola they besieged Breda which fell in 1625. During the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621) there were two major conflicts: the Jülich-Kleve succession crises and the start of the Thirty Years' War. In the second Jülich-Kleve crisis Spinola entered the disputed territories and occupied several cities, e.g. the strategically important Wesel. In 1620 he entered the Palatinate and conquered large parts of it. Presumably the British troops were part of each military expedition¹⁰⁷.

The Irish regiment provides a rare view of espionage in the diplomatic world. In August 1612 Fergus Donnell, son of Hugh Donnell of Ten Kelly in the county of Lese,

¹⁰¹ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 147-148; EGC, reg. 179, f^o 162-163.

¹⁰² Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 63-66 and 174-175; Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 271-272; SP 77/8/2 f^o 182r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 18 November 1607.

¹⁰³ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621*, 112.

¹⁰⁴ Murtagh, *Irish soldiers abroad, 1600-1800*, 295.

¹⁰⁵ Jennins, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 24. A list is given of all the different regiments with their officers, pp. 3-24.

¹⁰⁶ Parker, *The Army of Flanders*, 226.

¹⁰⁷ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 54-55.

approached Trumbull¹⁰⁸. He was a member of the Irish regiment and was held in high esteem by his countrymen. He offered *to give yor matie intelligence, in these parts of such practises as should be contryved among his countrymen against yor mats realms*. The English agent requested his sovereign to treat these overtures with the highest degree of secrecy as the Spaniards and the Irishmen had many spies about the English court. Furthermore he requested a cipher for the conveying of secure messages¹⁰⁹. During several meetings in fall and winter 1612 and spring 1613 it became clear what Donnell wanted in return for his services: protection from the king, a life-long annuity of 120 pounds and amnesty for his offences¹¹⁰. The initial response from Sir Thomas Overbury (*bap.* 1581-1613)¹¹¹, secretary to Lord Rochester, did not yield much as he told Trumbull to

be vigilant and large in promises toward such as only offer their service and for such as perform the king will prove as bountiful, nor shall you want means to recompense merit, and you of all the rest it behoves to look about you, for your residence is in the shop of wickedness.

Afterwards the letters from Rochester and Overbury were more forthcoming. Trumbull even received money to pay Donnell. The English agent promised to take good care of that money, which was the public treasure of his country¹¹².

The pension he requested seems to have been awarded as Trumbull was ordered to pay him 30 pounds which was the first quarter by February 1613¹¹³. But at the court of king James financial business was never that straightforward. Overbury, in the name of Rochester, requested Trumbull to draw up a draft for the pension and the pardon. The allowance was only to be as long as it pleased king James and not for life¹¹⁴. In May 1613 Donnell stressed that he wanted an allowance for life in exchange for the danger he put himself into. When James VI/I would recall him he would loose the 40 crowns he got from the Spanish king. In a sense it would more profitable for him to remain in Spanish service, but his sense of loyalty and duty towards king James was too great to contemplate such a course. Trumbull *represented unto him the greatnes of his present entertainment, and the punctuall payment thereof; wth the little fruicte wch his matie had as yet reaped for the monney delivered him by myself*. The English agent paid him a further 30 pounds, out of his own pocket, as a token of good will¹¹⁵.

The pardon was somewhat more difficult to obtain. Fergus Donnell wanted to remain anonymous in the Spanish Netherlands. If this pardon was passed under the Great Seal, then any hope of secrecy would be in vain. Rochester suggested that it could be under

¹⁰⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 303r.

¹⁰⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 217r-217v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 4 September 1612.

¹¹⁰ SP 77/10f^o 228r-228v, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 8 October 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 231r-232v, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 8 October 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 243r-244r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 6 December 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 253r_254r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 14 January 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 263r-264r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 26 February 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 286r, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 16 April 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 292r-293r, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 18 May 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 303r, *Grant of Pension to FergusDonnell*, June 1613.

¹¹¹ Considine, 'Overbury, Sir Thomas (*bap.* 1581, *d.* 1613)'.

¹¹² HMCD, iii, 369, Overbury to Trumbull 15 September [1612].

¹¹³ SP 77/10 f^o 263r, Trumbull to [Rochester], 26 February 1613.

¹¹⁴ HMCD, iv, 83, Overbury to Trumbull, 4 April 1613.

¹¹⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 292r-293r, Trumbull to Rochester, 18 May 1613.

the signet with the recognition of his services and the reason why it was not under the Great Seal¹¹⁶. As mentioned before, it was Trumbull's task to draft a pardon and send it to the king's favourite. In May 1613 Donnell requested that the pardon would be *in forma debita* as it had already been sued for by his father. He assumed that no one would discover it, if it were passed *as quietly as may be, and granted to the father, for the meanes to withdrawe that partie from the service of Spaine*¹¹⁷. By the end of February 1613 Donnell had requested the assurance of freedom of worship when he would be called back in case his cover was blown. Trumbull told him that the latter would be difficult, but if his services were extraordinary the English agent would *doe my best endeavor to procure him contentment, and satisfaction, so farre forth as it might be agreeable to the State, and, and not preiudiciall to his mats. affaires.*

Early in 1615 Donnell was summoned by his father to Ireland and was threatened to be disinherited. Trumbull requested the king to grant him leave to spend five or six months in Ireland. After that time he could return to the Southern Netherlands or serve the monarch in Ireland. Donnell requested to meet James VI/I on his way to Ireland. Trumbull also informed Somerset of these plans. According to the English agent Donnell had excelled in his work, but, stressed Trumbull, his pension had not been paid in the past three years¹¹⁸. On his way he would inform Somerset on the news about Ireland and the earl of Tyrone. Furthermore he would relate to Somerset whom should be recalled from the Catholic Low Countries. Trumbull ended with stating that Fergus Donnell was a Catholic but submitted himself wholly to the obedience of king James. Trumbull requested Somerset and Arthur Chichester (1563-1625)¹¹⁹, Lord Deputy of Ireland (1605-1616), for toleration, as already had been granted to others. Donnell certainly was in England by April 1615 as is clear from a letter from Charles Howard (1536-1624), first earl of Nottingham and Lord Admiral of England to Trumbull. Trumbull used Donnell on his way to Ireland as a courier for conveying a letter addressed to Nottingham, whom Trumbull had known in the 1590s during his stay at Hampton Court Palace¹²⁰. Probably Donnell never returned to the Spanish Netherlands as there is no further mention of him in Trumbull's correspondence.

Apparently Trumbull did not correspond in writing with Fergus Donnell while he worked as a spy. It is also possible that Trumbull destroyed their letters to prevent them falling into the wrong hands. Between August 1612 and October 1613 Trumbull mentions at least seven meetings with Donnell in Antwerp and Brussels. The information Donnell delivered to Trumbull concerned a possible invasion of Ireland, persistent rumour since the end of the Irish rebellion in the final years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. Overbury recommended a book on the subject to Trumbull which supported this almost paranoid fear, *A discovery of the true cause why Ireland was never*

¹¹⁶ HMCD, iii, 449, Rochester to Trumbull, Whitehall, 31 December 1612; Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders, 1586-1621*, 67.

¹¹⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 292r-293r, Trumbull to Rochester, 18 May 1613.

¹¹⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 259r-259v, Trumbull to Somerset, 28 February 1615.

¹¹⁹ McCavitt, 'Chichester, Arthur, Baron Chichester (1563-1625)'.

¹²⁰ SP 77/11 f^o 257r, Trumbull to James VI/I, 28 February 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 259r-259v, Trumbull to Somerset, 28 February 1615; HMCD, vi, 197-198 (letter 410), Donnell to Trumbull, 18 April 1615; McDermott, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536-1624)'.

entirely subdued until the beginning of his Majesty's happy reign, by Sir John Davis (bap. 1569-1626)¹²¹, Attorney-General for Ireland (*sic*, he was in fact Solicitor-General) published in 1612. During their first meeting in August 1612 Donnell revealed a conversation he had with an Irish Franciscan friar who was close to colonel John O'Neill, commander of the Irish regiment. The sway of the Irish Franciscans on John O'Neill was evident. After the departure of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, O'Neill, a minor at that time, had been left under the charge of the Augustinian Canonesses and later of the Irish Franciscans in Louvain¹²². The friar told Donnell, of some greate, and secrett practise in hand, as well against yor matie, and yor realms; as against the reste of the Protestant Princes¹²³.

Trumbull gave Fargus Donnell the advice to return to his garrison in Antwerp, to observe the dispositions, and motions of his countrymen. The English agent, after receiving instructions from both Overbury and Rochester¹²⁴, thereafter exhorted Donnell to return to Brussels as soon as possible to negotiate the terms of his employment and to give him instructions. Donnell did not come to Brussels, but Trumbull travelled to Antwerp and succeeded in setting up a secret meeting at the start of December. Donnell was constant in his intentions. According to his information there was a confederacy between pope Paul V and king Philip III. If a conflict broke out between Spain and England this Catholic alliance would send 6.000 soldiers to Ireland: 2.000 in Lemster, 2.000 in Ulster, 1.000 in Munster and 1.000 in Connaught. Four Franciscan friars had been sent to prepare the way by stirring up sedition in that Country, and debauching his mats subiects to joyne wth his enemyes. Trumbull wanted specific details such as a timetable and the points of entry that would be used. Donnell did not have access to that information but promised to do his utmost to discover them. Letters from Naples and Spain, Trumbull added, confirmed that there could be a rebellion in Ireland during March or April 1613, which would be supported by foreign assistance. To get more information, Trumbull had instructed Donnell and other Irishmen,

to addresse themselves to the Jesuitts, as the fountayne, from whence all trecherous practises doe floe: and they have yeilded to my admonition: But the Irish franciscane fryers at Louvayne, (and spetially their Gardian called Hugh Mac Angan, now lately comme from Rome, a man well learned in Philosophie, but more in policy, and treason) are the Oracles of that nation, and rule the reste.

The details Fargus Donnell divulged became more and more revealing: transport of canons and ammunition out of Poland, the place of choice to invade was Munster which they would subsequently fortify, besides the eight companies in Flanders there were as many in Spain and in France there were 800 Irishmen living as beggars and devoted to Tyrone¹²⁵. The earl of Tyrone and Rury O'Donnell (1574/1575-1608), first earl of

¹²¹ Kelsey, 'Davies, Sir John (bap. 1569, d. 1626)'; John Davies, *A discoverie of the state of Ireland: with the true causes why that Kingdom was neuer entirely subdued, nor brought vnder obedience of the crowne of England, vntill the beginning of His Maiesties most happie raigne* (London, William Laggard, 1613) can be found in the National Library of Ireland, Ir 941 d 6.

¹²² Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*, 5.

¹²³ SP 77/10 f^o 217r-217v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 4 September 1612.

¹²⁴ The letter of the latter is no longer extant.

¹²⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 253r-254r, Trumbull to [Rochester], 14 January 1613.

Tyrconnell¹²⁶ had fled Ireland in 1607. This *Flight of the Earls* is well documented in historiography¹²⁷. Planning to sail to Spain, their ship landed in Normandy. The French king gave them permission to travel to the Southern Netherlands where they became a major concern for the English diplomat in Brussels. Trumbull especially worried about what kind of reception they could expect in the Catholic Low Countries.

At the end of February 1613 Fergus Donnell assured Trumbull that the plans for an invasion were not yet finalized. In the next three or four months the scheme would not be put into action. The Provincial of the Irish Franciscans had been sent to Ireland recently to seduce the local population away from their allegiance to king James. Originally Donnell stated that the Irish regiment would be sent to Ireland before Easter 1613. To counter this, Donnell told Trumbull, he could select 500 of the best men to join the services of James and be sent to Ireland, the United Provinces or Germany. Trumbull instructed him to observe the designs of the Jesuits and the Franciscans, *who are the oracles and directors of the Irish nation*¹²⁸. But at the end of February Donnell assured the English agent that nothing would happen within the next three or four months¹²⁹. Trumbull mentions another meeting that took place in Antwerp during fall 1613. Donnell told the English agent that king James should be especially mindful when the fleet for the West Indies departed or returned. These were excellent times for those wanting to surprise the English administration in Ireland¹³⁰.

One of the possible avenues that could be explored, according to Trumbull, was the breaking of the Irish regiment if conflict arose between the crowns of Spain and England, as Donnell already had suggested. As he had been instructed Trumbull sought additional sources for information. He got acquainted with other Irishmen he could use for to that end. He, as instructed, asked them *to apply themselves to the Jesuits*¹³¹. In February 1613 Trumbull forwarded a design of another Irishman, Edward Eustace. Salisbury had granted Trumbull the permission to give Eustace a passport in December 1611¹³². He had been banished from Spain because of his services to Sir Charles Cornwallis, the English ambassador in Madrid¹³³. He requested Trumbull's help in securing a passport to travel to

¹²⁶ Silke, 'O'Donnell, Rury, styled first earl of Tyrconnell (1574/5-1608)'.

¹²⁷ Boyle, 'The flight of the earls', 496-478; Brendan, 'The career of Hugh, son of Rory O'Donnell, earl of Tyrconnell, in the Low Countries, 1607-1642', 219-234; Canny, 'The flight of the earls, 1607', 380-399; Carty (ed.), *Ireland, from the Flight of the Earls to Grattan's Parliament, 1607-1782; a documentary record*; Earls, 'The flight of the earls', 651-652; Harris, 'The state of the realm: English military, political, and diplomatic responses to the flight of the earls, autumn 1607 to spring 1608', 47-64; Lyons, 'Reluctant collaborators: French reaction to the Nine Years' War and the flight of the earls, 1594-1608', 70-90; McCavitt, *The flight of the earls*; McCavitt, 'The flight of the earls, 1607', 159-173; Ó Caináin, *the flight of the earls; edited from the author's manuscript, with translation and notes, by Rev. Paul Walsh*; Ó Caináin, *Imeacht na nIarlaí* [Flight of the earls]; Ó Fiaich, 'The O'Neills of the Fews', 263-315; Smith, 'Flight of the earls? Changing views on O'Neill's departure from Ireland', 17-20; Walsh, 'The last years of Hugh O'Neill: Rome, 1608-1616'; Walsh (ed.), 'The will of John O'Neill, third earl of Tyrone', 320-325; Wilson, 'The flight of the earls: an unsolved problem of history', 479-491.

¹²⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 228r-228v, Trumbull to [Rochester], 8 October 1612.

¹²⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 263r-264r, Trumbull to [Rochester], 26 February 1613.

¹³⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 336r-336v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 6 October 1613.

¹³¹ SP 77/10 f^o 263r-264r, Trumbull to [Rochester], 26 February 1613.

¹³² HMCD, iii, 200, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 12 December 1611.

¹³³ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*, 563 (878); *CSP Ireland, Dom.*, 1623-1625, 469; *CSP Ireland, Dom.* 1625-1632, 73; HMCD, iv, 150, Carno Y Clanarvurque, Madrid, 30 June 1613 (n.s.).

England for three or four months, *for the discovering of certene secretts to yor L*¹³⁴. Originally Trumbull did not hold Eustace in high esteem, but this changed in the following months. As Eustace feared being captured in the Southern Netherlands, which already had occurred¹³⁵, he fled to France, promising to return shortly. Trumbull repeated that he did not know the man at all but that he was known among the Irish as someone *well affected to his mats service; and sufficient to performe, what he shall undertake*. Trumbull gave him a passport for England at the end of March 1612¹³⁶. Henry records a memorandum of Eustace about the Irish military community in Flanders¹³⁷. Possibly it is this memorandum Trumbull refers to. Eustace wrote that,

*All Irishmen in the service of Spain, with the exception of O'Neill and O'Donnel, and their kindred, may be brought home by giving them some means to live upon. They love their country; few of them have money abroad; they have no property there; O'Neill keeps his posts in the Irish service for his men; and the last reduction of pensions did breed a general hatred between all the reformed captains and the pensioners of that nation and the Spaniards*¹³⁸.

Trumbull added that he did not deliver this plan into the hands of Rochester as something to follow, but only to enable him to make a complete assessment of the situation. Trumbull himself was furthermore of the opinion that *although it might do greate harme if it were at home, in tyme of Rebellion: yet being kept dyvyded, as it is at this day, into factions, & partiallyties it is the lesse to be feared*. Eustace repeated this offer in 1625¹³⁹. If there were conspiracies, Trumbull was intent on discovering them and would keep London informed. The English agent also sent a list with *Names of those gentlemen serving in the Irishe Regiment, wch are able to doe good or harm*:

Cap^{ten} Cornelis Driscall¹⁴⁰, of Baly More in the County of Corcke
Cap^{ten} William Barret¹⁴¹, aidare Corcke
Mr. William Bourcke brother to Redman Bourcke¹⁴²
Twoe others of the said Bourckes
Cornellis O Reily mac Pror: of the county of Cavan¹⁴³
Edmond mac Rury O more in the County of Leise
O Danne
Ragh

¹³⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 145r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 14 November 1611.

¹³⁵ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*,

¹³⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 162r, Trumbull to Salisbury, 9 January 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 175r-175v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 March 1612.

¹³⁷ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders 1586-1621*, 144 and 193 (n. 130); CSP Ireland, 1625-32, 191-193. This document is calenderad under 1626, but according to Henry it must have been written before 20 July 1616 because Eustace refers to Hugh O'Neill, 'now old and decaying'; apparent also from the diplomatic correspondence from Trumbull is that the mentioned reduction was carried through during spring 1613, see HMCD, iv, 96, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, 26 April 1613.

¹³⁸ Quoted in Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders 1586-1621*, 144.

¹³⁹ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*, 563; CSP Ireland 1625-1632, 73.

¹⁴⁰ Captain Cornelius (Connor) O'Driscoll

¹⁴¹ Captain William Barret

¹⁴² William and Richard (Redmond) Burke.

¹⁴³ Cornelius O'Reilly

O Donogh O More¹⁴⁴
 Geraldines of Munster
 Art Og
 Donell Og Odonnell
 The Earle of Tyerconnells sonne
 The twoe sonnes of Tyrone
 On Oneale Seargeant Major of the Irish Regiment; and his bretheren¹⁴⁵.

Current research into the Irish military community in the Southern Netherlands allows us to identify some, though not all, of the people mentioned in the diplomatic correspondence from Brussels, e.g. captain Cornelius O'Driscoll and captain Richard Burke. O'Driscoll, according to a letter of archduke Albert to Philip III in September 1616, had served in the Southern Netherlands for fifteen years, since 1601. He already stipulated in March 1603 his wish to return to Ireland. Writing to Luis Carillo de Toldeo, conde de Caraçena, governor and captain-general of Galicia, he requested permission to travel to Ireland with one hundred soldiers, money and the Irishmen living in Coruña. His main motivation consisted of his willingness to assist the Irish Catholics in their struggle. O'Driscoll, however, was appointed captain in the Spanish Netherlands¹⁴⁶. In August 1616 he left his company and travelled to Spain with the permission of Albert and a letter of recommendation (September 1616) to Philip III¹⁴⁷. Probably he had a conversation with Trumbull at that time. The English agent reported that he alleged to have an honest wish to reconcile himself with James VI/I. He also wanted permission to return to Ireland¹⁴⁸. Richard or Redman Burke served the Spanish for several decades in Naples, the West-Indies and the Low Countries. During the Nine Years' War Sir William Stanley had sent him back to support the rebellion of the earl of Tyrone¹⁴⁹.

The breaking of the Irish regiment was not something that could be pursued officially, according to Rochester and Overbury, as Albert was an ally of the English king. Dissolving the whole regiment was impossible, argued Rochester, because their conditions in the Southern Netherlands were far better than what they could expect at home. Furthermore, he feared they could do more damage in Ireland than while they remained in the service of the archdukes,

Therefore never deal upon the whole body, but find out particular men amongst them discontented out of reason of their own fortunes, and work upon such to discover the designs of the rest, and use them to dishearten the rest from any hope of recovering their country or from expecting any better conditions if the Spaniard held it, then as now it is¹⁵⁰.

¹⁴⁴ Possibly Roderick O'Doneghue.

¹⁴⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 263r-264r, Trumbull to [Rochester] 26 February 1613. SP 77/10 f^o 265r, *Names of those gentlemen serving in the Irishe Regiment, wch are able to doe good or harm*

¹⁴⁶ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders, 1586-1621*, 138.

¹⁴⁷ Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*,

¹⁴⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 149v, Trumbull to Winwood, 7/17 August 1616.

¹⁴⁹ Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Flanders, 1586-1621*, 57, 97, 123.

¹⁵⁰ HMCD, iii, Rochester to Trumbull, Whitehall, 31 December 1612.

The only way, according to Overbury, to achieve the disbanding of the Irish regiment was by nourishing *a difference between the ancient Irish* (O'Neill, O'Donnell, and Thomond) and those descended from English races, though degenerate into Irish (Ormond, Kildare, Desmond, Clanricard), respectively the Old Irish and the Old English¹⁵¹. Rochester's secretary argued this would be easy, and Trumbull agreed with that appraisal. Even within the Old Irish community there were also antipathies. Trumbull frequently reported about the dissensions in the Irish regiment. In June 1611 the English resident agent informed that discord had never been greater. Captain Gerald, the sergeant-major, was deprived of his function. The reason for this appeared to be that he had stolen some barrels of beer. He was ordered to pay it back fourfold, more than 600 pounds sterling. Trumbull, however, was not so sure this was the real reason, adding that the Irish friars in Louvain wanted that captain [Art] O'Neill would replace him. He was, after all, a son of one of the brothers of Tyrone, *and a great enemy to the Englishhe*. As is clear from the list in February 1613, they succeeded. Because of the great discontent some of the more wealthy soldiers were considering returning to Ireland. To avoid this it was possible that Tyrone would get permission to return to the Spanish Netherlands, conveyed Trumbull,

But in the meane while they are so animated one against another, as they begin to fale into civill broyles among themselves in the wch one Capn Welche [possibly William Walsche]¹⁵², som tyme servant to the Earle of Southampton, hath within these fewe dayes, ben very sore wounded¹⁵³.

According to historian Murtagh, speaking for the 1630s, an O'Donnell would not serve under an O'Neill¹⁵⁴. Somerset repeated these instructions in May 1614, *you are to omit no means that may nourish distaste and distractions among the Irishe there*¹⁵⁵. Trumbull agreed with this assessment. The Franciscans friars feared a split in the Irish regiment and required all to take an oath to quell differences between them¹⁵⁶. With the appointment of Sir Ralph Winwood as principal secretary of state in 1614 the policy remained unchanged. The secretary of state reiterated, *your vigilant eye that you carry over the Irish in the archduke's pay is acceptable to H.M.*

In November 1614 Winwood met with the man Trumbull had recommended as nearly the only Irishman with good intentions towards the king, Eustace¹⁵⁷. The secretary studied his allegations and could find only one point of interest, *that he knew of the meanes howe all the cheife commaunders and gent. of quality serving in the Irish Regement might be revoked and caused to disbande without one penny charge to the Kings coffers*. The fact that it would not cost the king a penny, half a year after the failure of the Addled Parliament to provide funds for James VI/I, must have appealed to Winwood. He was intrigued and wanted Eustace to disclose the mystery. The only possibility, argued Eustace, was the *graunting unto the Irish nation lyberty of conscience in their religion*. Winwood, never known

¹⁵¹ Kidd,

¹⁵² Jennings, *Wild Geese in Spanish Flanders*, 148 (593), EGC, reg. 179, f^o 239.

¹⁵³ SP 77/10 f^o 85v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 June 1611.

¹⁵⁴ Murtagh, 'Irish soldiers abroad 1600-1800', 295.

¹⁵⁵ HMCD, iv, 412, Somerset to Trumbull, Whitehall, 26 May 1614.

¹⁵⁶ SP 7710 f^o 286r-286v, Trumbull to Overbury, 16 April 1613.

¹⁵⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 169r, Trumbull to Winwood, 23 October 1614.

for his Catholic sympathies, thought it unnecessary to debate this point with the Irishman but nevertheless promised to report favourably to the king on his loyalty. On Trumbull's proposition that the Irish regiment could serve the United Provinces in stead of the archdukes, Winwood was adamant. The United Provinces would never trust the Irishmen because of their obstinacy in religion. Returning to Ireland was also an option Winwood, as Rochester and Overbury before him, did not consider as viable. James could not *with safty permitt them to retorne into their contrey a la file, one by one, much less in a body, as nowe they stande, without hazarding the state of his kingdome of Ireland*. That the Republic had no interest in these Irishmen was clear when François d'Aerssens, adviser of Maurice of Nassau, thanked Trumbull for his proposal. Prince Maurice would have considered it, he assured Trumbull, if there was a mutual tolerance between the English and the Irish. *However, he does not regard it as being of such importance to this State as to the service of your King, whether they remain in the Archduke's employment or not, since they are the sworn enemies of the English*¹⁵⁸.

At the start of April 1615 secretary Winwood informed the English agent in Brussels of the numerous complaints he received concerning Irish soldiers leaving the archdukes' service and returning to Ireland passing through England. Most of them had a passport and a safeconduct from Trumbull. *I pray you hereafter to hold your hand, for it is a dangerous consequence, as things stand now in Ireland, to furnish that Countrey with well trayned and disciplyned soldiers*¹⁵⁹. Trumbull defended himself in two ways. First of all he had, except on a few occasions like Eustace, never given a passport or a safeconduct. It had always been a request. He added to his argument that he had never received clear instructions on the matter. As he was left to his own devices he judged it far better that the Irish regiment should be disbanded than kept intact. To achieve this feat he gave these requests for a passport and safeconduct to those *which are the best affected among their Countryment*¹⁶⁰. Eighteen months later the English agent again received instructions on the matter. Winwood advised him *to exercise restraint and discretion* in giving Irishmen passports:

*It cannot but breed jealousy and suspition that when Captains, Lieutenants, Alpheres and Pencionaries doe leave their treatments and retire into Ireland where they have no meanes to live, that they have some practizes or desseignes to trouble and embroyle the peace of that country*¹⁶¹.

Captain John Rathe, from Tredach in Ireland, was another who turned to Trumbull for help to secure him a royal pardon. Rathe started serving archduke Albert and infanta Isabella in May 1606¹⁶². It is the last entry in the correspondence of John Packer which completes the story. Packer described the situation of Rathe since his departure from Ireland. When Rathe was impoverished he left his own country in 1606 and joined the the Irish regiment. The archdukes sent him after the discovery of the treason of Tyrconnell and Tyrone with a ship to Ireland (1607). Under the mask of fishing he was to

¹⁵⁸ HMCD, v, 65 (letter 153), Winwood to Trumbull, 14 November 1614; HMCD, v, 152-153, d'Aerssens to Trumbull, 3/13 March 1615.

¹⁵⁹ HMCD, V, 185 (letter 380), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 4 April 1615.

¹⁶⁰ SP 77/11 f^o 308r-309r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 April 1615.

¹⁶¹ HMCD, vi, 31 (letter 74), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 16 October 1616.

¹⁶² Jennings, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 87 (238).

transport them from Ireland to Spain. His reward was a company of Irishmen composed of the followers of the two earls under his command. After spending some time in Spain, he arrived in the Spanish Netherlands with a patent to form a new Irish company, which was disbanded because he had not abided by the terms of the patent¹⁶³. In 1614 he was the only navigator in the Irish regiment and they implored him to serve the king of Spain at sea. To persuade him they offered him an *ayuda de costa* of 50.000 crowns. As he descended from Englishmen, his Irish countrymen did not trust him. Trumbull promised to mediate for a pardon, but also emphasized the gravity of his offence. If this pardon was awarded, he would have to do some extraordinary service.

Thereupon he hath undertaken to discover some of their plotts unto me, and I am shortly expecting the issue and perfourmance of his promise. It may please yor matie to consider his most humble Suite, and to affoord him such clemency and favor, as to yor accustomed goodness shall seeme fitting.

Rathe did as promised and delivered *Advertisments and offers of service* to the English king in November 1613, mainly concerning Tyrone and Tyrconnell. The pardon was procured swiftly. John Packer (1572-1649)¹⁶⁴ reported in February 1614 that the king would grant it. During 1614 Trumbull mentioned a C.R. in his letters, most likely referring to captain Rathe. Because of his want of money he would have to turn to the friars, the English agent warned. Trumbull would pay the captain himself, if his means would allow him to do so. Trumbull tried to convince Somerset and Winwood that these services were essential. In these times, argued the hard pressed agent in Brussels, such men were indispensable. Although Trumbull did not know what religion Rathe adhered to, but *truly I doe think in my conscience his affections are English*. To lose him would be a serious blow, according to Trumbull¹⁶⁵. The last entry that can be found is a letter written by John Packer. According to Packer the king was well aware of all that, *who however does not know of any service that R. has performed commensurate with the clemency he has received in the form of a royal pardon*. Packer added that if Rathe was able to bring about the breaking of the Irish regiment, without official English involvement, or something similar, then his request for money or a pension would be considered according to his merits. *But if his offers are simply the result of his dissatisfaction with his treatment in Flanders, or of a desire to improve his fortunes, then they will not be considered*¹⁶⁶. In September 1616 Trumbull reported that Rathe was in Rome. He longed for a revocation

¹⁶³ SP 77/10 f^o 14r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 30 January 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 15v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 13 February 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 19v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 February 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 57r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 27 March 1611; the commission was dated 9 November 1607, see, Jennings, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 93 (305), E.G. reg 24, f^o 78v; SP 77/8/2 f^o 165v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 4 November 1607.

¹⁶⁴ Porter, 'Packer, John (1572-1649)', secretary of Somerset from 1612, after Somerset's fall became secretary of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham.

¹⁶⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 331r-331v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 September 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 348r, draft, Rochester to Trumbull, 22 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 232, Rochester to Trumbull, 22 October 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 364r-364v, *Advertisments; and offers of service, presented to his Matie by Capne John Rathe*, published in Jennings, *Wild Geese in Flanders*, 485-486; HMCD, iv, 320, Packer to Trumbull, Newmarket, 26 February 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 160v-161r, Trumbull to Somerset, Brussels, 29 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 163r-163v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 29 September 1614.

¹⁶⁶ HMCD, v, 166-167 (letter 352), Packer to Trumbull, Newmarket, 16 March 1615.

and to be able to return to his country if he got the means to pay his debts, *and beare his charge: and some fitt portion in fee farme, out of his mats lands in Ireland, to lyve upon with his wife and children.* According to Trumbull Rathe was an active mind who knew all the designs of the Irish, and, more important, he was *weary* of the Spaniards. Rathe was the only Irish sailor among the Irishmen in the Southern Low Countries, *wch can doe them good, and harme to or. Country.* Trumbull requested Winwood's instructions on the matter, which never came¹⁶⁷.

Other informants were less trustworthy. The fear for conspiracies against king James never dissipated. Trumbull informed secretary Winwood in June 1615 that there was a possible plot in the making. He got this information from what he called a person of note in these countries: Ottavio Bonnayuti. At the same time he instructed one of the Irish captains, Walter de la Hoyde to travel to England, passing through Zeeland, deliver his letters to Sir Ralph and request a private audience with the king. He would bring James VI/I the news of N., who was being sent to the English court. The captain then had to return with money for W. Bonnayuti wrote his own letter to the king, offering his services to the state. N., according to Bonnayuti, was a trustworthy person and requested £ 100 per year for his services. Captain de la Hoyde would divulge the name of N. to the secretary of state. N. had left the Archducal Netherlands by 2 July but because of contrary winds had travelled through Flanders and boarded a ship in Calais and not in Zeeland. He had requested Walter de la Hoyde to wait for him in the house of the postmaster or the port of Dover. Trumbull had given him 20 shilling. About three weeks later Winwood wrote Trumbull that N. had not yet arrived and that the captain was despairing. There was still no news by mid-August 1615. In December of that year de la Hoyde contacted Trumbull. He had waited for half a ear in London which was *wearisome and expensive.* If he had to wait much longer he would not have any money left to travel to Ireland. He requested Trumbull for instructions¹⁶⁸. In May 1616 the English agent wrote that the captain, *who embarcked mee, with that charlaton Octavio Bonajutim,* did not think it was his intention to mislead Trumbull, but only to show *his affection to the kings maty and our Countrye.* The captain himself held *good quarter* with Sir Thomas Edmondes as with himself, reported Trumbull¹⁶⁹. During the fall of 1616 de la Hoyde had already returned to the Southern Low Countries to try and resolve the case he had commenced. Despite enthusiasm his efforts were not met with success, according to Trumbull. When he arrived back in the Southern Low Countries he found Ottavio seriously ill. On the way to England he had been arrested and tortured, according to the dying man himself. De la Hoyde could perform nothing without Ottavio, who died 25 July 1616. He had planned to give his information to the captain but was surprised *by the fangs of death.* His confessor refused him absolution of his sins and a Christian burial if he did not deliver these papers to him. Eventually it became clear that all papers had been burned. There

¹⁶⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 182r-182v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 September 1616.

¹⁶⁸ HMCD, v, 379 (letter 785), Delahoyd to Trumbull, London, 13 December 1615.

¹⁶⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 349r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 20 June 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 341r-351v, [Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels], 20 June 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 355r, Bonnayuti to James VI/I, Brussels, 30 June 1615 (n.s.); SP 77/11 f^o 360r-360v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 362r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 365r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Ditton Park, 22 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 371r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 380r, draft, [Winwood] to Trumbull, Bewley, 19 August 1615; SP 77/12 f^o 99r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 May 1616.

was no reason now to keep the captain in the Archducal Netherlands, so Trumbull sent him back to England and recommended him to Winwood¹⁷⁰.

The future of the Irish regiment had been somewhat in doubt in 1613. Trumbull reported that there were consultations in Brussels concerning the Irish regiment, *being much vexed with their continuall factions, begguis, partiallityes, robberyes, and incessant importunityes*. On the one hand it seemed that they wanted to keep the regiment in their service as an instrument to cause troubles in Ireland and invade it or keep the English troops from the coast in case of a war between James VI/I and Philip III. On the other hand the Irishmen themselves *doe apprehend, that may of their extraordinary pencions, and entertainments shable cutt of, and some of their weakest companyes broken, to reenforce the reste*. Trumbull did not yet know what the *redución* would be. In Spain it was decided to reform the Irish regiment and to cancel pensions. This reformation did not only affect the Irish regiment. According to Trumbull Philip III of Spain wanted to save 800.000 to 900.000 ducats per year. Most pensions were scrapped. Of the English only Sir William Stanley was maintained. The Irish were luckier: four Irishmen and nine Irishwomen kept their allowances¹⁷¹. Some of the weaker companies would be disbanded and the soldiers were to join the remaining companies. The Irishmen were displeased with what had happened. Those well affected to the English king, according to Trumbull, could now more easily be convinced to return from the Spanish Netherlands. To appease them archduke Albert and the marquis of Spinola promised to write to the king of Spain in their favour, but Trumbull did not know if this was only to deter them from making overtures to James VI/I¹⁷².

The fear of an invasion of Ireland had not faded in 1614. The earl of Tyrone, who had been at Rome since 1607 or 1608 kept planning the military overthrow of the English administration in Ireland to the end of his days. A document written in 1610, *Memorial of Hugh O'Neill* to the king of Spain, provides a clear insight in what Tyrone wished. He requested the Spanish king to send an army into Ireland in secret and in the name of pope Paul. This army, with the help of the Irish regiment 1.500 men strong, would take Ireland easily¹⁷³. On the other hand, Tyrone seems at first to have wanted to make his peace with king James. Overtures were made by Hugh MacAngnan, prefect of the Irish Franciscan friars in Louvain, who contacted Trumbull on behalf of the Earl, exiled in Rome. It was Rochester who gave Trumbull permission to negotiate with the friar. MacAngnan delivered a written petition to Trumbull. The English agent considered the conditions too extravagant to present it to king James. The friar was sure that if anything was disagreeable, Tyrone would diminish his requests. He was even willing to send a son to court, or at any other place of James's choosing, to be educated there.

Receiving Tyrone would also have advantages for James VI/I, according to MacAngnan. The world would be witness of James' clemency, it would prevent other subjects of the king from *precipitating themselves into the lyke inconvenyence*, it would create

¹⁷⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 186r-186v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 September 1616.

¹⁷¹ SP 77/10 f^o 300r-300v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 June 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 297r-298v, *Copie of the Archds. order for the reforminge the entertainments of his army*, 20 June 1613 (n.s.).

¹⁷² SP 77/10 f^o 283r, Trumbull to James VI/I, 16 April 1613; HMCD, iv, 96, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, 26 April 1613, from Flushing; SP 77/10 f^o 307r-307v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 14 July 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 337r, Trumbull to Rochester, 6 October 1613.

¹⁷³ McGurk, 'The Irish in European armies (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries)', 41; Kerney Walsh, *Destruction by Peace: Hugh O'Neill after Kinsale*, 251-254.

discord between the Spaniards and the Irish and finally it would secure a stable government in Ireland, which could never occur without the earl of Tyrone. Trumbull replied that *the estate of Ireland, as so wel ordered, as wee neither had cause to feare any intestyne commortions or forrayne invasions*. But because of his sense of duty Trumbull promised to send the petition to England. He asked Rochester to look into it and if he deemed it worthy, to present it to James. In the mean while, he awaited instructions.

These instructions took months because Rochester simply had forgotten he had not replied. The king found a large discrepancy between the written petition and the conference the friar had with Trumbull. The English agent was instructed not to reveal James had seen the petition, it had been decided that it would have created a greater distaste between the king and Tyrone to deliver the petition to James. Tyrone's offer to retire to England and give his son as a hostage, would be considered, only if Tyrone presented this himself. That seems to have been the end of these overtures as Trumbull received instructions (July 1614) to end further conferences about Tyrone with the friar or any one else¹⁷⁴.

In April 1615 Trumbull came across some top secret information: a possible marriage between Henry O'Neill, colonel of the Irish Regiment and eldest son of the earl of Tyrone and the daughter of the secretary of state and War, Juan de Mancidor (*d.* 1618)¹⁷⁵. Trumbull got his information from an Irishman. Winwood could use this information but had to make sure that the source was not revealed. If it were known Trumbull had briefed Winwood, then it would not be difficult to identify Trumbull's informant. Although Trumbull could not confirm the truth of this report he deemed it very likely. He requested further instructions. About six weeks later Trumbull sent Winwood a letter of which he was convinced it told the truth. Trumbull's informant offered to keep doing his job, but that his services would not be free. According to the English agent in Brussels this marriage would be detrimental to king James and his kingdoms. Again he stressed that the information had to be treated with utmost care and secrecy. If not, the lives of several men would be endangered¹⁷⁶.

At the same time there were rumours of Tyrone's imminent departure from Rome. According to Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice (April 1610-November 1615), Tyrone intended to travel to Brussels. He did not plan to linger in the Southern Netherlands, but wanted to cross over to Ireland together with the Irishmen in the service of the archduke and unleash a rebellion on the green island. George Abbot shared Carleton's concern and wrote of Tyrone's friends soliciting archduke Albert to discharge the Irish regiment, so they could return to Ireland. The archbishop however was not so gullible to believe this readily, but if it was true that Tyrone would come to Brussels, he hoped the earl *will have a poor bargain of it*.

Meanwhile secretary Winwood wanted a complete report, a *perfect statement*, on the Irish regiment and on the whereabouts of Tyrone, who was reported to be ready to

¹⁷⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 305r-305v, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels 7 July 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 312r-312v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 27 July 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 348r, draft, Rochester to Trumbull, [Royston], 22 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 232, Rochester to Trumbull, Royston, 22 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 449, Somerset to Trumbull, Whitehall, 3 July 1614.

¹⁷⁵ Lefèvre, 'Mancidor (Juan de)', 534-536.

¹⁷⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 308r-309r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 April 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 339r-339v, 340r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 June 1615.

return to the Southern Netherlands. Trumbull obliged at the end of May 1615, sending Winwood a list of all that were serving in Spain of the Irish nation. The list was divided in three sections: those serving in Spain (seventeen entries), those remaining in Spanish Netherlands (97 entries) and finally a list of eight reformed captains. Throughout the list Trumbull makes a distinction between the Old Irish and the Old English. There were rumours of Tyrone's return throughout 1614 and 1615. In March and June 1615 Tyrone's arrival seems to have been inevitable and in both months the English agent approached Albert, who promised to deny the earl entry into his dominions¹⁷⁷.

Trumbull found precedents of the ambition of Spain to get a foothold in Ireland. It could function as an ideal base of operations against England. That ambition had not dissipated, argued Trumbull. Proof was Tyrone and the Irish regiment. Trumbull furthermore received information that at the time of the negotiation of the Twelve Years' Truce, the archdukes and their ministers had resolved to send the earl of Tyrone back to his country with 3.000 or 4.000 troops, arms and money to raise a rebellion¹⁷⁸. The invasion never happened and Tyrone died in Rome in July 1616. After 1616 the Irish regiment is mentioned only occasionally until the early 1620s. They remained more of a threat, in Trumbull's eyes, than its English and Scottish counterparts in 1625. Trumbull, as mentioned, told the secretary of state, since January 1623 Edward Conway (c. 1564-1631)¹⁷⁹, a few months before his revocation to London, that he could convince some of the king's subjects, the best and most eminent officers and captains, to return to their own country, but he added that the colonels and the Irish were beyond his reach¹⁸⁰.

¹⁷⁷ HMCD, iv, 348, Carleton to Trumbull, Venice, 4 April 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 378, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 20 April 1614; HMCD, iv, 408-409, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 23 May [1614 endorsement]; SP 77/11 f^o 135v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 18 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 138r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 18 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 292v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 March 1615; HMCD, v, 231-233 (letter 474), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, [Brussels], 31 May 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 338r-338v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 June 1615.

¹⁷⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 77r-77v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 June 1614.

¹⁷⁹ Kelsey, 'Conway, Edward, first Viscount Conway and first Viscount Killultagh (c.1564-1631)'.

¹⁸⁰ SP 77/18 f^o 178r, Trumbull to Conway, s.l., 20 June 1625.

Chapter 4 Your Majesty's ill affected subjects

The relations between England and the Southern Netherlands have too often been limited to the religious realm. The Spanish Netherlands, surrounded by Protestant nations, England across the Channel, the United Provinces to the North and the Palatinate to the east, proved to be the ideal refuge for Catholics. One of the earlier examples of interest in the colleges and convents established by the English on the continent was published in 1849, Petre, *Notices on the English Colleges and Convents established on the Continent after the dissolution in England*. The historiographical interest in this matter peaked between the 1860s and the 1910s, with Proost's 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique', Lechat's *Les réfugiés anglais dans les Pays-Bas espagnols durant le règne d'Elisabeth, 1558-1603*, Willaert's 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas Catholiques (1598-1625)' and Guilday's *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*. There was also English interest in this matter, e.g. Whelan and his history of the convents in France and Flanders during penal times¹. Biographical work on the British refugees can be found in old and recent historiography, e.g. Gillow².

Decades before the Treaty of London (1604), in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, English Catholics already sought refuge on the continent³. Especially in times of greater persecution, e.g. after the failed plot in 1569, a number of people left their native soil. Leys discerns two kinds of Catholics: a minority which fled to the Continent and a majority who remained in England. The minority consisted of unmarried women and widows who entered existing monasteries on the continent or started their own congregations, of men who joined Spanish military service, and of professionals, e.g. musicians as Peter Philips, who was the first and principal organ player of the archdukes (1597-1628), and John Bull, both fleeing England citing religious reasons⁴. They were financially dependent on Spanish and other sponsors as well as on money that was smuggled out of England⁵. After the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII English monastic life survived into the twentyfirst century thanks to the English monasteries which were erected throughout Europe, with a great concentration of them in the Spanish Netherlands.

Originally the English government did not concern itself with the refugees. Gradually this changed. The Treaty of Bristol (28 August 1574) which mainly concerned trade differences between England and Spain mentioned the refugees. English Catholic refugees residing in Flanders lost their pensions. The magistrates of Douai agreed to ban all English students from the Faculty of Theology at their university. Flemish refugees in England suffered the same fate at the hands of Elizabeth⁶. Thomas Wilson (1523/24-

¹ Whelan, *Historic English convents of today: the story of the English cloisters in France and Flanders in penal times*.

² Gillow, *A literary and biographical history, or bibliographical dictionary of the English catholics: from the breach with Rome, in 1534, to the present time*; for the studies on the monasteries and colleges see further on.

³ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vii, 589.

⁴ Proesmans, 'Spreading a new musical style', 133.

⁵ Leys, *Catholics in England 1559-1829. A Social History*, 59.

⁶ Loomie, 'Religion and Elizabethan commerce with Spain', 28.

1581)⁷ was sent as a special ambassador to the Low Countries from November 1574 to March 1575 to negotiate with Don Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga (1528-1576), governor of the Low Countries from 1573 until his death. The principal points of the negotiation were commercial: Wilson wanted that the Scheldt would be opened unto Antwerp for the benefit of the Company of the Merchant Adventurers. Wilson also requested the implementation of the Treaty of Bristol: the banishment of English rebels from the territories of the Catholic king Philip II; the religious refugees had to recognize Elizabeth I as their sovereign queen; in return the same would be done in England with Philip's Protestant subjects. This proposition was debated in two of the three collateral councils, the Privy Council and the Council of State, and finally submitted to governor Requesens⁸. Wilson's mission could be considered a success in some respects: Requesens banished the English exiles who had been involved in the 1569 plot, for which Guilday terms him weak, and opened the Scheldt to English merchants⁹.

The number of Englishmen leaving their native country because of religion augmented after 1604. Despite the penal laws, even under the reign of Elizabeth, the enforcement of the laws varied at times. Persecution was especially heavy after plots. James VI/I wanted to reduce the penal laws, but this was impossible due to changed circumstances, the Bye Plot (1603) and the Gunpowder Plot (1605)¹⁰. The penal laws were enforced and expanded which caused the increase after 1604. This worried Salisbury. Members of some prominent families depended on Spanish or archducal pensions. The diplomatic correspondence from London to Brussels does not contain useful information on these refugees, according to Willaert, which is not the case for the correspondence from Brussels to London. In 1617 Trumbull outlined the support the fugitives got in the Catholic Low Countries strikingly:

This yor hor. may see howe or. fugityves are favored, & supported by men of all sorts in these Provinces; and what danger is lyke wth tyme, to growe to or. Prince and Countrey by the nourishing here, of so many vypers, and enemyes: to the one, and the other. I beseech the Almighty to tourne their harts; to preserve his matie from their mischeevous practises: and to maintayne yor hor.[Sir Ralph Winwood] much yeares, as a faithfull, and vigillant Sentinell over their actions, and in the gouvernemente of or. State¹¹.

The hospitality of Albert and Isabella towards the refugees created problems. King James distinguished between two kinds, moderates and radicals in religion. According to Questier he would tolerate *the popishly affected moderates, but not the radicals*¹². Willaert makes a similar distinction, between those refugees who only looked for a possibility to practise their Catholicism freely or follow their monastic calling and those persons who sought political means to let Catholicism triumph. The second kind was characterized by

⁷ Doran and Woolfson, 'Wilson, Thomas (1523/4–1581)'.

⁸ Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique', 279-285; Loomie, 'Religion and Elizabethan commerce with Spain', 28. Proost refers to the Treaty of 1496, Malus Intercursus, and its fifth article.

⁹; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142 and 152.

¹⁰ Norman, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan settlement to the Second Vatican Council*, 14 and 33.

¹¹ SP 77/12 f^o 383r-384r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels 11 July 1617. Winwood died three months later.

¹² Questier, 'What Happened to English Catholicism after the English Reformation?', 36; Fincham and Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', 184.

religious fervour and hostility towards the political regime in England. Salisbury made that same distinction in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot in a conversation with Hoboken, the archducal ambassador in London. Salisbury described Flanders and Brabant as *les marchés des trahisons plus dénaturées*¹³. The reception of refugees would remain a difficult issue in the following decades. Salisbury's view-point can be taken as starting point. A difference can be made between recusants residing in the Southern Low Countries and monasteries and colleges on the one hand and high profile refugees on the other. As will be seen, the first category, although numerous references can be found, did not trouble the London government much. Instructions on this matter were scarce. secretary of state Winwood was much more interested in those refugees than any other secretary, except when it concerned those who were implicated in the Gunpowder Plot. Trumbull's most important job in this matter was to observe and report. The high profile refugees were an entirely different matter, but were they dangerous, true enemies of the state? They were an embarrassment to the government and Trumbull, besides observing and reporting, had to intervene.

Gunpowder Plot¹⁴

A few months after the arrival of Edmondes and his team in Brussels the Gunpowder Plot was discovered. This conspiracy not only had consequences for Catholics in England but also for certain individuals in the Southern Low Countries. The archdukes were put into a difficult position. The archdukes not only received many religious refugees in their dominions, but supported them financially. Besides this Catholic exile community they also had British and Irish regiments serving in their cosmopolitan Army of Flanders. Several questions can be propounded while examining the consequences of the Gunpowder Plot for the diplomatic corps and their dealings with foreign governments. First, which English Catholic refugees were involved? Why did the English government seek them out? And entwined with that is the point concerning the reaction of the sovereigns of the Southern Netherlands. What kind of repercussions did the Gunpowder plot entail for them?

Who was involved? The three men who are usually mentioned in literature as in Dodd's 1938 article 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees' or Willaert's *Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1615)* are Hugh Owen, father William Baldwin and to a lesser extent Sir William Stanley. These historians did not use the English diplomatic correspondence (except for the Winwood Memorials) or its archducal counterpart extensively. The authors of these letters are for England Salisbury, Sir Thomas Edmondes and Sir Charles Cornwallis. On the other side of the Channel the letters from Hoboken to Brussels are relevant. These sources offer new elements. Besides the three men already mentioned three others are revealed: captain James Blount, Sir William Windsor and John Gerard¹⁵.

¹³ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vii, 591 and 604 ; PEA reg. 365 f° 229 and 233, 4 June 1608 (n.s.).

¹⁴ This is based on a lecture I gave for the conference 'Gunpowder Plot: context and reactions' organised by the History of Parliament and the Royal Historical Society in Westminster Hall, London, 4 November 2005.

¹⁵ John Gerard wrote an autobiography, see Caraman, *John Gerard: the Autobiography of an Elizabethan*.

Who were these men? Baldwin and Gerard were English Jesuits. Owen, often in historiography mistaken for a Jesuit, only belonged to their faction. Blount, Windsor and Stanley were members of the English regiment. The close association of the men with the Jesuits also had an apparent negative consequence after the Plot. They lost ground in England. Edmondes reported in September 1607 that some high ranked English Jesuits in Spain would be sent to England to win back the support of prominent English Catholics. In the wake of the plot the English Catholics had turned to priests and no longer to Jesuits¹⁶. The relation of the Jesuits with the English regiment was cause for concern, because they tried to corrupt every soldier or officer who enlisted in archducal service, which then could be employed in an invasion of England, a concern explicated by Edmondes and Trumbull at several occasions.

The problem of English Catholicism had been on the agenda for decades. Archduke Albert and king Philip III considered it their duty to alleviate the plight of their co-religionists in England. The negotiations for the peace treaty in London in 1604 presented them with the perfect opportunity, but it came to nothing. Following a request of the pope to the Catholic monarchs throughout Europe Albert wanted to intervene in England and ask for some alleviation. Hoboken opposed such a strategy. It would get the Catholics little and such a move from the Southern Low Countries or from Spain would be ill taken in England. Hoboken was convinced that Henry IV of France should ask for such an easing. Albert followed the advice of his ambassador. A few days later the Gunpowder Plot was discovered.

The news of the plot and especially the Catholic involvement was met with disbelief in the Spanish Netherlands. It took some time, according to Sir Thomas Edmondes, before the truth of the entire matter could be accepted. Such a conspiracy could never involve true Catholics, was the reasoning behind the disbelief. It was far more likely that it was a ploy by the Republic of the United Provinces, known enemies of monarchies. Denial of Catholic implication, however, became impossible. To account for that involvement it was proclaimed that *it is a Work of the Devill's expressly to banish and extirpate the Catholique Religion out of England*. Edmondes had no problem if that were the case, confessing, *For myne owne parte, I wil freely confess, that I doe effectually desire (whatsoever Judgment they make thereof) that we may make that use of it, as we have just cause soe to doe*¹⁷.

So far Albert and Isabella did not suffer any consequences. James was convinced that they nor the Spanish king had any part in it. Consequences arose when James wanted to get his hands on some of his subjects residing in the Southern Low Countries because of their presumed involvement. Between 1605 and 1609 especially Owen, but also Baldwin, would be considered the first prize. Owen had fled England after the Ridolfi plot of 1571. He had joined the service of Philip II and his governors in the Spanish Netherlands, subsequently the duke of Parma, archduke Ernest and archduke Albert. His presumed knowledge of English affairs made him valuable for Spain. Guy Fawkes had confessed, according to Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634)¹⁸, to have gone to the Southern Low Countries to acquaint Owen and others with the details of the plot¹⁹. Owen, he had confessed under

¹⁶ SP 77/8/2 f^o 114v-115r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 July 1607.

¹⁷ WM, ii, Edmondes to Cornwallis, Brussels, 27 December 1605.

¹⁸ Boyer, 'Coke, Sir Edward (1552–1634)'

¹⁹ Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 641.

torture, *liked the plot*. It took Salisbury only five days to send instructions to Edmondes and ask him *that as Owen appeared to be implicated the archdukes should be asked to detain him until charges should have been formulated*. Albert gave order to arrest Hugh Owen by 20 November. Although this seemed to be speedy justice on the part of Albert and Isabella, Edmondes had little faith in their sincerity and called their actions concerning Owen but nominal²⁰.

Meanwhile, father William Baldwin and Sir William Stanley had also been incriminated and subsequently incarcerated. That Owen and Baldwin both could be dangerous appeared from the reports Edmondes sent from Brussels in the months preceding the Gunpowder Plot. In October he sent news that both had tried to bar all the candidate-chaplains for the English regiment that did not belong to their Spanish faction. Albert prevented this from happening²¹. Not a month later the Gunpowder Treason was discovered. It was feared that not only did they have detailed knowledge of the treason, but they would have played an active role in the aftermath if the scheme had succeeded. Their contacts with the English regiment made that a grave matter. It became apparent that Sir William Stanley had to be ready to cross the Channel into England if the plot succeeded, according to Edmondes at the end of 1605²².

The matter did not end with the arrest of the presumed culprits. The real problems only arose when James requested the extradition of Owen and Baldwin. It would have been a logical step for Albert to deliver them into the hands of the plaintiff. First, to preserve the recently concluded peace and secondly because of the precarious situation with the United Provinces. Albert, however, refused, although it was not an outright refusal. In his original request for the extradition of Owen and Baldwin James anticipated a rejection, because he offered many guarantees, certainly when it came to Owen. He would only be charged with the Gunpowder Plot and with no other crimes. He would be lodged at the house of Hoboken, who got permission to attend all the examinations²³. James, furthermore, originally also requested the papers of Owen and his accomplice, Baylie. Albert, however, who had given the order to seize and search them, concluded they contained nothing relevant to the Gunpowder Plot. Salisbury wrote Cornwallis in Madrid that in the end the English king did not press this demand,

*because his Majestie understood that the Archduke did mislike of it, fearing that thereby many other Intelligences and Correspondencies might be discovered to the Prejudice of his Estate, his Majestie was content not to trouble himself or them any further with it, but to leave it to the Archdukes Discretion*²⁴.

Several reasons can be found why Albert and his ministers thought it unwise to hand over Owen to James. Owen had been privy to a lot of information and had many

²⁰ Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 646-647.

²¹ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vii, 596-597.

²² WM, ii, 183-184, Edmondes to Cornwallis, Brussels, 27 December 1605.

²³ Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 647; SP 77/8 f^o 76r-81r, *Demand of James for delivery of certain traitors and the King of Spain's reply*, s.l., 9 April 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 13v-14r, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondes], s.l., 26 April 1606.

²⁴ WM, ii, Salisbury to Cornwallis, Whitehall, 30 January 1606.

contacts in England and throughout the Catholic world. This was not a reason explicitly mentioned by the English ambassador in Brussels. Albert justified his refusal informing Edmondés that the men did not fall under his jurisdiction. Hugh Owen was a servant of the Spanish king so it was up to his master to decide what happened to him. His departure out of England was justified, according to an unidentified advocate, because of the religion promoted by Queen Elizabeth I and the persecution of Catholics suffered. The goods of Owen had been confiscated in England which in itself was reason enough why Owen could not be considered a subject of Elizabeth. He had been out of England for 30 years without ever returning. King James followed in her footsteps and even increased the penal laws²⁵. Owen, therefore, was under no obligation to acknowledge him as his sovereign. Moreover, it was abundantly clear in natural and canonical law what happened to the obligations of a subject towards a heretical monarch, argued the advocate²⁶. The same lack of archducal jurisdiction applied to others. Father William Baldwin was a member of the clergy and could therefore not be subjected to any other authority than ecclesiastical, unless his superiors decided otherwise. This opinion was also voiced in London by Hoboken.²⁷

According to the papal nuncio in Brussels, Ottavio Mirto Frangipani, who was appalled with what had happened in England, Albert did not know which way to turn with the request for the delivery of Owen and Baldwin. Both men claimed that it was the intention to drive all Catholics from England. The pope in Rome nor the king of Spain could alleviate their plight. The pope had insufficient power and the Spanish king had only recently concluded a treaty with his English counterpart. Frangipani wanted to be of as much help as possible to Edmondés. He sent a priest, White, to the English ambassador to arrange a meeting so he could express his utter abhorrence with the Gunpowder Plot. For this occasion he even offered to visit Edmondés with secular clothes. Edmondés expressed that he was pleased that Frangipani was not seduced by the words of the two traitors. Edmondés, however, declined to accept a meeting²⁸.

The Jesuits were hardly content with the stance Frangipani took. The pope originally seemed to avow Frangipani's words and actions. In January 1606 he called upon his nuncio to procure justice against the culprits of the Gunpowder Plot because the Catholic cause had suffered more setbacks²⁹. The Jesuits, however, reproached the papal nuncio, *that he did greatly scandalize his profession in enterprising correspondence with me* [Edmondés]. Even the nuncio in Madrid rebuked his colleague in Brussels³⁰. By June Rome was convinced that Frangipani did not do enough to further the Catholic cause. A decision was taken to replace him by Guido Bentivoglio, from the house of Carafa, according to Thomas Barnes, one of Salisbury's informants³¹. Archduke Albert tried to mediate and

²⁵ See also, La Rocca, 'James I and his Catholic subjects, 1606-1612: some financial implications'.

²⁶ HMCD, ii, 448-449, copy, *Advis de Mons. -, Avocat au Conseil de Brabant, touchant le fait du Sieur Owen, Anglois.*

²⁷ Roothans, 'De diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen Engeland en de Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de Aartshertogen', 109-110; PEA reg. 365, f^o 72r.

²⁸ SP 77/8 f^o 13r-14r, Edmondés to [Salisbury], Brussels, 6 January 1606.

²⁹ SP 77/8 f^o 22r-22v, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 23 January 1606.

³⁰ SP 77/8 f^o 64r-67r, 68r, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 5 April 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 84r-84v, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 12 April 1606.

³¹ SP 77/8 f^o 122r-122v, II [Thomas Barnes] to Salisbury, Brussels, 16 June 1606; For the embassy of Bentivoglio see, Gachard, 'Le cardinal Bentivoglio. Sa nonciature à Bruxelles (1607-1614)'; for the origins

requested that Frangipani could remain in Brussels, but the new nuncio arrived in August 1606, which brought the Jesuits great joy³².

It was evident from the reply formulated by Albert that he needed an answer out of Spain, which can be considered as the second diplomatic front in this case. The language from Spain, according to Cornwallis, was everything but reassuring. The duke of Lerma used the same argumentation as Albert when it came to the Jesuit Baldwin. Philip III, however, would intervene in Rome to request a suitable punishment. Owen, on the other hand, had not been in England for three decades and therefore could no longer be considered a subject of the English king. He had become a servant of Philip II,

At which words he lifted up His hands and protested, that he humbly and unfeynedly thanked God, that he had not ben received nor entertained by the King present, since he had declared himself to be so wicked and facinorous.

Lerma assured Cornwallis that Philip III would advise Albert that Owen should be punished, but on authority of the Spanish king and the archdukes, implying not the authority of James, *as hee [Owen] that hath offended the King in a High Degree here, and the Princes in whose Dominions he liveth*³³.

In effect, Spain took no decision and handed the case back to Albert. He sent the much appreciated Jean Richardot, president of the Privy Council, to Edmondes to inform him of the reasons why Owen could not be delivered into the hands of English justice. Besides reiterating what already had been stated on numerous occasions, he went on to say that Owen denied any complicity. Albert offered to have a trial in Brussels and requested James to send the charges and all the evidence to Brussels. King James thought this an infringement on his jurisdiction and refused. Both men were released, because they could not be held indefinitely without charges. Baldwin was released in January and Owen in June 1606. The English government, nevertheless, was surprised with the release of both men³⁴.

Eventually archduke Albert sent Owen to Spain where he arrived in Autumn 1606. According to Cornwallis, he *receiveth here a very cold countenance*, but that was only in public, *to conceale from me their secret Favour*. His stay in Spain was short, having returned to the Spanish Netherlands by March 1607. He and his compagnons *carrie themselves more loftily then ever they did*. As his sudden return was not insult enough, he arrived back with an increase in his allowance. Richardot tried to reassure Edmondes that Albert knew nothing of the intention of Owen to return to the Southern Netherlands. Edmondes turned to Albert to complain about this grave injustice. He tried to convince him with a very sensitive argument: the relationship between Brussels and Madrid. When Philip II died in 1598, he gave the Low Countries to his daughter, the infanta Isabella Clara

of the nunciature see Maere, 'Les origines de la nonciature de Flandre. Etude sur la diplomatie pontificale dans les Pays-Bas à la fin du XVIe siècle'.

³² SP 77/8 f^o 140v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 16 July 1606;

³³ WM, ii, 186-189, Cornwallis to Salisbury, Madrid, January 1606.

³⁴ Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 649; Roothans, 'De diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen Engeland en de Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de Aartshertogen', 110; SP 77/8 f^o 13r-15r, Edmondes to [Salisbury], Brussels, 6 January 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 14v, draft, [Salisbury] to Edmondes, s.l. 18 June 1606.

Eugenia and her husband, archduke Albert. Although sovereign in name, the Southern Netherlands were considered a satellite country of Spain by its contemporaries. This situation with Owen, according to Edmondés, clearly proved *that he [Albert] had no absolutenes in himself, but was forced in all thinges to receive the Lawe of Spayne*. Albert flatly denied that the case had any baring on their sovereignty³⁵.

Owen stayed put in the next few years despite a failed kidnapping attempt in 1608. Salisbury complained in August 1608 to Hoboken because of an Englishman that had been arrested in the Southern Netherlands. His mission, according to Salisbury, had only been to ascertain if Owen and others were plotting against the king and his realm³⁶. When Edmondés was recalled in 1609 he made one last plea concerning the rebels. William Trumbull followed in the footsteps of his master. In september 1609 Albert decided to banish the Gunpowder Plotters from his countries, Trumbull was able to report³⁷. Despite this sentence Baldwin was back the following month. Trumbull informed the archduke that not only had he returned to Brussels, but he had brought with him John Gerard³⁸. Albert was surprised and answered *que ya avia encommando el negocio de tel manera y esperaba de breve dar a sua Magt. entera satisfacion*. The following morning Albert ordered his secretary Philippe de Prats to write to the Provincial of the Jesuits to call Baldwin away. De Prats also was instructed to assure the English agent that Albert had written to Philip III to resolve the matter of Owen. Albert expected to receive directions from the Spanish king to send Owen away. By mid-November it was *commonly believed* that Baldwin and John Gerard had left the Southern Low Countries for Rome. Owen, on the other hand, according to Trumbull's information *upon receipt of some letters from Spain, doth begin to take heart at 'grasse', and to vaunt among his favourites that in despite of all his enemies he will remain here during his own pleasure*³⁹. That same month the English Benedictine nuns approached the abbess of the monastery of the Descalças, Madre Anna, to ask the infanta for permission for both to stay in the Southern Low Countries. The abbess only answered that it was not within her power to alter resolutions taken by the archdukes⁴⁰. After Owen and Baldwin left the Southern Netherlands the diplomatic correspondence of Trumbull mentions them only occasionally.

Baldwin left the Low Countries in disguise under a false name, Alessandro Prawn. He wanted to travel through the Palatinate but was recognised in August 1610. The elector

³⁵ WM, ii, 259, Cornwallis to Salisbury, s.l., 30 September 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 176v, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 8 October 1606; WM, ii, 270, Cornwallis aan Salisbury, s.l., 26 November 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 57v, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 18 March 1607; SP 77/8/2 f^o 68r, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 15 April 1607; SP 77/8/2 f^o 75r-75v, Edmondés to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 April 1607.

³⁶ Roothans, 'De diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen Engeland en de Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de Aartshertogen', 111; Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', 650; For more information on Hugh Owen, see, Edwards, 'The Attempt of 1608 on Hugh Owen Intelligencer for the Archdukes in Flanders' and Edwards, 'The First Earl of Salisbury's pursuit of Hugh Owen'; Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans. The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II*, 52-93, which is a chapter entitled An "Intelligencer": Hugh Owen.

³⁷ HMCD, ii, 117-118, copy, Edmondés to Albert, [Brussels], 14 September 1609; HMCD, ii, 128, Edmondés to Trumbull, London, 27 September 1609; HMCD, ii, 147, Beaulieu to Trumbull, London, 27 September 1609.

³⁸ PEA reg. 1976, Trumbull to Albert, Brussels, 28 October 1609.

³⁹ HMCD, ii, 151-152, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondés], Brussels, 12 October 1609; HMCD, ii, 179, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondés], Brussels, 15 November 1609.

⁴⁰ HMCD, ii, 480, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 22 November 1609.

Palatine, Frederick V, arrested him and handed him over to Sir Ralph Winwood, representative of James VI/I in Düsseldorf. Winwood informed Sir Thomas Bodeley and Sir John Chamberlain. Baldwin arrived in Düsseldorf 27 August and Winwood intended to send him towards England accompanied by two captains. At the last moment Winwood had to change his plans. He had been warned by the governor of Düsseldorf and several councillors that letters had been sent from Brussels and other cities to Düsseldorf to inform themselves of the arrival of Baldwin. The garrison in Rhineberg was also put in readiness to rescue Baldwin if necessary. Baldwin was still in Düsseldorf under close guard⁴¹. Baldwin arrived in the Tower of London in October 1610. John More informed Trumbull at the end of January 1611 that he had been accused in the Star Chamber by someone called Ratliel. Baldwin was suspected to have told Ratliel in the Southern Low Countries of a plot *for the relief of English Catholics which Providence itself could not prevent*. Ratliel, however, does not seem to have been a particularly good witness.

Butt he form of his accusation, some of the circumstances foregoing the main point, being somewhat to blame, did so disgrace the accuser that in the matter itself his bare affirmative would not sufficiently overweigh the Jesuit's negative who at the accusation carried himself very petulantly, unworthily of his gravity and of the greatness of those before whom he stood.

Another witness, a Jesuit called Strange who was imprisoned in the Tower, was equally unable to deliver a satisfactory testimony. Albert now requested for the release of the English Jesuit. James assured archduke Albert that Baldwin would be set free, once he had been found innocent⁴². Baldwin remained in the Tower until 1618. He was exchanged for Mr. Mole who had been detained by the Inquisition in Rome. By August 1618 Trumbull reported to the secretary of state,

Baldwin the Jesuitt accompanied wth Creswell, came to see me at Gant⁴³, pretending that the grace, and favour he had received from his matie. In England, did oblige him so to doe; and that where soever he came he would proclame his mats. clemency and goodnes, and be ready as a good subiect to do him all humble service.

Trumbull's disbelief at their words was great, *because I knewe him to be one of the brood of Ignatius of Loyola*. From 1621 until his death in 1632 Baldwin remained in the Catholic Low Countries, from 1622 onwards as the rector of the English College in St. Omer.

What happened to Owen is less clear. Trumbull reported that he was in Rome in January 1612. From Rome he sent certain *mistacal commendations* to his nephew Thomas

⁴¹ WM, iii, 210, Winwood to Bodely, Düsseldorf, 22 August 1610.

⁴² WM, iii, 211, Winwood to Chamberlaine, Düsseldorf, 23 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 346, Hotman to Trumbull, Hambach, 24 August 1610; WM, iii, 212, Winwood to Salisbury, Düsseldorf, 27 August 1610; WM, iii, 212, Winwood to Salisbury, Düsseldorf, 27 August 1610; WM, iii, 277, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 18 October 1610; HMCD, iii, 16, More to Trumbull, London, 31 January 1611.

⁴³ Trumbull had just been on leave for six months and returned to the Southern Netherlands. As the Archdukes were staying at Ghent, he repaired to Flanders to greet them.

Lewis. Presumably Hugh Owen spent the remainder of his life in Rome. Trumbull reported his death in June 1619⁴⁴.

In contrast with Owen and Baldwin, John Gerard had been in London in November 1605. Archbishop Abbot informed Trumbull in March 1612 that Gerard had not been mentioned in the Act of Parliament thanks to some powerful friends. In January 1614 the archbishop elaborated. Gerard was the one who had given communion to the five people who *first entered the conspiracy in Percy's lodging in St. Clement's parish near Temple Bar*. After mass he retreated to an adjacent room while the others told the rest what their intentions were. This, according to the Abbot, was cunning, but it was, nevertheless, clear that they chose Gerard above all others, which meant *that he knew of some of them what was intended*⁴⁵. Gerard managed to cross the English Channel and arrived on Catholic soil at the end of April 1606, according to Salisbury's informant Barnes and confirmed by Sir Thomas Edmondes⁴⁶. John Gerard wrote his own narrative of the Gunpowder Plot in 1606⁴⁷. In 1607 he resided at the English Jesuit College in Louvain⁴⁸. At his departure in September 1609 Edmondes complained that the archduke harboured English fugitives in his countries, even those implicated in the mother of all plots. Gerard was now living, the departing ambassador argued, as if he had found a safe haven. In the months after Edmondes's departure and the banishment of Owen and Baldwin Trumbull focused on John Gerard. Gerard was banished from the Southern Low Countries at about the same time as Owen and Baldwin. Trumbull contacted de Prats when it became clear Gerard was on his way to Louvain. By mid-November 1610 it was reported that Gerard had left together with Baldwin and that both were on their way to Italy. Baldwin, as abovementioned, was captured in the Palatinate.

Gerard had been spotted in St. Omer, Douai, and Brussels. While Gerard resided in the Southern Netherlands Trumbull reported on his whereabouts. In May 1613 the Jesuit was in Louvain staying with fellow brethren, *there he walketh up and downe the streets in publicke, as if he were the most innocent man in the world, giving it out, that he hath leave from the Archds. to remayne in their dominyons*. Trumbull requested instructions but also advised James VI/I to approach Ferdinand de Boischot in London to further the case⁴⁹. Trumbull received instructions from the king and his favourite, Rochester. Meanwhile the English king followed the agent's advise. Northampton informed Trumbull of the answer of the archducal ambassador, *he denied the least notice either of the man or of his being there, adding that if he found any one guilty of that hellish treason in those parts he would be the first that should fall on him*. Trumbull was unable to gain access to the archduke until 7 July. He replied

that in consideracion of yor mats complainte, and the maintenance of the amity wth England, he would informe himself wheter Gerard were yet at Louvayne, or noe; and if he were founde in that place, or any other wthin his jurisdiction; there should be such order taken wth the said

⁴⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 294r-294v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, January 1612; SP 77/13 f^o 281r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [presumably Naunton], 10/20 June 1619.

⁴⁵ HMCD, iv, 292-293, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 January 1614.

⁴⁶ SP 77/8 f^o 98r, II (Thomas Barnes) to Mr. Du Pré (Salisbury), St. Omer, 6 May 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 108v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 21 May 1606.

⁴⁷ Gerard, *The Condition of Catholics under James I. Father Gerard's Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*.

⁴⁸ SP 77/8/2 f^o 188v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 25 November 1607.

⁴⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 294r-294v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 26 May 1613.

Gerrard; as might give yor matie contentment; and wittnes to the world, that he had no desyer to releve any man wch was accused of sch an abhominable cryme.

Trumbull assured Rochester he would observe what would happen closely. By August Albert had written to the Provincial of the Jesuits asking whether Gerard still resided in the Spanish Netherlands or not. Albert intended to banish him. According to Trumbull's information he was still *lurking in his accustomed denne* in Louvain but also he was restricted to his chamber. The archduke's secretary of state guaranteed James's agent that he would *have further notice what issue is lyke to follow in that nice, and strange busines*. In October Trumbull was *still kept in suspence by delays*⁵⁰. In January 1614 Trumbull was shown a letter written by Gerard that cleared him of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot. De Prats gave several arguments why Gerard was innocent beyond any doubt. His name had not been mentioned by those arrested in London. While he was in Rome the pontiff had ordered an investigation. Later he was nominated as English confessor in St. Peters (early 1607), which could not have happened if he was guilty of the charges he was accused of.

Somerset delivered James's instructions to Trumbull guaranteeing that Gerard would only be charged with the Gunpowder Plot, nothing else, if he presented himself to the English government. As he did not obey he *thereby apparently convicteth himself*⁵¹. Trumbull did as instructed and requested the banishment of the Jesuit as Albert and Isabella did not want to give him a harsher sentence⁵². In November 1613, however, Gerard was appointed novice master in the newly founded English Jesuit College in Liège, just outside archducal jurisdiction. He held that position until August 1621. Trumbull does not report on the appointment. The first time Gerard is mentioned as a person of note in an English Jesuit College was in September 1617. A Gage daughter made her vows at which ceremony *the prime Jesuits of our nation, and particulerly the Rectors of the 3 Colleges of St. Omers, Leege and Louvayne, Cresswell, Gerard and Benefields*⁵³. After 1621 Gerard defended the project of Mary Ward in Rome, but was appointed tertian director in Ghent in 1623. In 1627 he returned to the English College in Rome where he died in July 1637.

Besides the English Jesuits and Hugh Owen some members of the English regiment were also sought according to the diplomatic correspondence. After the Armada of 1588 the fear for a new armada to invade the British Isles and Ireland was ever present⁵⁴. This trepidation did not dissipate with the signing of the Treaty of London. The relationship between the British and Irish regiments and the Jesuits was a cause of major concern. For them it was clear that the British regiments would play an essential role. Sir William Stanley had been arrested by Albert but was released like Owen and Baldwin in 1606.

⁵⁰ SP 7710 f^o 305r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 7 July 1613; HMCD, iv, 144, Northampton to Trumbull, Northampton House, 18 June (1613 endorsement); SP 77/10 f^o 308v-309r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 19 June 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 341r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 15 October 1613.

⁵¹ SP 77/11 f^o 49v-50r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 4 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 412, Rochester to Trumbull, Whitehall, 26 May 1614.

⁵² SP 77/11 f^o 88r-88v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 30 June 1614.

⁵³ HMCD, vi, 296-297, draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617.

⁵⁴ See Loomie, 'The armadas and the Catholics of England', Loomie, 'Philip II's armada proclamation of 1597'.

According to Salisbury Hugh Owen had to contact Stanley to cross the Channel. The diplomatic correspondence only mentions Stanley on a few occasions so that it can be concluded that Stanley was not as important as Baldwin or Owen. He spent a large part of his life in Malines, as governor of the city and became a key founder of the Jesuit college in Liège, but Trumbull does not report on his help. The English agent only mentions him a few times, e.g. in June 1621 Trumbull reported that Stanley had returned from Spain and retired to his house in Malines or in March 1625 when he reports that Stanley returned from Madrid with 8.000 ducats to pay of his debts and that he retired himself to the English Carthusian monastery in Malines⁵⁵. There were others members of the British and Irish regiments as Sir William Windsor and captains James and John Blount. The latter provides the most interesting case.

John Blount travelled to England and the English agent recommended him to two privy councillors. Abbot reported his arrival in March 1614. Blount's former subordinate ensign Frost accused him of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot and he was arrested. That he was the brother of captain James Blount, a known dependent of Catesby, did not improve his standing. Furthermore, he knew Hugh Owen, and two other Jesuits, Baldwin and Hodgkins. The Privy Council had the intention of releasing him, but further proof was given which seemed to confirm Frost's accusations. Abbot promised Trumbull do his utmost to get him released on condition he left England. As the accusations grew stronger John Blount was forced to return to the Archducal Netherlands. Three trustworthy persons gave out he knew of something of the Gunpowder Plot via his brother James. Although he had behaved himself better since that time, no person associated with the plot could be given countenance⁵⁶.

According to Sir Thomas Edmondes in January 1606 James Blount did not know the exact details of the Gunpowder Plot but knew there was a plot in hand. He and Sir Edmond Baynham⁵⁷ were instructed to put the English regiment into the field in England. Baynham, known as the messenger from the Gunpowder Plotters to the pope, was already in Milan at that time. To be able to examine Blount's knowledge he got the order from England to return, but Blount, naturally, was not to eager to cross the Channel. Edmondes invited him in his house to inform him of his instructions. Although Blount accepted the invitation of the English ambassador he was far from thrilled. He nevertheless promised to leave once he had made arrangements for his affairs in the Southern Low Countries but he did not offer Edmondes an exact date. He was only stalling, as could be expected. In the mean time he contacted Owen and as a result only wanted to be tried by the Spanish king⁵⁸.

Archduke Albert was much more obliging than in the case of Owen and Baldwin. In March he inquired if Blount had obeyed and if not what should be done? As a result, the captain went into hiding and left the Archducal Netherlands in April 1606. Hoboken tried to convince Salisbury and James of the goodwill of Albert and Isabella. They wanted to

⁵⁵ SP 77/14 f^o 351r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 21 June 1621.

⁵⁶ HMCD, iv, 331, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 10 March 1614; HMCD, iv, 379, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 20 April 1614.

⁵⁷ See also, Sprot, 'Sir Edmund Baynham'.

⁵⁸ SP 77/8 f^o 16v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 January 1606 ; SP 77/8/2 f^o 9r-9v, copy, Salisbury to Edmondes, s.l., 22 January 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 23v-24r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 23 January 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 39r-41r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 February 1606.

arrest captain James Blount, but were prohibited by Edmondes. Salisbury, unimpressed by Hoboken's assertion, reminded the ambassador of Owen and Baldwin. Meanwhile, Blount had travelled to Spain. Sir Charles Cornwallis requested his arrest, which was promised by Pedro de Franqueza, conde de Villa Longa in May 1606. As nothing happened, Cornwallis wanted to invite the captain and detain him until he received instructions from London. But Blount did not trust Cornwallis and stayed clear of the ambassador's house⁵⁹. De Villa Longa finally delivered on his promise to arrest James Blount. When Cornwallis tried to get access to the prisoner, he was sent from the conde de Villa Longa to the conde de Miranda and back. Blount barely spoke Spanish, so Cornwallis wanted to help him because

how heynous soever the Crime was wherewith he was charged, yet it is neither the Custome nor Disposition in England to suffer any to perish for want of Necessaries, but to sustayne them till the Law determine them worthy of an End by Justice.

But Cornwallis was sent from pillar to post. Laconically his witty pen reported,

This is their Fashion. I assure your Lordshippe I verily think if a Man should put up a Memorial unto them, desireing it might be lawfull to eat Mustard with his Beef, they would keep him one three Months in their Counsels and Consults before they would determine it⁶⁰.

In the end London did not want to pursue the matter further *because*, Salisbury wrote to Cornwallis in August 1606,

that the Issue of thos Chastisements will either be multiplied for great Obligations upon us, or else would find occasions from our lack of Proof, or in the defect of their Lawes (which do not usually punish by Death practices against other Princes,) we rather chose to runn a Course to express our good Interpretation of that they have done with Blunt; and did declare, that his Majestie disdained to trouble himself any further with such a base Companyon;

he went on to chastize Philip III and the Albert and Isabella writing, *when those whom all Truth do convince of that unheard of and malicious Treason, doe not only find Safety in their Territories and Courts, but Support and Countenance.* King James expected Blount to be banished⁶¹. James Blount, however, returned to the Southern Netherlands in spring 1607 with a Spanish pension to support him. What happened afterwards is unclear.

In May 1616 Trumbull informed secretary Winwood that captain James Blount, who had served many years in the Archducal Netherlands and who had been accused *by the mallice of his adversaryes, wrongfully (as he affirmeth) to have ben accessary to the powder treason* desired to come to England to clear his name. He was leaving the Netherlands for England to that end. *It may please yor. hor. to affoorde him yor. accustomed favor for the*

⁵⁹ SP 77/8 f^o 50r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 7 March 1606 ; SP 77/8 f^o 56r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 12 March 1606 ; SP 77/8/2 f^o copy, Salisbury to Edmondes, s.l., 21 March 1606; WM, ii, 213, Cornwallis to Salisbury, Madrid, May 1606.

⁶⁰ WM, ii, 236-237, Cornwallis to Salisbury, s.l., End June-Start July 1606;

⁶¹ WM, ii, 251, Salisbury to Cornwallis, Whitehall, 17 August 1606.

expedition of his business, and to procure him an indifferent hearing. The issue of the whole matter is uncertain⁶².

Sir William Windsor was implicated in the treason by captain Roger Orme⁶³. During a conversation Windsor informed Orme that he could help him once he had returned to England. At the time Orme did not grasp what he meant, but after the Gunpowder Plot was discovered it all became clear. The information Edmondès had uncovered was that if the Gunpowder Plot had been successful, Windsor would have become appointed sergeant-major. Edmondès assured secretary Salisbury that Sir Edward Parham would be able to divulge more details. Orme also had information on the Jesuit Baldwin. Baldwin had asked if Orme was prepared undertake something for the glory of God. Before giving more details on what he meant, Baldwin spoke Sir Thomas Studder. As the matter at that time had been progressing well, no further help was needed, so Orme did not get more information. Baldwin had told that within the Privy Council there were some councillors that were notorious enemies of Catholicism, Salisbury, he exclaimed, was their leader. Edmondès described Windsor as extremely superstitious and a passionate follower of the Jesuits but doubted that he was involved in the plot. Salisbury took an interest in Windsor and instructed Edmondès to follow the same course as with James Blount. Windsor was to take the oath of allegiance and to travel to England to answer the accusations. Albert would be informed by his ambassador in London and Edmondès in Brussels⁶⁴.

Windsor was put under house arrest in England until Roger Orme had returned to England. Orme first had to find a way to dispose of his responsibilities in the Southern Netherlands, which proved difficult. In May 1606 Edmondès reported that captain Orme was almost ready to return to England. Orme had a conversation with the earl of Salisbury in July 1606 and confirmed all he had disclosed to Edmondès. Windsor was confronted with Orme in December 1606 but denied any knowledge of the plot⁶⁵. Windsor, *a pretiall instrument of the Jesuitte, and ill affected Englishe*, was living in the Southern Netherlands in 1611 and received the high profile fugitive William Seymour in his house in August and September⁶⁷. After that he disappeared entirely. He is not mentioned in a list with the names of the principal gentlemen residing in the Southern

⁶² SP 77/8/2 f^o 40r, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 18 February 1607; SP 77/8/2 f^o 75r-75v, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 April 1607; SP 77/12 f^o 105r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13 May 1614.

⁶³ SP 77/8/2 f^o 23v-24r, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels 23 January 1606

⁶⁴ SP 77/8 f^o 32r-32v, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 February 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 9v-10r, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondès], s.l., 12 February 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 39r-41r, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 February 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 47r, Roger Orme, s.l. 14 March 1606 (n.s.); SP 77/8 f^o 52v, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 7 March 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 60r, *Confession of Rog. Orme*, s.l., s.d.

⁶⁵ SP 77/8/2 f^o 12r-12v, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondès], s.l., 21 March 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 68r, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 5 April 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 111v, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 May 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 16v, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondès], s.l., 12 July 1606; SP 77/8/2 f^o 18v, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondès], s.l., 4 December 1606.

⁶⁶ HMCD, ii, 480, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 22 November 1609.

⁶⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 110v-111r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussel, 28 August 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 116r-117r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Antwerp, 11 September 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 118r-118v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussel, 18 September 1611.

Low Countries (1615) which could mean two things: he had left the Low Countries or he had died⁶⁸.

It is clear that the English Catholics in the Southern Netherlands were never suspected. The community as a whole was never on trial. Salisbury acknowledged as much to Hoboken in 1608. In a meeting with Hoboken the principal secretary of state accused Albert of giving sanctuary to known traitors as Hugh Owen, father Baldwin and others. According to Hoboken Albert only received those who had fled because they could not freely exercise their religion. Salisbury made a distinction between two kinds of refugees: those Catholics who are not implicated in any treasons, *ains de ceulx qui s'en treuvent tout embrouillés, et mesme de celle de la Pouldre*⁶⁹.

Did the Gunpowder Plot, and especially the refusal to hand over certain suspects, have no consequences? Apart from rhetoric there was no official response. The only way James could influence the decision in the Southern Netherlands was by changing the recruitment policy for the British and Irish regiments. Salisbury stated that there was a direct link between the lack of volunteers to join the the Army of Flanders, in contrast with the numerous men who joined the service of the Protestant North. The men that joined Catholic service were condemned by their fellow Englishmen because they followed in the footsteps of treasonous people. Although Edmondès mentioned a few times that the sending over of new recruits depended on the outcome of the proceedings concerning Owen and Baldwin, this never had much effect as the recruitment, as seen, was less necessary because of the cessation of arms in 1607 and the Twelve Years' Truce in 1609.

The Gunpowder Plot presented Albert and Isabella with a problem which seemed to be serious. In a sense it would have been logical to deliver the presumed culprits into the hands of the English judicial system, to preserve the peace. Moreover the archdukes could need the help of the English king in their negotiations for a Truce with the United Provinces. In an other sense it was logical to refuse James's request. How could they give up fellow-Catholics? And furthermore, the men had been privy to information which could harm the Catholic cause. After the departure of Edmondès from Brussels in 1609, the same year as the concluding of the Twelve Years truce, the Gunpowder Plotters, with the exception of John Gerard, figure only occasionally in the diplomatic correspondence. This episode certainly made life for the ambassadors more complicated and difficult, but in the end this did not have any permanent consequences for the relations between both courts. The Gunpowder Plot never seriously endangered the amity between Albert and Isabella and James.

Monasteries, convents and colleges

The monastic life in the British Isles and Ireland survived thanks to the foundation of English, Scottish and Irish monasteries on the continent. The Archducal Netherlands saw the erection of convents throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Walker

⁶⁸ SP 77/11 f° 25r-26r, *The names of Certaine Principall men of the Englishe, and Scottishe nations, now residinge in the Archds Provinces.*

⁶⁹ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vii, 591.

speaks of a monastical revival after 1603. The foundation of new monasteries, colleges and seminaries were news items on which Edmondes and Trumbull reported. That archduke Albert and infanta Isabella considered it their duty to safeguard the British Catholic refugees and their institutions was evident from their attitude. In August 1606 six English priests were given a warm reception, moreover they were given benefices⁷⁰. William Trumbull intercepted a letter to the abbess of the English nuns at St. Omer concerning a residence to educate young girls from England⁷¹. Trumbull sent James VI/I this letter referring to the abbess as the *matrone of certaine brainsicke English gentlewomen*. Trumbull added that he had the original minutes of the letter in his possession. These were signed by Guillaume de Grysperre, the vice-president of the archdukes' Privy Council. The English agent concluded that his master *may perceive what favor is borne to yor. evil affected subiects, and to what end they are fostered, and nourished in these parts*⁷². Both male and female monasteries were created in the Catholic Low Countries. Not every order was a cause for concern, though. Sometimes there are but a few references. Trumbull, for example, only mentioned the erection of a new monastery for the English nuns of the Order of the Descalças or Theresians in Brussels in July 1621⁷³.

Reports concentrated on specific monasteries or on certain individuals. One of the first foundations since the reformation of English contemplative females was the monastery for the English Benedictine nuns: the Convent of the Assumption of our Blessed Lady. At the end of the sixteenth century they had moved to Rome, but got permission of pope Clement VIII (1536-1605) to reside in Brussels and create a monastery at the end of the sixteenth century. John Petit, in November 1599, spoke of sixteen women who wished to set up the monastery. Albert gave them 2.000 pounds sterling⁷⁴. They bought the hotel of knight Roland de Longin, viscount of Berghes and St. Winnok. Of the female monasteries, this one figures prominently in the correspondence between Brussels and London. In April 1607 a procession in Brussels saw five English women join the monastery: Mrs. Morgan, one time servant of the countess of Sussex; Elisabeth Doleman from the North and a niece of the Jesuit Conyers; a daughter of Mr. [Edward] Gage; a niece of the Jesuit Parsons and Mrs. Deacon who had served Lady Riche. Morgan was accompanied on that occasion by the infanta herself⁷⁵. In 1609 three others, [Mary] Digby, [Lucy] Knatchbull and Colford, were professed in the presence of the infanta⁷⁶. At the start of 1616 William Trumbull reported that the nuns had offered 7.000 pounds sterling for the house of the count of Berlaymont to enlarge their monastery⁷⁷. Out of this abbey several more were erected throughout the Southern Low Countries: Ghent

⁷⁰ SP 77/8 f^o 162v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 27 August 1606; for the relation between the infanta and the English Benedictine nuns see, Arblaster, 'The Infanta and the English Benedictine nuns: Mary Percy's memories in 1634'.

⁷¹ SP 77/10 f^o 288r, copy of a letter to the abbess of the English Nuns at St. Omer, 2 May 1613 (n.s.).

⁷² SP 77/10 f^o 294r-294v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 26 May 1613

⁷³ SP 77/14 f^o 403r-403v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 25 July 1621.

⁷⁴ Dom. Cal. Elis, 1598-1601, Petit to Privy Council, Brussels, 13-23 November 1599; Guidlay, *The English Catholic refugees on the Continent*, 258 note 1.

⁷⁵ SP 77/8/2 f^o 68r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 15 April 1607; Guidlay, *The English Catholic refugees on the Continent*, 259, 260, 361.

⁷⁶ SP 77/9 f^o 310v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 13 December 1609.

⁷⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 38v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616.

(1624), Boulogne (1652), Pointoise (1658), Dunkirk (1662) and Ypres (1665)⁷⁸. The first abbess of the Benedictine nuns in Brussels, dame Joanna Berkeley, died in 1616 and was succeeded by Mary Percy (ca. 1570-1642)⁷⁹. She was installed by the archbishop of Malines

*with a thousand magicall ceremonyes. To grace this solemnity, there was a generall confluence of all or. Englishe Papists, of the better sorte wch lyve in these parts; and they were all sumptuously feasted, there, the same day at dynner, upon the charges of the said Cloyster*⁸⁰.

Although it prospered in the 1610s, a conflict between Percy and the novices led to a stop in recruitment in the 1630s and 1640s⁸¹.

One of the most remarkable figures is Lady Mary Lovel (born Jane Roper, c. 1564-1628)⁸². Lady Lovel was the daughter of Sir John Roper, baron Teynam (c. 1534-1628). She arrived in the Southern Netherlands during the summer of 1606 together with two lady-companions and some chambermaids. She had received permission to travel to Spa because of her breast cancer. In August 1608 John Beaulieu reported from Spa that Lady Lovel had taken a holy and strange decision, which should not wonder anyone, he added, because of her involvement with the Jesuits. From the beginning, Guilday argues, Lovel was observed by the English ambassador at Brussels. Edmondès named her *most passionate besotted poore woman that ever was*. She herself reported to Salisbury in 1608 that her only wish was *to seeke the glory of God and the securitie of my soule in a state of life*⁸³. By November 1609 she had joined the English Benedictine monastery in Brussels⁸⁴. Abbot commented on Lady Lovel, *she is as forward in her monastery as shee was foure of five yeeres since, being a person humerous and inconstant, not onely as shee is a woman but as shee is that woman, the Lady Lovell*⁸⁵. Abbot was referring to her lifelong spiritual quest to ascertain her vocation, as Seguin puts it. Leaving Brussels in 1609 because of a dispute with abbess Percy she wanted to found a Benedictine convent in Louvain, but her attempt failed. Her attempts in 1616, following a Marian vision, to found a Carmelite convent in Liège and Malines equally came to nothing. In 1619 she finally succeeded and established a Carmelite convent in Antwerp. After she left to raise money in England, the nuns had permitted Flemish women to join their ranks in 1623, which was not to Lovel's liking. By 1625 Lady Lovel was no longer in Antwerp and was trying to establish a Bernardine cloister in Bruges, but her death meant she never saw the fruition of that project.

⁷⁸ Guilday, *The English Catholic refugees on the Continent*, 256.

⁷⁹ Bowden, 'Percy, Lady Mary (c.1570-1642)'.

⁸⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 169r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 September 1616.

⁸¹ Walker, *Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe. English Convents in France and the Low Countries*, 13, 24.

⁸² Seguin, 'Lovel, Mary, Lady Lovel (c.1564-1628)'.

⁸³ SP 77/9 f^o 112, Edmondès to Salisbury, Brussel, 10 August 1608; SP 77/9 f^o 119r, Lovel to Salisbury, August 1608; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 360-365; Walker, *Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe. English Convents in France and the Low Countries*, 136.

⁸⁴ HMCD, ii, 12, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Brussels, 6 July 1606; HMCD, ii, 71, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Spa, 18 August [1608]; HMCD, ii, 480, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 22 November 1609; Guilday, *The English Catholic refugees on the Continent*, 360-361.

⁸⁵ HMCD, vi, 71 (letter 167), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 December 1616.

Mary Ward (1585–1645)⁸⁶ was especially known for her attempt to found a new order for women who would follow the rules of the Jesuits, the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Of all the English female contemplatives she is the one who received most attention in historiography⁸⁷. After the Virgin Mary appeared to her she left Gravelines (1609). She gathered a small group of followers in St. Omer. Known as the English Ladies they were supported by bishop Blaise and the Jesuits. Her visions lead her to believe she was to form a female order cast in the same mould as the Society of Jesus. Despite opposition Ward opened new houses throughout Europe: Liège (1616), Cologne and Treves (1620–21), Rome (1622), Naples (1623), Perugia (1624), Munich (1627), Vienna (1627), and Pressburg (1628). Abbot was sure that she would not succeed in obtaining permission for her Jesuitesses, stating

*For the Pope maketh greate scuple to erect any new order of weomen, and especially of Jesuitrices, which shee doth principally desire, because hee knoweth that the name Jesuites, upon whose decrees these must depend, is sufficiently odious already*⁸⁸.

Abbot's suspicions proved right. Although she was armed with a letter of recommendation from the infanta Isabella in 1621 she was refused to use the name Jesuits by pope Gregory XV and Muzio Vitelleschi (1563-1645), General of the Jesuits since 1615. The Italian houses were suppressed in 1625, those in the Southern Netherlands in 1630. The following year Ward was imprisoned for two months and a papal bull of suppression forbade *women or virgins to assume the name of Jesuits*. Ward abandoned her project and reformed her houses into secular teaching communities for girls⁸⁹.

Besides the female monasteries which appear to have been of little concern, according to Walker, the male monasteries were considered rather more conspicuous⁹⁰. Not all male monasteries, however, were considered of immediate concern by the English diplomat in Brussels. The monastery of the contemplative Carthusians in Malines was only mentioned occasionally. In 1615 their prior left for Spain to assure that the monastery in the Archducal Netherlands would be maintained⁹¹. Robert Browne, a Scottish friar of the Order of Minims, founded a new monastery in Antwerp at the end of 1614 with the money of a banker called Bally. Trumbull went on to state that these were the enemies of king James in the Southern Netherlands, but they never figured further in the

⁸⁶ O'Brien, 'Ward, Mary (1585–1645)'.

⁸⁷ Walker, *Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe. English Convents in France and the Low Countries*, 3; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 163-214; Lux-Sterritt, 'An analysis of the controversy caused by Mary Ward's Institute in the 1620s'; Lux-Sterritt, 'Les religieuses en mouvement. Ursulines françaises et Dames anglaises à l'aube du XVIIe siècle'; Peters, *Mary Ward. Ihre Persönlichkeit und Ihr Institut*; Norman, 'A woman for all seasons: Mary Ward (1585-1645), renaissance pioneer of women's education'; Wetter, 'Mary Ward'; O'Laoghaire, 'Mary Ward, 1585-1645: a personal tribute'; O'Brien, 'Ward, Mary (1585–1645)'.

⁸⁸ HMCD, vi, 71 (letter 167), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 December 1616; O'Brien, 'Ward, Mary (1585–1645)'.

⁸⁹ Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540-1770*, 70-71; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 163-214.

⁹⁰ Walker, *Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe. English Convents in France and the Low Countries*, 115-116.

⁹¹ SP 77/11 f^o 377r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 August 1615.

correspondence. The Irish Cistercians founded a college in Douai in 1612⁹². Francis Nugent, in February 1620, was treating in Brussels with the archdukes and the papal nuncio about erecting a new monastery in the dominions of the archdukes of the *Cheulrs de la Milica Chrestienne*⁹³. The English agent only mentioned the erection of a monastery of English Franciscans in Brussels in passing in November 1621⁹⁴.

In August 1611 the Irish, with the help of the Phillip III and Albert and Isabella founded two seminaries/colleges, one in Lille and one in Tournai⁹⁵. Don Diego de Velasco, who had been Spain's ambassador in London, wanted the foundation of a college in Louvain for the priests he had been able to deliver from prison at his departure from England. He had already made that request to the archduke and would also suggest it in Spain⁹⁶. The new nuncio in Brussels, Ascanio Gesualdo, obtained permission to erect a new English monastery in January 1615. According to Trumbull it would house English Franciscans. *But where those Hornets make a nest, it is yet undetermined*. Gravelines was a likely candidate but so were the other harbours of Flanders. Besides this new house the nuncio also had other projects: the foundation of houses and colleges to receive English refugees who lacked the resources to be able to maintain themselves. To get money he wanted an intervention from Rome to get the richer monasteries in the Southern Netherlands to contribute. Trumbull was sceptical about this second plan, *seeing that the Pope is naturally of an convetus disposicion; and the clergy-men of these Provinces are moste subiect to the synne of avarice; especially towardes strangers*⁹⁷.

With Winwood at the helm it hardly surprises that the secretary of state was interested in the Catholic subjects of king James residing in the realms of the archdukes. In February 1615 he requested the English agent in Brussels to collect information of a possible college of Benedictine friars that was intended to be built in Louvain. Because of the lack of money it did not proceed, *but that from the executor of my lord of Northampton mony shortly is expected*, referring to the recently deceased Henry Howard (1540-1614)⁹⁸. He also requested a list with the most important gentlemen and their families and also a list of the colleges, seminaries and monasteries. In the State Papers a list can be found that is dated 1614. As the Scottish convent in Antwerp, founded by Robert Browne, was only erected at the end of 1614 and Winwood requested the list in 1615, the list should be put in that year:

⁹² For a map of the Irish colleges on the continent see, Silke, 'The Irish abroad, 1534-1691', 616.

⁹³ SP 77/14 f^o 33r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 26 February/7 March 1620.

⁹⁴ SP 77/11 f^o 210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 December 1614; SP 77/14 f^o 539r, Trumbull to Digby, Brussels, 10/20 November 1621.

⁹⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 110r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 August 1611.

⁹⁶ HMCD, iv, 228, Floyd to Trumbull, Paris, 18 October 1613.

⁹⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 15v-16r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1615.

⁹⁸ HMCD, v, 143 (letter 309), Winwood to Trumbull, 20 February [1615]; Croft, 'Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton (1540-1614)'.

Brussels ⁹⁹ :	<i>A monastery of Englishe nunnes: of 44. persons</i>
Louvain ¹⁰⁰ :	<i>A Colledge or noviciate of Englishe Jesuits of above 60. persons</i> <i>A Monastery of Englishe nunnes: of the order of St. Augustine</i> ¹⁰¹ <i>A Convent of Irishe franciscane fryers</i>
Malines ¹⁰² :	<i>A Monastery of English Carthusian moncks: of 23. persons</i>
Antwerp ¹⁰³ :	<i>A Seminary of Irishe</i> <i>A Convent of Scottishe fryers: of the order of the M[inims]</i>
Douai ¹⁰⁴ :	<i>A Seminary of Englishe of 80. students</i> <i>A Seminary Colledge of Scottishe</i> <i>A Seminary of Irishe</i> <i>A Monastery of Benedictine moncks Englishe</i>
Tournai:	<i>A Seminary of Irishe</i>
Lille ¹⁰⁵ :	<i>A Seminary of Irishe</i>

⁹⁹ For the Benedictine convent see, Arblaster, 'The monastery of our lady of the Assumption in Brussels (1599-1794)'; Sequin, 'Addicted unto Piety. Catholic Women in England 1590-1690'; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 256-283.

¹⁰⁰ For the British and Irish monasteries and colleges at Louvain: Irish Franciscans see, Murphy, 'College of the Irish Franciscans at Louvain'; Cavanagh, 'The Irish Franciscan College at Louvain, Belgium'; Conlan, 'Irish Franciscan studies in the 17th century'; Conlan, *St. Anthony' College of the Irish Franciscans Louvain*; Cunningham, 'The culture and ideology of Irish Franciscan historians at Louvain, 1607-1650'; Fennesy, 'Guardians and staff of St. Anthony's College, Louvain, 1607-1999'; Brendan, *Louvain papers*; for Saint Monica's see, Antheunis, 'Een weldoener van het St. Monicaklooster te Leuven : Thomas Worthington, 1553-1619' [A benefactor of St. Monica's Convent, Louvain]; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 377-385; for English Jesuits see, Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 149-153.

¹⁰¹ Originally they housed in the convent of Saint Ursula. In 1609 they received permission of the Archbishop of Malines to found their own community. They rented the refuge of the Abbey of Vlierbeek, which eventually became their property. Their convent was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, Saint Michael and Saint Monica. The relique they had, was the penitential robe of Sir Thomas More. Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique', 311; in 1622 a convent of the Irish Dominicans was created in Louvain, see Fenning, 'Irish Dominicans at Louvain before 1700: a biographical register'.

¹⁰² For the English Carthusian monks see, Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 41-55.

¹⁰³ For the Irish college see O'Connor, 'Irish migration to Spain and the formation of an Irish college network, 1589-1800'; Morales, 'Not only seminaries: the political role of the Irish colleges in seventeenth-century Spain'; Giblin, 'The Irish colleges on the continent'; Nilis, 'The Irish College Antwerp'; although there were also students from the British Isles studying at Louvain, they do not figure in the correspondence, for information see also Jennings, 'Irish students in the university of Louvain'.

¹⁰⁴ For the British colleges and monasteries of Douai: English College see, Fabre, 'Le collège anglais de Douai: son histoire héroïque'; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 63-120, 307-345; Holt, 'Free places at the English College of St. Omer and Bruges and at the Liège Academy'; Willaert, *Le collège anglais de Saint-Omer: les debuts*; Holt, *St. Omers and Bruges Colleges, 1593-1773: a biographical dictionary*; for the Scottish college see, Moran, 'The library of the Scots college, Douai'; Chadwick, 'The Scots College, Douai, 1580-1613'; Baxter, 'The Scots college at Douai'; Anderson, *Records of the Scots colleges at Douai, Rome, Madrid, Valladolid and Ratisbon*; for the English Franciscans see, Marron 'The English Franciscans at Douai'; for the foundation of the English Benedictines see, Fabre, *The settling of the English Benedictines at Douai. As seen chiefly through unpublished documents of the Vatican archives, 1607-1611*; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 222-237.

¹⁰⁵ For the Irish College in Lille see, Boyle, *The Irish college in Paris from 1578 to 1901. With a brief account of the other Irish colleges in France : viz., Bordeaux, Toulouse, Nantes, Poitiers, Douai and Lille; and a short notice of the Scotch and English colleges in Paris.*

- St. Omer¹⁰⁶: *A Seminary of Englishe of 160. persons
A noviciate of yong Englishe gentlewomens, called expectations in wch
there are
about 26. persons all of principall houses*
- Gravelines¹⁰⁷: *A Monastery of nunnes of the order of the Poor Clares*¹⁰⁸

In September 1616, in the wake of the débâcle of *Corona Regia*, Trumbull wrote to Winwood that there were about twenty monasteries, colleges and seminaries with subjects from king James, *which are no better then so many seedplots of practyses and conspiracies against his Majestie his kingdoms and the Relligion whereof he maketh profession*. Trumbull's informant in Douai, Henry Taylor, reported the following numbers in Douai: English College, 100; Scottish College, 11 and Irish College, 50¹⁰⁹. In November 1617 Trumbull argued that most monasteries and colleges had been founded after the Treaty of London in 1604, which Walker, as abovementioned, styled 'monastic revival'. To add more to his argument Trumbull mentioned that there were more English religious houses in the Archducal Netherlands than in any other part of Europe. Since 1604 at least seventeen monasteries or colleges had been erected, while only five were erected before the Treaty of London. According to secretary Charles de la Faille Albert and Isabella were only guided by piety and charity, the same argument the archducal ambassador had used in a meeting with archbishop Abbot. It was against their conscience to let those men and women, who left England to be able to exercise the Catholic religion, wither. *They were people of a quiett disposition; and medled wth nothing but their beads & prayers*. De la Faille even accused James VI/I because he received *the Repaille (that very woord [sic] he used) of these Provinces; beeing men of unquiett, & turbulent spiritte* in England. Trumbull naturally denied this and stressed that since king James was crowned king of England the archdukes nor their ministers ever formulated a complaint. Furthermore, they were not financially supported as the British and Irish Catholics were in the archducal dominions. Moreover, the majority of the men and women who had migrated to England came from the United Provinces, which were, according to the Twelve Years' Truce, an independent and free republic¹¹⁰.

It was clear to Trumbull that nothing could be done to thwart all this in the Netherlands ruled by the pious archdukes. England was the only place where actually something could be effected.

¹⁰⁶ For the British colleges and monasteries of St. Omer: English college see, Holt, 'Free places at the English College of St. Omer and Bruges and at the Liège Academy; Willaert, *Le collège anglais de Saint-Omer: les debuts*; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 138-145.

¹⁰⁷ For the Poor Clares at Gravelines see, Hunnybun, 'Registers of the English Poor Clares at Gravelines, including those who founded filiations at Aire, Dunkirk, and Rouen, 1608-1837; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, 297-301.

¹⁰⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 25r-26r, *The names of Certaine Principall men of the Englishe, and Scottishe nations, now residinge in the Archds. Provinces*. For the Irish colleges see, O'Boyle, *The Irish colleges on the continent. Their origin and history*.

¹⁰⁹ HMCD, vi, 276 (letter 591), [Taylor] to Trumbull, Doai, 3/13 September 1616; HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629), Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617.

¹¹⁰ HMCD, iv, 291, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 January 1614; SP 77/12 f^o 416r-417r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 12/22 November 1617.

*His Majesty shall never be at quiet until some means be found to root out these seminaries and shops of popery and treason. I think it were less prejudice to our state to have open war with Spain than such a secret canker to eat into the bowels of his subjects*¹¹¹.

Salisbury had already noted his opinion in the year before he died:

*Touching the Irish, Spanish and Archduke's contribution to the erection of those seminaries in Lille, Tournay ... the reception there of poor seduced women and other malcontented fugitives; they are all fruits like the tree they grow on, unpleasant, unsound and such as are far fitter for a settled peace to bring forth than remedy*¹¹².

While on leave in the first half 1618 Trumbull requested instructions on a number of issues. On the top of his list he wrote *What course shalbe taken to prevent the future buyldinge of Monasteryes, Colledges, and Seminaries, by, and for his mats Subiects in the Archduks Provinces, there beeing too many already?*¹¹³ Trumbull got his instructions when he returned to Brussels to resume his duties in summer 1618:

*First, it is not unknowne to you that wee have before found our self displeased that so many monasteries, Nunries and other places of religion are erected and mainteyned in their countreis for receipt and entertainment of our subjects, who either for discontentment departing the Universities and Schooles of this realme or being seduced young, and oftentimes without the privity of their parents are adverse to the religion established here in this realme, but also oftentimes corrupted with opinions in matter concerning their dutie and allegiance to us, which cary them into acts of disloyaltie to our grieffe and the great disgrace and daunger of their owne parents. A course which you shall in our name move the Archduke that hereafter may be stayed and restrayned, and wee shall take it as a testimonye of his good meaning to preserve the amitie which is betweene us, or otherwise it wilbe a nourishment of jealousie and doubt betweene us*¹¹⁴.

The order which received most attention was the English branch of the Society of Jesus, which Trumbull describes *as the fountayne, from whence all trecherous practises doe floe* and the Irish Franciscans of Louvain, which already figured in the chapter on the British and Irish regiments¹¹⁵. The English Jesuits, often called vipers by Trumbull, were considered among the most dangerous English religious refugees¹¹⁶. The Jesuits in general were regarded as the spearhead of the Counterreformation and the Catholic Renewal. As such they were the great adversaries of James VI/I and the Church of England and had to be monitored closely. Moreover they had presumably been implicated in the Gunpowder Plot, as seen in the first paragraph of this chapter. Their

¹¹¹ HMCD, iv, 260, draft, Trumbull to Abbot, Brussels, 1 December 1613.

¹¹² HMCD, iii, 127, Salisbury to Trumbull, Salisbury House, 25 August 1611.

¹¹³ SP 77/13 f^o 7r-7v, *Certain points to bee represented to his maties consideration; before my retourne to Bruxelles.*

¹¹⁴ HMCD, vi, 433 (letter 939), *Instructions to William Trumbull*, 16 June 1618.

¹¹⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 110v-111r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 August 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 243r-244r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 6 December 1612.

¹¹⁶ For recent research on the English Jesuits see, McCoog, *English and Welsh Jesuits, 1555-1650*.

theory of regicide and the presumed power of the pope to depose kings made them even more odious¹¹⁷.

Edmondès and Trumbull kept a close watch on the English Jesuits in the Southern Low Countries. Their college in St. Omer, originally founded by Philip II of Spain, was intended to receive the youth out of England which Elizabeth had wanted to separate from their parents. The foundation was announced in 1593 by the governor-general of the Low Countries, Peter Ernest, earl of Mansfeld, and was put under the protection of the bishop of St. Omer. According to Guilday it became *the leading English Catholic preparatory school on the continent*. St. Omer was intended to educate boys from ten to fifteen who afterwards would be sent on to the seminaries at Rome, Douai and in Spain¹¹⁸. The English college in Douai had been founded by William Allen (1532-1594)¹¹⁹ and had a large influence on the English Catholics. While it was originally intended to replace Oxford it gradually became a place where missionary priests were educated¹²⁰. From 38 scholars in the 1590s, their numbers rose to 106 (1598) and 120 (1602). The English Jesuits themselves numbered seven in 1594-95, which increased to eleven in 1604¹²¹. In the 1630s there were about 200 students enrolled in the college which at that time was under the leadership of Thomas Worsley¹²². Edmondès assured that the new laws in England did not miss their effect in August 1606. Following the Gunpowder Plot the English Parliament passed anti-Catholic legislation: a law against the only occasional presence at Protestant services and the obligation to take communion at least once a year or pay a fine; a law that passed the oath of allegiance, if the oath was not taken then all property was confiscated, a law that forbade recusants to come to court unless they were called for, a law forbidding recusants to own a house in London unless they traded there or did not have any other house. Catholics were also excluded from some professions: doctors, lawyers, working for the state, a.s.o. A reward of £50 was promised to those revealing recusants¹²³. Many priests, some of which had been banished and some who chose voluntary exile, turned to archduke Albert for support. According to Willaert, there were still at least 600 Jesuits and priests in England in 1599. That number dropped to 160 priests in 1606, although he admits it is impossible to give exact numbers¹²⁴. The English ambassador furthermore stressed that several recusants who had up till then harboured priests, now conformed and that others had withdrawn their financial support. This was especially bad news for the Jesuits as they were the main beneficiaries of that money.

Although the Gunpowder Plot did cause some disturbances, the number of scholars at St. Omer kept growing. Eventually it was decided to separate the noviciate from the college. Bishop Blaise gave the English Jesuits the old monastery and church at Watten in 1603. Although this was approved by Philip III (1604), Paul V (1607), and was ratified by two generals of the Jesuits, Claudio Acquaviva (1612) and Muzio Vitelleschi (1616), the

¹¹⁷ See Chapter 6: *Corona Regia*.

¹¹⁸ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 140.

¹¹⁹ Duffy, 'Allen, William (1532-1594)'.

¹²⁰ Norman, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan settlement to the Second Vatican Council*, 16-17.

¹²¹ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141.

¹²² Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais dans la Belgique', 300-301.

¹²³ Leys, *Catholics in England 1559-1829. A Social History*, 59-60.

¹²⁴ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vi, 570.

noviciate was not established in Watten because of *the jealousy of the Archduke Albert towards the English Jesuits*, Guilday argues. It was only erected in 1622, the year following the death of archduke Albert¹²⁵. Because of their lack of success the Jesuits wanted to erect their noviciate in Louvain in September-October 1606. Richardot, president of the Privy Council, was the first person on the list which was to receive a complaint formulated by Edmondes. Sir Thomas stressed that the French king had expressly forbidden such a foundation. Richardot pretended to know nothing of the intended noviciate. He assured the English ambassador that he would not grant permission in these circumstances but apologetically told Sir Thomas that he could not make any promises¹²⁶. Edmondes did not leave any stone unturned when it concerned the English Jesuits and confronted Albert. The English ambassador feared that this noviciate was going to turn into a college. Although Albert promised to look into the matter, the ambassador had little hope in achieving success, as preparations for the new building were already well underway. He requested Salisbury to raise the matter with Hoboken in London¹²⁷. This was not to much avail, as Edmondes reported that two Englishmen, one Brooke and one Sparre, entered the noviciate during the summer of 1607¹²⁸. The money for the erection in Louvain was provided by Dona Luisa de Carvajal who left 12.000 ducats in her will, written in 1604, for the establishment of an English noviciate¹²⁹. The English ambassador was not the only one to oppose the English Jesuits. In 1607 he reported a conflict between the English Jesuits and their Benedictine counterparts. The Benedictines wanted to erect a college of their own in Douai which would have meant the end of the monopoly the Jesuits had on education. The Benedictine spokesman, White, was countered by Dr. Thomas Worthington (c.1548–1626)¹³⁰, president of the English College. Jean Richardot informed Edmondes that the Benedictine request had been refused, in part to the satisfaction of king James¹³¹.

At his departure, in September 1609, Edmondes wrote a final letter to the archdukes iterating several outstanding matters, including the English colleges and monasteries. The one order he mentioned emphatically was that of the Jesuits. Under the pretence of devotion and studies those houses, Sir Thomas argued, were only there to *nourrir et remuer leur praticques dans l'Etat de sa Matie, par les emissaires et instruments qu'ilz y ennuoyent tous les jours de ces lieux la*¹³². The English Jesuits did not disappear from the scope of the English diplomat in Brussels with the changing of the guard. At the start of 1611 seven women joined a house of Parsons, presumably George or Richard, brother of the deceased Jesuit, Robert Persons (1546–1610)¹³³.

¹²⁵ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142, 149.

¹²⁶ SP 77/8 f^o 167r-167v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 17 September 1606.

¹²⁷ SP 77/8 f^o 173v-174r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 24 September 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 176v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 1 October 1606.

¹²⁸ SP 77/8/2 f^o 115r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 29 July 1607.

¹²⁹ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142, 150.

¹³⁰ SP 77/8/2 f^o 28v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 22 January 1607; Loomie, 'Worthington, Thomas (c.1548–1626)'.

¹³¹ SP 77/8/2 f^o 39v-40r, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 18 February 1607.

¹³² HMCD, ii, 118, copy, Edmondes to Albert, [Brussels], 30 August 1609.

¹³³ Houliston, 'Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610)'.

By the industry and artifice of the Jesuitts, who to enriche themselves seeke the spoile of other men; there are so many English gentlemens sonnes and daughters trayned over hether, to be couped up in Seminaryes, and in Cloisters... to be instructed in their superstitions, and intruded into monasteryes¹³⁴.

Throughout the correspondence Trumbull mentions men or women who turned to the English Jesuits for support and guidance: e.g. Mr. Southcott and Gerard Oxenbridge in 1611¹³⁵.

In July 1611 Trumbull came across some information concerning the English Jesuits. As already had been the case during the tenure of Sir Thomas Edmondes they wanted to get the abbey of Watten. Edmondes had been able to prevent that. During an audience Trumbull requested the same. Albert assured Trumbull he would take information, *and promised to beare it in remembrance, when tyme should serve*¹³⁶. In April 1612 a Scottish Jesuit from Douai arrived in Brussels with letters from the Spanish king for the archdukes. It was for the erection of a Scottish seminary at the University of Douai. The king of Spain had awarded an annual pension of about 3.000 crowns¹³⁷. During the fall of 1613 the Jesuits in Louvain were suing for permission to erect their own university at Liège to teach their *Pharisaicall doctryne*, as Trumbull termed it. Although the universities of Louvain, Douai and Cologne vehemently opposed the idea, the English agent feared that the Jesuits were too omnipotent to endanger their project. In his opinion all rulers in Europe should try and prevent this. Even when archduke Albert, under pressure from Louvain and Douai, wrote to the Provincial of the Jesuits threatening to close down their schools in his jurisdiction unless they abandoned their intended university, Trumbull remained sceptical. He argued that Spain and/or Rome would most probably back the Jesuits against the archdukes¹³⁸. Trumbull only lifts a corner of the veil when it comes to his involvement in the controversy, writing in October 1613,

The animosityes betweene the encroaching Jesuitts; and these mylde Princes, doe yet continuwe; about the erecting of an University at Leege: (as I formerly wrote unto yor matie) and to the uttermost of my poore meanes, and understandinge, I doe in secrett caste oyle into the flame, to have it the sooner quenched. One of that Pharisaicall Sect, discoursing wth a gentleman of my acquaintance, and supposing him to be of their Sodallity; said in Lattin quod Archidux se opporit Societati, & sanctis suis conatibur, per instinctum diaboli: wch woord I have caused to be related to these Princes; and hope that albeit, they have their hands bounde by a superior aucthority in Italy, and Spaine; yet therby the Spiritt of these Locusts of Egipt, and their pryde shalbe knowen, and in some sorte may be restrained by the power of the Archdukes¹³⁹.

¹³⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 1v, Trumbull to Salisbury, [Brussels], 2 January 1611.

¹³⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 15v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 13 February 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 59v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 10 April 1611;

¹³⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 99r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 11 July 1611.

¹³⁷ HMCD, iii, 272-273, draft, Trumbull to [Abbot], 9 April 1612; HMCD, iii, 273, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, 9 April 1612. The Scottish Jesuit was Father Christick, (SP 77/10 f^o 182, Trumbull to Salisbury, 14 May 1612); but was called Robert Scott by Sir John Digby, HMCD, iii, 247, Digby to Trumbull, Madrid, 24 February 1612.

¹³⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 332r-332v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 September 1613.

¹³⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 342v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 15 October 1613.

Louvain did not only turn to the archdukes but also approached the States of Brabant, which supported their claims. The Jesuits, on the other hand, applied themselves to the States of Hainaut, Artois and Flanders. Those three provinces housed 1.800 of their disciples, whose parents were *men of the beste, and most eminent quallity*, Trumbull clarified. Despite sending their most eloquent men to Albert, e.g. Leonard Lessius (1554-1623)¹⁴⁰ from Louvain, to try and mask their intention as piety, the archduke ordered the closure of their school in Douai. According to Trumbull's information, this command was respected¹⁴¹. Undoubtedly Trumbull was pleased he was able to inform king James of the lack of progress of the Jesuits in December 1613.

After the Prothean Jesuitts had changed themselves into all manner of shapes, and stayned all the springs of their staggered reputacion; for the mainteyning of their publick Schooles at Leege; (the Archeds. Having sylenced their Professors at Doway): they resolved rather then they would spem pretio emere; and take shaddowes for substance: to yeeld to the tyme; and promisse, that at Leege; they would desiste from their teaching, so they might be restored to the favor of these Princes¹⁴².

In 1614 the English Jesuits decided leave Louvain for Liège or Aachen. Although Trumbull did not know the true reason for this, he gave the king four possible motivations. Firstly, the house where they resided in Louvain was the property of archduke Albert. He had only leased it to them for a few years. Secondly, they were still opposed by the University of Louvain, which did not want the English Jesuits to give public lectures. Thirdly, there was also a geographical sound argument. Liège or Aachen were closer to Spa. The famous Spa attracted many men and women from all over Europe, including England. Trumbull in 1617 described the Englishmen arriving at Spa as with *more diseases in their soules, then in their bodyes*¹⁴³. In 1618 he mentioned to Carleton in The Hague, that of the 60 Englishmen and Scotsmen who visited Spa that year, there were but ten or twelve Protestants. These Protestants had been harassed by a number of Jesuits to try and convert them, which would be much easier when they lived nearby. Trumbull thought it would be a great fortune to remedy these abuses, but he feared *wee are more lyke to undergoe new, then amend olde faults*¹⁴⁴. Finally, Trumbull concluded, by removing to Liège or Aachen the English Jesuits would leave the jurisdiction of the archdukes and enjoy complete liberty to do as they pleased and especially to hatch plots against king James and his realms.

In December 1614 Trumbull reported, *our Englishe Jesuitts have planted a newe collony of their yong wolfes at Leege*¹⁴⁵. In 1625 the noviciate was finally removed to Watten, while the college itself remained at Liège¹⁴⁶. Proost motivated the move to Liège as result of a disease in Louvain. But he added, rather simplistically, that *on savait par expérience que*

¹⁴⁰ Le Roy, 'Leys (Léonard)'.

¹⁴¹ SP 77/10 f° 346r-346v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 25 November 1613.

¹⁴² SP 77/10 f° 370r-370v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 December 1613.

¹⁴³ SP 77/12 f° 389v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 4 August 1617 (n.s.).

¹⁴⁴ SP 77/13 f° 38r-39r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 19/29 August 1618.

¹⁴⁵ SP 77/11 f° 171v-172r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 28 October 1614; SP 77/11 f° 190v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11 November 1614; SP 77/11 f° 203r, Trumbull to SOMeret, Brussels, 17 November 1614; SP 77/11 f° 210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, 8 December 1614.

¹⁴⁶ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142, 152-153.

l'ambassadeur de Jacques Ier auprès des archiducs jetait les haut cris chaque fois que les réfugiés établissaient un nouveau couvent en Brabant ou Flandre. Guilday followed Proost in his opinion stating that *one of the reasons for this change from Louvain to Liège was the constant attacks made on the existence of the novitiate at Louvain by the English ambassador at Brussels.* This however seems simply untrue, Trumbull was very much a spectator and reporter on the entire episode¹⁴⁷.

The rector of the new Jesuit College in Liège was no one less than father John Gerard. Trumbull insisted that he should be banished. The archduke replied,

that in consideracion of yor mats complaints, and the maintenance of the amity wth England, he would informe himself wheter Gerard were yet at Louvayne, or noe; and if he were founde in that place, or any other wthin his jurisdiction; there should be such order taken wth the said Gerrard; as might give yor matie contentment; and wittnes to the world, that he had no desyer to releve any man wch was accused of sch an abhominable cryme¹⁴⁸.

As Gerard settled in Liège, he was out of the archducal jurisdiction, and Trumbull's request had been granted. Winwood had information in February 1615 that the English Jesuits were planning to erect a college in Liège and had 12,000 *Jacobeaux in specie*. Trumbull had to investigate¹⁴⁹. Abbot requested Trumbull to keep an eye on the new college, *for it must needs produce some excellent effects, when so honest a man as Gerard, the powder traytour, hath the managing and ruling of it¹⁵⁰.*

The Irish Franciscan friars, with their abode in Saint Anthony's in Louvain, were also cause for concern, but they never figured as prominently as the English Jesuits. Their close association with the Irish regiment, and especially with the colonel, could mean trouble, for Trumbull considered them *the oracles and directors of the Irishe nation¹⁵¹*. Philip III had founded this community in 1609 under the supervision of Florence Conry (d. 1629)¹⁵², archbishop of Tuam. In March 1616 Trumbull reported that their numbers increased daily and beyond expectation¹⁵³. Trumbull's Irish informant, Fargus Donnell, divulged that five friars had been sent to Ireland in 1612 supposedly to prepare for a possible invasion by stirring up rebellion¹⁵⁴. Archduke Albert and infanta Isabella laid the foundation stone of the Irish Franciscan Church in 1618¹⁵⁵.

Throughout the correspondence of Edmondes and Trumbull references can be found to the numbers of men and women living in a college or monastery. There are numerous instances of men or women joining the convents, e.g. in February 1606 two women

¹⁴⁷ Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique', 301; Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142, 151.

¹⁴⁸ SP 77/10 f^o 308v-309r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 14 July 1613.

¹⁴⁹ HMCD, v, 143 (letter 309), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 February [1615]

¹⁵⁰ HMCD, v, 165 (letter 349), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 March 1615.

¹⁵¹ SP 77/10 f^o 231r-232v, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 8 October 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 243r-244r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 6 December 1612.

¹⁵² Clavin, 'Conry, Florence (d. 1629)'.
¹⁵³ SP 77/12 f^o 40r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616.

¹⁵⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 243r-244r, Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 6 December 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 253r-254r,

Trumbull to [Rochester], Brussels, 14 January 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 263r-264r, Trumbull to [Rochester] Brussels, 26 February 1613.

¹⁵⁵ Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique', 303.

arrived, one from Yorkshire and the other from Lancashire¹⁵⁶, June 1607 two more women arrived to join but their names were kept secret¹⁵⁷. In November 1609 the English agent reported that the English Jesuits in Louvain had 38 or 30 persons in their convent. This meant their numbers had tripled in two years, five years later above 60 members could be found in the College. In March 1616 the Colleges in St. Omer, Douai, Liège and Louvain counted over 300 students. Chaworth, while in the Southern Netherlands to condole the infanta with the death of Albert counted 42 professed nuns, besides the novices, in the Brussels Benedictine monastery. The other monastery, presumably that of the Order of St. Clare, in Brussels only counted seven members, because it had only been recently erected¹⁵⁸.

The monastery of the Ignatian Expectatives in St. Omer, governed by Mary Ward, housed over 20 young English gentlewomen of good houses. Mary Ward also had founded the English monastery of the Poor Clares at Gravelines by the end of 1608. Four English nuns had died at that monastery in Gravelines. Reports were spread by priests that they were poisoned by beer out of England. *Were it not better to continue such foolish rumours than to oppose them, I had complained ... but I will not do so without instructions*, Trumbull informed Abbot¹⁵⁹. In July 1617 Trumbull reported that Englishmen arrived in the Archducal Netherlands on a daily basis. On 21 July, he saw six *gentlewomen of good houses*, who entered the monastery in Brussels, which now numbered over 50 women. He added, *they, and their meanes are managed, & gouverned wholly by the Englishe Jesuits*¹⁶⁰. As always, the Jesuits were Trumbull's strongest enemies.

Besides the deplorable number of individuals that were seduced by the Jesuits another consequence was equally noteworthy, *the infinite wealth wch they continually drawe out of his mats. Dominyons*. In November 1609 Trumbull reported rumors among the refugees in the Archducal Netherlands. William Baldwin was thought to have received up to 7.000 pounds sterling out of England for the maintenance of the English seminaries¹⁶¹. The new Jesuit College in Liège was created in 1614 with money that came from different sources. In November the English agent was able to report that in the three months before 3.500 pounds had been collected in England. The brother of prince Maximilian gave large sums in 1618 (5.000 florins) and 1620 (1.300 florins). In March 1616 the Jesuit Colleges in St. Omer, Louvain and Liège drew 20.000 pounds sterling every year out of England. Based on the private accounts published by Foley, Guilday concluded that this number was exaggerated, although he does not substantiate his case¹⁶².

Saint Monica, the English Augustine canonesses in Louvain, got over 1.000 pounds out of England, according to Trumbull in 1611. After its foundation, Guilday argues, money and vocations poured in. After two decades they were looking for a place to start another establishment. According to the same author *St. Monica's was perhaps of all the English communities in Belgium the most intently loyal to the House of Stuart*¹⁶³. In the same

¹⁵⁶ SP 77/8/2 f° 34v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 4 February 1606.

¹⁵⁷ SP 77/8/2 f° 96v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 17 June 1607.

¹⁵⁸ Kempe, *The Loseley Manuscripts*, 456.

¹⁵⁹ HMCD, iv, 260-261, draft, Trumbull to Abbot, Brussels, 1 December 1613.

¹⁶⁰ SP 77/12 f° 383r-384r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11/21 July 1617.

¹⁶¹ HMCD, ii, 173-174, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondes], Brussels, 8 November 1609.

¹⁶² Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 141-142, 153; Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*.

¹⁶³ Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 382.

report Trumbull mentioned that five women had joined the English monastery in Antwerp bringing with them 2.500 pounds¹⁶⁴.

An individual of note to the financial prosperity of the British foundations on the continent was the abovementioned Dona Luisa de Carvajal¹⁶⁵ who lived London. Trumbull reported that the Spanish lady had amassed 30.000 crowns in England for the erection of an English novitiate in Louvain in 1607. Dona Luisa (1568-1614) arrived in London to do her missionary work in 1605. Salisbury promised Trumbull that she would be watched closely and would get what she deserved¹⁶⁶. Trumbull reported to be glad with the resolution of king James to apprehend her in 1613. She had gotten a benevolence of £ 8.000 for the English Jesuits at Louvain. Not only the Jesuits were startled at her apprehension, infanta Isabella also held her in high esteem. If she came to the Archducal Netherlands, she would either be allowed to serve the infanta or become the director of the *Ignatian Expectatives* at St. Omer¹⁶⁷.

This did not mean that English colleges never encountered financial difficulties. In November 1609 the archdukes gave the English College in Douai *a librança of 4,000 'philips'* for their debts¹⁶⁸. In January 1613 James Carre, writing from Calais, informed Trumbull that *the college is extreme poor, wrought by means of the Jesuits, insomuch as where they used to keep 100 persons they cannot keep 50*¹⁶⁹. In March 1617 a collect was being held in England, Trumbull reported, to pay the debts of the English seminary in St. Omer. Without fresh money it would have to close. The financial situation did not improve in the following year. Trumbull was informed by a local resident that they considered moving to Liège or some other part of the country¹⁷⁰.

Despite the charity work of the archdukes Trumbull stressed the overall importance of the financial contributions smuggled out of the realm of king James. Writing in 1612 to Sir Thomas Overbury he stated,

*for I dare boldly assure you, that it is not the pencion of Spaine, wch alone doth mainteyne these cloisters, & colledges; but the exhibicions of the bewitched English, wch I they could be refrained, or taken away, would soone make them banckrupt, and without inhabitants*¹⁷¹.

It remains unclear if anything was undertaken to prevent this money drain towards the British Catholics on the Continent.

¹⁶⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 116r-117r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Antwerp, 11 September 1611.

¹⁶⁵ Fullerton, *The Life of Luisa de Carvajal*; Munoz, *Vida y Virtudas de la venerable Virgen Donna Luisa de Carvajal de Mendoza, su ornada a Inglaterra, y sucessos en aquel reyno*. For the will see, Gerard and Morris (ed.), *Condition of Catholics under James I. Father Gerard's Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*, cxxiv; *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795*, 150-151; for recent research see Rhodes, 'Luisa de Carvajal's Counter-Reformation Journey to Selfhood (1566-1614)' and the unpublished lecture of Redworth, 'Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza; a Spanish nun in England, 1605-1614'.

¹⁶⁶ HMCD, iii, 127, Salisbury to Trumbull, Salisbury House, 25 August 1611.

¹⁶⁷ HMCD, iv, 260-261, draft, Trumbull to Abbot, Brussels, 1 December 1613.

¹⁶⁸ HMCD, ii, 174, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondès], Brussels, 8 November 1609.

¹⁶⁹ HMCD, iv, 9, Carre to Trumbull, 9 January 1613.

¹⁷⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 383r-384r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11/21 July 1617.

¹⁷¹ SP 77/10 f^o 231r-232v, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 8 October 1612.

High profile refugees: Sir William Seymour, Benjamin Carier, John Bull and William Cecil, Lord Ros

The flight of the earl of Tyrone and the earl of Tyrconnell created a diplomatic incident during the time Sir Thomas Edmondes served as English ambassador in Brussels. Trumbull too was confronted with a possible rift between the two courts. The first serious incident, after the Gunpowder Plot concerned Arabella Stuart and William Seymour. They had married in June 1610 despite the direct prohibition of king James. Arabella Stuart was the first cousin of James VI/I and her grandmother had been the first cousin of Elizabeth I, which brought her close to the thrones of England and Scotland. The Seymour family also had a claim to the English throne. After the discovery of their illicit marriage Stuart and Seymour were imprisoned, respectively in Lambeth and in the Tower¹⁷². Both succeeded to escape their confinement (3-4 June 1611), but only William Seymour managed to flee the country. Arabella Stuart was retaken and died in the Tower in September 1615. This episode was the only time Salisbury wrote on a regular basis to the English agent in Brussels. Of the thirteen letters written by the principal secretary of state between February 1610 and his death in May 1612 four were written on a weekly basis and all four concerned Arabella Stuart but especially William Seymour: 6 June, 13 June, 20 June and 27 June. John More was the first to report the escape of the couple on 5 June. He anticipated that, *If she arrive, on your your coast, it will cut you out some work*¹⁷³. King James informed the archduke in Brussels of the getaway of both¹⁷⁴. Trumbull was requested, in his first instructions written on 6 June, to deliver a letter to the archduke and to *represent unto him how sensible his Majesty shall be of the Proceedings towards them in a matter of this Nature*. Trumbull particularly had to stress

that the Archdukes will not suffer the World to conceive that their Friendship with his Majesty is so weakly grounded, as not to demonstrate on such an occasion somewhat more than the ordinary Rules of Amity or Treaty may directly tye them to.

Trumbull did not receive further instructions, *the Time admitting no particular Relation or the Fact nor any long Discourse, the rest must depend upon your own Discretion, to amplify and enforce the same as you shall see cause*¹⁷⁵. Trumbull jumped at the occasion to come into action. He immediately set out for Mariemont, where Albert and Isabella held court. During a private audience the following day Trumbull informed Albert of the flight of Stuart and Seymour. It was feared that both would try and gain access to the Southern Netherlands. Trumbull *told him that now he had fair opportunity offered him, which might both prevent all sinister interpretations of his proceedings, gratify his maty, and confirm in all men an asurance of his honourable dealings*. Albert was surprised and pleased with Trumbull as he was the first to deliver this news, adding *que tendria prevenido todo lo que seia avenester en esto caso*. Nevertheless, he only offered a general answer: he was going to abide by the treaties punctually. His secretary, Philippe de Prats, would deliver Trumbull a written

¹⁷² Smith, 'Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587–1660)'; Marshall, 'Stuart, Lady Arabella (1575–1615)'.

¹⁷³ HMCD, iii, 85, More to Trumbull, London, 5 June 1611.

¹⁷⁴ PEA 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 4 June 1611.

¹⁷⁵ WM, iii, 278-279, Salisbury to Trumbull, 6 June 1611.

answer to James's letter. Furthermore Albert promised to consult with his ministers and take a decision on what should be done in case they effectively arrived in his dominions. He also granted Trumbull's request to inform the governor of the ports and the frontiers to halt both on arrival. As the secretary of state and War, Juan de Mancidor (*d.* 1618)¹⁷⁶, was absent from court, these instructions were put on hold. Trumbull experienced, while he was Edmond's senior secretary, how difficult it could be for the English king to get satisfaction in such cases, even when it concerned men who had presumably been implicated in the Gunpowder Plot. Another example of such difficulties is found in the case of the French prince de Condé. The French king wanted the archduke to detain him. Albert however secretly informed de Condé to give him the chance to retreat to Cologne or Liège, outside his jurisdiction. Trumbull assessed his audience with archduke Albert,

And to say the truth I found the archd. in all outward appearance very well inclined to fulfil his matys demands, but I am not able to judge whether the council of the Spaniards or ministers of Rome (who no doubt shall be consulted in this business) are bale to alter or change this resolution.

Trumbull had not heard anything of the arrival of the escaped couple, yet when he wrote his dispatch (11 June) he suspected they were hiding in an English monastery or *other lurking places* until it became clear what Albert intended to do with them¹⁷⁷. Three days later Trumbull was sure that Salisbury had already been informed of the arrival of Seymour, with Mr. Rodney and two servants, at Ostend on Friday 6 June. Seymour had travelled to Brussels via Bruges and Ghent and was staying at an obscure inn across *l'Hostel d'Oranges*, presumably referring to the city palace of the Orange family on the Place de Sablon. He had been detected in Alost by Henry Ballam, the courier delivering Trumbull's dispatch of 14 June to Salisbury. The English agent had thereupon instructed Ballam to go to Flanders and try and obtain information on Arabella.

Trumbull had at that time not yet received the new instructions from Salisbury, which stated that the English had to *insist that he be remanded* (11 June). As soon as Trumbull was aware that the escapee was in Brussels he repaired to Guillaume de Grysperre (1543/1544-1622)¹⁷⁸, a member of the archducal Privy Council. De Grysperre awaited specific instructions from the archduke. He nevertheless informed the English agent that he could turn to de Venesis, a member of the Council of State and the head of their Finances¹⁷⁹. Trumbull did not wait and visited de Venesis, the answer, nevertheless, remained unchanged. He also went to see the auditor-general, with the same outcome. His only remaining option was informing the archduke who was still at Mariemont. He requested Albert to instruct his ministers to detain William Seymour. Trumbull did not go himself, because he wanted to observe what would happen in Brussels. Trumbull also redoubled his letters and sent them to secretary de Prats at nine o'clock in the morning. The courier, Henry Ballam, remained with de Prats until he received an answer (no longer extant).

¹⁷⁶ Lefèvre, 'Mancidor (Juan de)'.

¹⁷⁷ HMCD, iii, 87-89, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 11 June 1611.

¹⁷⁸ De Borchgrave, 'Grysperre (Guillaume de)'.

¹⁷⁹ I have thus far been unable to find additional information on this man.

Albert's answer, for once, did not take long. A letter for James VI/I was delivered to Trumbull and the English agent had to wait upon de Venesis to know what instructions Albert had issued. As Albert had not received information on the arrival of William Seymour and Arabella Stuart in his countries, besides from Trumbull, he was unwilling to believe everything Trumbull had disclosed. Because of that he was unwilling to order their detention until de Venesis reported that Stuart and Seymour had indeed arrived and was informed about their intentions (stay in the Southern Netherlands or just passing through these countries). The English agent requested de Venesis to arrest Seymour for a day or two, so Trumbull could talk to archduke Albert in person. The only thing de Venesis was willing to do, however, was trying to convince Seymour to stay until he had written to the archduke. Trumbull was already aware that the fugitive was planning on travelling to Liège, but was forced to *let them run their owne course*.

Trumbull then decided to visit Seymour himself. He feared that a Jesuit or some other *ill-affected English* would try and lure him with their *enchantments*. Again the English agent referred to the case de Condé because the French ambassador also had visited the renegade prince. The English agent tried to convince Seymour to continue his loyalty to the English king. Seymour replied that he had never wanted to do anything else. *He sought to palliate his fault with the pretence of liberty, and said he desired to return home*. He further apologised that he had not yet written to Salisbury because of his exile and the troubles he went through to get information on his wife. According to Trumbull he did not know yet what he was going to do. If he came to any decision he would keep his friends and Trumbull posted. After Trumbull's visit the English agent received information that Seymour intended to travel to Mariemont, and would afterwards repair to Liège. Trumbull wanted follow him and try and convince Albert to detain him. The English agent was convinced the archdukes did not wish to retain him in their countries for two reasons: the cost of entertaining him and the displeasure of James. If James IV/I would be willing to receive him, they would do everything so that peace between the subject and his king could be made. Otherwise the archdukes would let him depart their territories, despite English protest. Trumbull finished his dispatch by mentioning that Gilbert marquis de Preaux, French ambassador in Brussels, and his colleague, Samuel Spifame, Seigneur de Buisseaux (Bisseaux), the French ambassador to England, had assisted him with advice and other means in this case¹⁸⁰.

Seymour's plan of travelling to Mariemont was not to the liking of the archdukes, as becomes clear from Trumbull's dispatch of 19 June. De Venesis assured Trumbull that the archdukes would not grant him access to their presence. Help reconciling Seymour with James VI/I clearly seemed to be the only thing Albert and Isabella wanted to do. But even this kind of assistance was conditional. It would only be done if Seymour explicitly requested it and more importantly if it would *not be taken in evill part* in England. Moreover, Trumbull was positive that Seymour would not linger long in the Southern Netherlands but go to Italy. The English agent further awaited instructions because *the Archd. could not be induced upon my former instance, to make stay of mr. Seymer, I have forborne to presse them any more upon that subiect untill I may knowe yor L: further pleasure in that behalf*¹⁸¹.

¹⁸⁰ HMCD, iii, 89-90, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 12 June 1611; HMCD, iii, 90-92, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels 14 June 1611.

¹⁸¹ SP 77/10 f^o 85r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 June 1611.

Trumbull assessed the situation correctly. Instructions informed the English agent of the satisfaction of king James with *the Diligence and Cautions* he had shown, even though his attempts remained unsuccessful, *which he [James] imputeth to the Coldness of those Ministers, who doe lend but sou oreille to Motions of this Nature, and pretend a want of Authority, when in truth it is meerly a want of Will and Correspondency.* The letter Albert had sent James was only a formality. James's letter and Trumbull's discourse should have been information enough for the archdukes to know what James wanted them to do. Because of that,

his Majestie's pleasure is you should forbear to urge and press this Matter any further, but leave them to doe therein what themselves shall best advise; this being a thing of no such Consequence, as that his Majesty will make any extraordinary Contestation for it, but attend their own Motions and judge accordingly.

Clearly king James concurred with Trumbull and approved of his approach in Brussels. Meanwhile Trumbull should not have any more conferences with him, but observe him closely. How was he treated in the Southern Low Countries? To whom did he turn to? Who resorted unto him? Was he intent on staying or planning to leave the territories of the archdukes? The English agent was also instructed to inform the fugitive that he would receive no favour while he resided in one of the dominions of the king of Spain, the archduke or the pope. If he still intended to write, Seymour would have to do so to the Lords of the Privy Council in general or some particular councillors, but Salisbury would not receive any letters from Seymour directed to him personally¹⁸².

After de Venesis's visit, Seymour departed for Namur and Liège. After visiting Spa¹⁸³ he returned to Brussels, 25 June, via Tirlemont and Louvain. In Liège the prince-bishop had refused to receive him. He only got permission to travel through his territory, according to Trumbull, despite the meddling of the Jesuits, *whose power is omnipotent in this clymate.* Trumbull, as instructed by Salisbury, reported that during his first stay in Brussels the renegade had not been visited by any ministers nor other servants of Albert and Isabella. The only conversation he had was with de Venesis who convinced him to travel to the prince bishopric. If he *was haunted by or evill affected Englishe*, was unknown to Trumbull. It was, however, possible that he had been joined by Anthony Hoskins (1568/9?-1615)¹⁸⁴, a Jesuit, when he first came to Brussels. The English agent was certain that Seymour would remain in the Southern Netherlands for another fortnight and requested further instructions. Meanwhile he observed the instructions he already received closely¹⁸⁵.

Although couriers travelled fast between Brussels and London, instructions and dispatches of Salisbury and Trumbull crossed each other. Salisbury reported on 27 June that he had received Trumbull's dispatch of 19 June. He was discontent with the lack of information provided by the English agent. Seymour would find little encouragement to

¹⁸² WM, iii, 282-283, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 June 1611.

¹⁸³ Trumbull was informed by William Shelby of Seymour's arrival in Spa and his sudden departure, according Seymour because the Archduke had summoned him. SP 77/10 f^o 92r, Selby to Trumbull, Spa, 28 June 1611.

¹⁸⁴ Archbold, 'Hoskins, Anthony (1568/9?-1615)', rev. Peter Milward.

¹⁸⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 90r-90v, 91r-91v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 26 June 1611.

remain there, according to a letter, *of which I expected you would have written more certainly than only touch it en passant*. Furthermore, it was unclear to Salisbury if Seymour had gotten a formal answer from Albert or what the archduke intended to do,

*and therefore though you are not to press the archduke for performance of H.M.'s first demand, if you find it either past time or find him to stand upon such terms of disputation what he ought to do in such a case, yet H.M. should be advertised from him, either by you or by his own letter, what he hath done and means to doe, so it is also fit, whensoever you write, that you follow the instructions I gave you in advertising what becomes of him, more particularly not for any such consequence that can depend upon his person, being but a cadet of a House, and a science [scion?] from a stock blast with a note of illegitimation, but because the knowledge of his courses may be of some use in respect of other circumstances*¹⁸⁶.

Trumbull replied to these instructions on 3 July. Seymour had not been visited by any ministers of the archdukes, nor by any of the English exile community. Since his return from Liège, he travelled to Antwerp and Malines accompanied by Mr. Rodney and Mr. Norton. These two were his interpreters as he did not speak the local language. In Antwerp he wanted to get information about his wife. He sent several servants to Albert to request permission to remain in the Southern Netherlands, but this was denied¹⁸⁷. Taking Salisbury's discontent serious the English agent wrote another ample dispatch relating all that had occurred in the past weeks. In it he gave Salisbury some more insight into some of the decisions he had taken in June. While he was sure that Seymour was in Liège, about 22 June, Trumbull did not press the archduke to arrest Seymour because the fugitive was outside of the archducal jurisdiction. Furthermore, Trumbull had experience in these kinds of cases, as the flight of the earls and Gunpowder Plotters. He knew that the Albert would arrest nor extradite Seymour. And finally, Trumbull was aware that James VI/I wanted to keep Arabella Stuart and William Seymour separated, which had happened due to this *voluntary separacion*. Trumbull thus had anticipated Salisbury's instructions not to demand the return of Seymour of 20 June. The instructions a week later made Trumbull request a formal answer from the archdukes to ascertain what they had done in this case.

Trumbull asked an audience as soon as was possible, *by reason that ever since his comming to Bruxelles, he hath ben alwayes exercised in matter of devotion, businesses of Germany and wryting into Spain*. He informed secretary de Prats that James not only wanted the archduke to refuse Seymour passage through his dominions but that the man would be arrested and sent back to England¹⁸⁸. Albert responded that he had done what he thought convenient. As Seymour only wanted to pass through these countries, *wch was free for all men in generall*, Albert could not deny him. He had declined Seymour access to the court and refused permission to stay in the Southern Netherlands.

Meanwhile Seymour had travelled to Mons and Trumbull had not heard anything since. He feared that he was going to consult with *the Eng. Oracles*, presumably referring to the English Jesuits, in Douai and St. Omer before returning, *wch will inspire him wth no other then venimous impressions*. While he resided in Brussels Seymour lived secluded and

¹⁸⁶ HMCD, iii, 97, Salisbury to Trumbull, Whitehall, 27 June 1611.

¹⁸⁷ SP 77/10 f^o 96r-96v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 3 July 1611.

¹⁸⁸ PEA reg. 1976, Trumbull to de Prats, Brussels, 20 July 1611.

was hardly visited by countrymen, except Mr. Norton. Trumbull had given Norton permission to do so. The English agent also obtained more personal information concerning Seymour. Since his escape from Ostend he had spent 400 pounds sterling. He was left with little more than 50 pence and jewels worth 2.000 crowns. Once all that had been spent, he would have no choice but return to England. Albert, nor those serving him, would ever give him support, Trumbull informed Salisbury¹⁸⁹.

Kirkham, secretary of Salisbury, reported that his master was pleased with Trumbull's dispatch of 3 July. Trumbull spoke relying on information he got and without absolute certainty. Salisbury wanted him to detect what Albert was going to do about Seymour. Trumbull did not have to press the matter any further but as the first letter of Albert had only been a general answer a more particular answer was now required. Trumbull was to ask for a new letter which would clarify *how he stands affected to proceed in this business*. Trumbull was instructed by Albert to go to secretary de Prats. Trumbull obliged, but to his disappointment the answer from Albert was anything but encouraging. He still refused to believe that Seymour still resided in his dominions. He had given de Venesis order to instruct Seymour to depart, which he had promised. Trumbull reminded de Prats at what had happened at the start of June. Why did Albert not detain Seymour after his arrival in Brussels, at the time the English agent had delivered the letters of James VI/I to the archduke? De Prats replied that Albert only wanted to consult with his ministers before taking any action. Trumbull thought it a pity that so little credit was given to his information. De Venesis acknowledged this and apologized for the archduke's forbearance. *I concluded wth this reply that it was not wante of true informacion; but lacke of will in the Prince, and his officers, to make stay of mr. Seymour; wch had given him meanes to escape*. Trumbull finished by asking de Prats if king James was to expect any satisfaction in this matter. De Prats, however, assured Trumbull that he did not have any further commission from the archduke concerning Seymour¹⁹⁰. Albert's reply finally came in October 1611, a few weeks after the arrival of Ferdinand de Boisshot, the new archducal ambassador in London, at his post¹⁹¹. It was a general answer. The archduke acknowledged Seymour and Stuart had offended James by marrying despite his explicit prohibition. He nevertheless asked James VI/I to show them both clemency¹⁹².

Trumbull tried to keep himself informed on Seymour's whereabouts. Last spotted in Mons, the English agent had not received any new information by 24 July. He therefore suspected the renegade still lingered in Artois or Hainaut despite the order to leave the Southern Netherlands. That same month Seymour wrote Trumbull a letter. In it he thanked the resident agent for forwarding his letters to England. He was now staying in France, near the frontier with the Southern Netherlands and awaiting the return of his servant who served as courier. This Frenchman did not want to divulge Seymour's whereabouts. He suspected that if the answer out of England was not *to his* [Seymour's] *lyking*, then they would travel to Italy. Trumbull ordered Norton to go to Seymour to discover his intentions. Trumbull expected Norton to be back within days. Trumbull

¹⁸⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 98r-99r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 11 July 1611.

¹⁹⁰ HMCD, iii, 105-106, Kyrkham to Trumbull, Whitehall, 11 July 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 101r-101v, Trumbull to Salisbury Brussels, 17 July 1611.

¹⁹¹ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vi, 593.

¹⁹² SP 77/10 f^o 131r, Albert to James VI/I, Mariemont, 28 October 1611 (n.s.).

also received news from Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice. Carleton informed Trumbull of his instructions to treat with the Venetians about Seymour. The most Serene Republic promised to give the English king all the satisfaction he desired. Trumbull was asked to keep an eye on Seymour and to inform Carleton where the renegade intended to travel, though he was *little to be esteemed, as the poorest fugitive yet, knowing the arts and practises of Rome ... to make their advantage of all things, no diligence were ill employed to keep him from thence*¹⁹³.

Salisbury seems to have been pleased that William Seymour had left the Southern Low Countries for France, writing to Trumbull

*I will leave these to come to the honest care and vigilancy you have expressed in the business of Mr. Seymour, who by his remove (as I understand) to France, had ridden you of much trouble, but left such a proof of your industry as cannot escape H.M.'s approbation*¹⁹⁴.

By the end of August 1611 Seymour was back in Flanders and staying with Sir William Windsor in his home in St. Winoksbergen. He alleged to remain there until he received news out of England. Trumbull, however, feared it was more to enjoy the council and conversation of *those vipers*, who wanted to convert him to Roman Catholicism. Together they went to St. Omer and Dunkirk. Invited by the English Jesuits in St. Omer Seymour attended a play in their college. Afterwards he got into a fight and was committed to prison by the magistrate, but was soon released upon mediation of the Jesuits. By 24 September Trumbull got information that he returned to France where he would reside until he got news out of England¹⁹⁵. This was confirmed by Beaulieu, who reported the arrival of the refugee in Paris. James's ambassador Edmondès refused to receive him and informed London of his arrival. Although the situation of Seymour did not *afford him the usage which he would otherwise have done*, Seymour seldom resorted to Edmondès. *But there hath been no further cause of unkindness between them*, Beaulieu assured Trumbull. According to Seymour he had left the Southern Netherlands out of respect for king James. He had been notified that his stay there had outraged the English monarch, which was confirmed by Edmondès, adding that *I have not as yet made any motion here for the staying of him, not knowing whether his Maty thinks him worthy of that consideration*¹⁹⁶.

Although Trumbull did not receive any more instructions from London on William Seymour, he kept himself informed on his whereabouts. At the start of 1612 Seymour, *constant in nothing more then his own inconstancy*, was in Calais and Dunkirk. In Dunkirk he awaited money out of England. He then travelled to St. Omer together with Wilson, a lay brother of the Jesuits, who had been a servant of Henry Garnet (1555–1606)¹⁹⁷. Trumbull had heard that Seymour had converted to Roman Catholicism, but was unable

¹⁹³ SP 77/10 f^o 103', 104r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels 24 July 1611; HMCD, iii, 117, Carleton to Trumbull, Venice, 2 August 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 107v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 7 August 1611.

¹⁹⁴ HMCD, iii, 127, Salisbury to Trumbull, Salisbury House, 25 August 1611.

¹⁹⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 110r, 110v-111r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 August 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 116r-117r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Antwerp, 11 September 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 118r-118v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 18 September 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 123r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 24 September 1611.

¹⁹⁶ HMCD, iii, 149, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 27 September 1611; HMCD, iii, 166, Edmondès to Trumbull, Paris, 20 October 1611.

¹⁹⁷ McCoog, 'Garnett, Henry (1555–1606)'.

to verify that report¹⁹⁸. Indebted in France William Seymour was forced to leave, as he reported to Trumbull, to avoid *the importunity of his creditors at Paris, and Orleans*. In June 1613 he was back in the country where Trumbull was *his Majesty's public instrument*. He solicited for Trumbull's help and advice. He had forborne to do that until now because he did not know how the English agent would have reacted. Seymour assured Trumbull that he had passed through Brussels hastily, *lest my presence might have drawn out such visits and conversations as would have made me subject to a doubtful construction*. Seymour's only concern was to go to some merchant with whom he still had credit and to wait near England, *whence I only seek relief*. He concluded that he was well aware of the temptations, e.g. Catholicism, his residence in the Catholic Low Countries would entail, but was sure that it would be nothing more than a *further argument of zealous constancy*. Trumbull certainly replied to Seymour's letter. That becomes evident in the letters of Henry Peyton (died 1623)¹⁹⁹. Peyton was an Englishmen in the service of the United Provinces. He was also related to Seymour. He was married to Mary, daughter of Edward Seymour (1539-1621), duke of Somerset and grandfather of William Seymour²⁰⁰. In summer of 1613 Peyton stated that Seymour *receives much comfort by your friendly acceptance of his letter and from your good counsels*²⁰¹. Sir Henry Peyton acted as an informant of Trumbull and kept him appraised on Seymour. When William Seymour heard of Peyton's presence in Dunkirk, he requested a meeting. During their conversation Peyton tried to convince the fugitive to return to France, *to avoid ill council and suspicion*. He intended to do so once he had received relief from England. Seymour, according to his own words, was not even contemplating to change his religion or allegiance. Peyton could only hope Seymour was telling the truth, *yet I can affirm that for ought I ever knew he hath borne himself to the good liking of his best friends, except in matter of expenses and such youthful vanity as few of his rank at such liberty do avoid*. To avoid Seymour seeking worse company Peyton intended to visit him from time to time. He, nevertheless, wanted Trumbull's advice. If Trumbull had any information that William Seymour was endangering his friends, Peyton hoped the English agent would inform him thereof. Peyton only knew of one person who had visited the renegade twice, Mons. De Choison, but it had not been private conversations²⁰².

Thomas Floyd, in the service of Edmondes, reported in August 1613 from Paris that the Edmondes had given Seymour 100 pound sterling. The situation in England was improving. *Formerly we held the state was much appaised towards him, and that the king groweth daily better affected towards the Lady Arabella but men's conjectures are often deceived by seeming verities*²⁰³. Seymour was reported once more in Paris (October 1613), in St. Winoksbergen (June 1614) but was again in Dunkirk by the end of June 1614²⁰⁴.

¹⁹⁸ HMCD, iii, 220, Beaulieu to Trumbull, 16 January 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 165v-166r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 20 January, 1612.

¹⁹⁹ Trim, 'Peyton, Sir Henry (d. 1623)'.

²⁰⁰ Beer, 'Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset (c.1500-1552)'.

²⁰¹ HMCD, iv, 140-141, Seymour to Trumbull, Bruges, 26 June 1613 (n.s.); SP 77/10 f^o 300r-300v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels 23 June 1613; HMCD, iv, 172, Peyton to Trumbull, Sluce, 9 August 1613 (n.s.).

²⁰² HMCD, iv, 145-146, Peyton to Trumbull, Bruges, 28 June 1613 (n.s.).

²⁰³ HMCD, iv, 181, Floyd to Trumbull, Paris, 25 August 1613 (n.s.).

²⁰⁴ HMCD, iv, 228, Floyd to Trumbull, Paris, 18 October 1613; HMCD, iv, 438, Peyton to Trumbull, Den Brill, 26 June 1614; SP 77/11, 25r-26r, *The names of Certaine Principall men of the Englishe, and Scottishe*

Lady Arabella died in the Tower on 25 September 1615. By mid-December Peyton reported that William Seymour intended to cross the Channel. Peyton had many reasons to wish he would do this swiftly, *especially to satisfy his grandfather that he has not allowed his new habits of life to injure either his constitution or his religion*. If Seymour would arrive after his grandfather had died, he would be in the same financial problems as he had been while he was on the run²⁰⁵. This is the last time mention Seymour was mentioned in Trumbull's correspondence. Seymour was back in England in January 1616. In November he was appointed to the Order of Bath and effectively rehabilitated. In April 1621 he succeeded his grandfather and became the second earl of Hertford.

It is clear that because of Trumbull's intervention in the Southern Netherlands William Seymour was never at ease. It had been his intention to escape with his wife out of England, but that plan failed. It is unclear what they intended to do if they had succeeded. The reception Albert and Isabella could give them was a matter of some concern in England. Thanks to Trumbull the matter was kept alive and Seymour did not receive a particularly good reception in the Southern Netherlands. He kept moving residence and even contacted Trumbull. Eventually the English government lost interest, but Trumbull kept himself apprised. The marriage had succeeded despite James's explicit prohibition, but thanks to the capture of Arabella Stuart and Trumbull's work in the Southern Low Countries they were separated.

In 1613 three others fled England: John Bull (1559x63-1628) and Dr. Benjamin Carier (*bap.* 1565-1614), respectively organist and a chaplain-in-ordinary of king James and thirdly, Agnes, the sister of John ninth Lord Maxwell²⁰⁶. Dr. Benjamin Carier, chaplain to James VI/I, hankered for Spa in the summer of 1613, according to archbishop George Abbot. Under this pretext he crossed the Channel but without intending to return to England. He corresponded, still according to the archbishop, with Dr. Wright who could be found near the papal nuncio in Liège. Abbot did not want Trumbull to make this public, but he was to observe Carier. The archbishop concluded with a rumour. Possibly the former chaplain of James wanted to travel to Treves, Mainz or Cologne in Germany²⁰⁷. According to the historian Ryan, James VI/I ordered Isaac Casaubon to try and convince Carier to return, and possibly offered him the see of Lincoln. Carier's response in August 1613 was unfavourable. By the end of the year this news was public and Carier wrote an open letter from Liège, which became the basis of *A Treatise Written by Mr Doctour Carier*²⁰⁸, presumably published for the first time after his death.

Trumbull did as requested and wrote Henry Bilderbeck, the Dutch agent in Cologne. According to the Bilderbeck the same request had come from Heidelberg. Bilderbeck

nations, now residing in the Archds Provinces; HMCD, v, 250 (letter 506), Huddlestone to Trumbull, Dunkirk, 27 July 1615 (n.s.).

²⁰⁵ HMCD, v, 383, (letter 795), Peyton to Trumbull, London, 17/27 December 1615.

²⁰⁶ Brown, 'Bull, John (1559x63-1628)'; Ryan, 'Carier, Benjamin (*bap.* 1565, *d.* 1614)'; Hoppe, 'John Bull in the archduke's service'; Questier, 'Crypto-Catholicism, anti-Calvinism and conversion at the Jacobean court: the enigma of Benjamin Carier', 47 (1996), 45-64.

²⁰⁷ HMCD, iv, 194-195, Abbot to Trumbull, Croydon, 9 September 1613.

²⁰⁸ Benjamin Carier, *A Treatise Written by Mr. Doctour Carier, wherein he layeth downe sundry learned and pithy considerations, by which he was moued, to forsake the protestant Congregation and to betake hym self to the Catholicke Apostolicke Roman church ... addressed ... to the King, etc.* ([Liège, 1614]). It was subsequently published in St. Omer (1632), Paris (1649) and even in London (1678); for a copy of 1614 see BL 3902.bbb.28

confirmed that Carier was in Cologne but had changed his residence, which the Dutch agent had not been able to discover yet. By November Carier seems to have been back in Liège²⁰⁹. Trumbull replied to Sir Thomas Lake that he had received both letters from the start of November and forwarded the letters for dr. Carier to him in Liège. He was now awaiting his response. Carier did respond to both Lake and James VI/I at the start of December. Trumbull was now confident enough to report that the chaplain had converted to Roman Catholicism. He would remain in these countries unless he was permitted to hear mass in England²¹⁰.

Abbot not only received information from Trumbull about the former chaplain. He acquainted Trumbull with the information he got from other channels, mentioning mid-December 1613, that Carier had become a profane person and was soon to use all his venom against the Church and State of England. A few months later the archbishop wrote Trumbull that the main reason behind Carier's discontent was that no one had tried to convince him to return to England, ignoring the overtures made by Isaac Casaubon. Abbot only referred to Casaubon in April 1614, *I despair that we shall ever have an answer from him to Casaubon's book, for the poor man is much perplexed*. He had information that the English Jesuits in Louvain were going to lend him a helping hand. They would be joined by two Jesuits coming from Spain, Swetnam and Henry Fludde, who would cross the Channel into England²¹¹. During the spring of 1614 Carier received an invitation from Cardinal Jacques Davy Du Perron (1556-1618) in Paris, according to Abbot a small wonder since the cardinal himself was an apostate. The departure of Carier from Louvain was reported by Sir Thomas Leedes, himself a recusant. He had copied a letter and sent it to Trumbull. Carier left Louvain in April 1614, but before travelling to Paris he planned to stay in Brussels for two or three days²¹². Reports had it that *as to be very solitary and very pensive as if his conscience were not settled; but troubled with the remembrance of his Apostacy*. He arrived in Paris at the start of June and was reported dead at the house of the cardinal by mid July²¹³.

Carier did not prove much trouble, unlike John Bull, organist of king James. Proesmans describes Bull as *something of a genious virtuoso, leaving behind hundreds of compositions for the organ and of the harpsichord, as well as vocal works*²¹⁴. Trumbull reported his arrival in the Southern Netherlands to the archbishop Abbot and not James VI/I. Abbot passed the information on without mentioning his source. James VI/I was displeased that Trumbull had not informed him of Bull. Trumbull assured his sovereign in November 1613 that he had not neglected his duties as he had informed Abbot, of which the king apparently was not notified two months earlier. He also warned that information to the ministers of the archduke,

²⁰⁹ HMCD, iv, 221, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 21 October 1613 (n.s.).

²¹⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 362r-363v, Trumbull aan [Lake], Brussel, 29 November 1613.

²¹¹ HMCD, iv, 270-271, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 December 1613; HMCD, iv, 331-332, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth 10 March 1614.

²¹² HMCD, iv, 276, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 16 April 1614.

²¹³ SP 77/11 f^o 37v, 38r, Trumbull to [Winwood], Brussels, 21 April 1614; HMCD, iv, 417, Beaulieu to Trumbull, [Paris], 2 June 1614 [endorsement]; HMCD, iv, 458, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 14 July 1614.

²¹⁴ Proesmans, 'Spreading a new musical style', 133.

that if hee were admitted here into the Archds. service, without his mats permission, that hee beeing a domestick of his courte; and a sworne servant, his matie had just reason to take it in evill parte, and to be offended for the want of respect shewed towards him.

While in Brussels Albert and Isabella did not provide entertainment for Bull, but this changed when they left for Mariemont. Bull secured a position as organist in the archducal chapel in September 1613, which provided him with 750 florins per year²¹⁵. Bull was not the only English musician to be employed by Albert and Isabella. Well known in literature is Peter Philips (1560/61-1628), who left England early in the 1580s, but Trumbull, in his list of 1614 also mentions Anthony Chambers²¹⁶ as a musician, who played the corneta, and Robert Taylor and Roger Brumfield as trumpeters²¹⁷. The musical chapel of the archdukes was international with men from Spain, England, and Italy. Proesmans stresses that like Philip II Albert and Isabella received English fugitives and paid the musicians among them particularly well²¹⁸.

As they were in Mariemont and Trumbull had no pressing cases he had to wait until their return to approach them on the subject of Bull. It apparently was not Bull's intention to remain in the Southern Netherlands but to repair to Heidelberg or Paris. This was one of the reasons why Trumbull did not visit archduke Albert. In the meanwhile he was hoping to get instructions from Abbot, *whome I judged the fittest man of his mats counsell, or this purpose*. Abbot's answer took a long time. Abbot excused himself simply stating that he had forgotten to reply to Trumbull's request. Since the English agent received the letters of the start of November he had been seeking access to Albert, which was impossible due to his ill health.

In the meane tyme, for my humble excuse towards his matie (whome I am most sorry to have offended any way in the world) I beseech yo^w to informe his matie of the truth; and the syncerity of my proceedings. And wthall to alleage; that as I had no reason to complaine to the Archds. before Bull was entertained into his service. So he being irresolute, and inconstant in his courses: and accompted here for a loco, and discarted foolische fellowe, I was both to engage his mats honor in speaking against him²¹⁹.

Trumbull also used underhand means to convince Bull to return to England and submit himself to the mercy of king James. The English agent was convinced that if Bull got assurance that he would not be punished, he would consider returning to England. Bull was extremely irresolute, not knowing what to do *he knoweth not de quel bois se chauffer*, argued Trumbull. The English agent was still assuming that his only crime was leaving England without permission²²⁰. Although he fled England under the pretext of religion, it was an entirely different matter which drove him to the Southern Netherlands,

²¹⁵ See also Corbet, 'Musical relations between England and Flanders'.

²¹⁶ Chambers served the Archdukes from 1599 until his death in 1630

²¹⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 25r-26r, *The names of Certaine Principall men of the Englishe, and Scottishe nations, now residinge in the Archds Provinces*; for more information on Peter Philips see also Pike, 'Philips, Peter (1560/61-1628)'; Steele, 'Philips, Peter'; Steele, 'Calendar of the life of Peter Philips'; Petti, 'New light on Peter Philips'.

²¹⁸ Proesmans, 'Spreading the new musical style', 134.

²¹⁹ SP 77/10 f^o 362r-363v, Trumbull to [Lake] Brussels, 29 November 1613.

²²⁰ SP 77/10 f^o 362r-363v, Trumbull to [Lake], Brussels, 29 November 1613.

according to George Abbot. Charges had been brought against Bull in the Court of High Commission.

But yet do you now take knowledge of the reason of this wise man's departure. There were articles put against him in the High Commission Court, whereunto he took his oath to answer, but before he was examined, he fled over the seas. The accusation was for notable and impudent adultery. Himself and his wife lay in the upper bed, and in the truckle bed under him lay two of his maid-servants. Bull, in a summer morning when it was very light, riseth from his wife's side, goeth to the other bed, raising up one of his maidens biddeth her go lie by her mistress, he taking her place, committeth adultery with the other, which the maid beholding awaketh her mistress, and biddeth her see what her master is doing. His wife beholdeth it and telleth her servant that this was no news unto her, for her husband had long and often been a dealer that way, which indeed is since verified by common report.

Besides the charges of adultery he was also charged with attacking a minister during a service. Abbot concluded on the matter that Bull *hath more music than honesty and is as famous for marring of virginity as he is for fingering of organs and virginals*²²¹.

Trumbull, to whom duty was most important, also wrote the archbishop to help him clear his name at court, which he readily did. As silence had been the only answer, Trumbull had assumed that James did not think Bull worthy of any further proceedings²²². Trumbull's audience about Bull had to wait until mid-March 1614. The archduke instructed the English agent to turn to secretary de Prats to know what he had decided. The answer of de Prats (start of May 1614) was not forthcoming describing him as *a poore innocent man, who beeing a Catholicke, and comming hether only for his conscience sake, the Archd. would not with his honor expell him, out of his dominyons; without a just and lawfull occasion*. Trumbull stated that the English king was not as much interested in Bull himself as to how he left the country. Albert could do with Bull whatever he wanted. For Somerset the behaviour of the archdukes was a testimony

that he [James VI/I] regardeth those professions of amity which are between them, when he giveth entertainment to so vile and contemptible a person, and may justly judge by this what acceptation others shall find in those parts, which may be more dangerous instruments.

Trumbull had one last audience about the matter in June 1614. Albert wanted to give James satisfaction, and would provide an answer via de Prats²²³. The regular payment of Bull as organist of the chapel of the archduke ended in August 1614 although all payments only stopped in April 1618. From September 1615 Bull was an assistant organist to Raymond Waelrant (*d.* 1617) in the cathedral in Antwerp and from September 1617 a probationary organist. Sick in 1626 and 1627 he was replaced by deputy organists. Bull died and was buried in Antwerp in March 1628.

²²¹ HMCD, iv, 270-271, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 December 1613.

²²² HMCD, iv, 261, draft, Trumbull to [Abbot], Brussels, 1 December 1613.

²²³ SP 77/11 f^o 19r, Trumbull to Somerset, Brussels, 17 March 1614; HMCD, iv, 346, draft, Trumbull to de Prats, [Brussels], 3 April 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 255, draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 31 March 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 49v-50r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 4 May 1614; HMCD, iv, 411-412, Somerset to Trumbull, Whitehall, 26 May 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 88r-88v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 30 June 1614.

In August 1613 the sister of the beheaded John ninth Lord Maxwell (born in or before 1568-1613)²²⁴, Agnes, wife of William Douglas, armed with letters of recommendation from the English court arrived in the Archducal Netherlands soliciting for a Spanish pension, according to Trumbull's information²²⁵. In October Trumbull had more information, but requested Rochester to keep it secret until he had been able to look into the matter further. He mentioned that she had been recommended by a Lady, but her name was struck out (only the first two and the last letter are legible, Dr...n), or that Lady had secured her letters from the ambassadors in London recommending her to the archdukes. By October 1613 she had gotten the equivalent of twelve pounds sterling which solved her most pressing needs. It was the intention to give her an allowance through an abbey or through the archducal finances. A Spanish pension was impossibility. The only people who could claim such a pension were those *that lyke Trayters can serve him as Spies, to holde intelligence wth his ministers, and to breake the seale of confession, by revealing the secretts of their Prince, and Countrey*²²⁶. For about two years Trumbull falls silent on the subject of Lady Douglas. While Winwood was secretary of state he again mentioned her. She was complaining in the Southern Netherlands of the injustice done her by James VI/I and Mr. John Murrey of the Bedchamber, presumably John Murray (*d.* 1640)²²⁷, first earl of Annandale. She was planning to travel to Italy or France to voice her malcontent publicly. She was prohibited from doing that in the territories of the archdukes, according to Trumbull. *I have donne what I am able, to stoppe her mouth, by underhand meanes, and she seemeth willing to harken to a composition for her pretentions.* The English agent requested instructions²²⁸.

Her situation did not improve with the passing of the years. In January 1619 she had no other bread to eat than that which the archdukes gave her out of charity. She had written a letter in her own hand, a letter which was recommended Charles de le Faille and the countess of La Faire. The countess was one of the most important ladies at the court of the infanta which lead Trumbull to conclude that Isabella herself wanted to recommend this case. She did not do this in writing because she did not know how king James would react. Trumbull requested the secretary of state to give this matter his *powerfull furtherance* and to send him instructions as quickly as possible²²⁹.

Not all men arriving in the Archducal Netherlands were deemed worthy of royal attention. At the start of 1616 Trumbull reported the arrival of a Scotsman, Sir James Mac Donnell [MacDonald] (*c.*1570–1626)²³⁰, according to his own testimony a person of note in Scotland. He fled via Ireland but wanted to reconcile himself as soon as possible with king James. Arriving in Brussels he thought it opportune to visit the English agent. There he claimed he was innocent *for any other fault againste his matie, (as he pretendeth) then only the breaking of prison, out of the Castle of Edenborrowe.* He had been imprisoned

²²⁴ Macpherson, 'Maxwell, John, ninth Lord Maxwell (*b.* in or before 1586, *d.* 1613)'; Sizer, 'Maxwell, John, earl of Morton (1553–1593)'.

²²⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 320v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 19 August 1613.

²²⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 336r-336v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 6 October 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 360r-360v, Trumbull to Somerset, 25 November 1613.

²²⁷ MacDonald, 'Murray, John, first earl of Annandale (*d.* 1640)'.

²²⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 369r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615.

²²⁹ SP 77/13 f^o 151v, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 16 January 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 285r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 16/26 June 1619.

²³⁰ Macdonald, 'MacDonald, Angus, of Dunyvaig and the Glens (*c.*1548–1613)'.

because he had tried to kill his father Angus (c.1548–1613). He offered to submit himself and remain obedient. The only reason he had escaped in May 1615 was because he had been incarcerated for a very long time (since 1609), which did not agree with his natural inclination for liberty. Trumbull first refused to forward MacDonald's letter, but as he was unsure what charges were brought against him and what importance it could be to have the man back in Great-Britain, so he consented. MacDonald derived his presumed substance from the fact he had been instrumental to king James in submitting his father to royal authority. He represented his father as negotiator in the 1590s. Winwood informed Trumbull a little over a week later,

I am to tell you from his Mats: mouth, that Sr: James Mc: Donnell is noe principall gentleman of Scotland, but a base companion, and unworthy of his Mats: favour; of his arrivall to Bruxelles his maty: doeth make this conclusion that the Arch-dukes countryes are the refuge, and retrayte of all his fugitives, and rebels²³¹.

In the fall of 1616 Trumbull was able to report that the Scotsman had left for Spain together with Hugh Cavell, a friar of the Irish Franciscans in Louvain, *as well to procure him an annuall entertainment, as for some other practises against the Realme of Ireland²³²*. MacDonald's presence in Spain was confirmed by the English agent at that court, Francis Cottington, in November 1616²³³. In the fall of 1618 he was back in the Catholic Low Countries with a Spanish pension of 100 crowns per month²³⁴. As he did not prevail in getting entertainment in the Netherlands he travelled to Rome. Trumbull had been informed that his wife had come from Scotland and intended to follow her husband to Rome²³⁵. His wife was in for a shock, he had appealed to the pope to get his marriage annulled, a request which was granted²³⁶. In November 1619 Trumbull was told that MacDonald intended to undertake something secret in Scotland or Ireland. Trumbull did not believe much of these rumours stating,

The Irishe (I knowe by experience) are a giddy headed people desirous of noveltyes, superstitious beyond measure, and credulous in beleevving dreames and fables, of which sorte perhaps his pretended enterprize may be²³⁷.

The conde of Gondomar was able to bring about a reconciliation between MacDonald and the earl of Argyll, which did *in some mens opinyons presage a project upon Ireland, or the westerne coaste of Scotlande, rather then of assayleing the Mores, & Pyrats in Africa*. Trumbull, however, did not agree with that analysis. He refused to believe Philip

²³¹ SP 77/12 f^o 15v-16r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 20r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 10 February 1616, HMCD, v, 420-421 (letter 872) Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 10 February 1616.

²³² SP 77/12 f^o 182r-182v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 September 1616.

²³³ HMCD, vi, 40 (letter 103), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 8 November 1616.

²³⁴ SP 77/13 f^o 92r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 21/31 October 1618.

²³⁵ HMCD, vi, 315 (letter 669), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 23 October 1617.

²³⁶ HMCD, vi, 424 (letter 919), copy, Papal Chancellor to Papal Nuncio in Brussels, Rome, 23 May/2 June 1618.

²³⁷ HMCD, vi, 572 (letter 1238), draft Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 5 November 1618.

III or Albert and Isabella were willing to break the peace with James. If they would attempt anything in Europe, the most likely adversary would be the United Provinces²³⁸. In September 1619 Trumbull requested secretary Naunton's intervention with James, if he deemed it a possible feat that Sir James MacDonald could deliver any services. Macdonald was pardoned and was back in London in 1620. He was never permitted to return to Scotland and died in the English capital six years later²³⁹.

Following the double marriage between the crowns of France and Spain in 1616 king James sent out ambassadors to congratulate both royal houses. He sent James Lord Hay to France in July 1616 and William Cecil (1590-1618)²⁴⁰, sixteenth baron Ros, to Spain at the end of August 1616²⁴¹. A house had been prepared for him. According to Francis Cottington he would be pleased with the reception he got in Madrid²⁴². His mission to Spain consisted of formal congratulations to the Spanish king and to mediate in the conflict between Spain and Savoy²⁴³. He began in journey in October 1616 and arrived in Lisbon at the end of November²⁴⁴. In March 1617 Tobie Mathew told Trumbull he was travelling to Paris to meet Lord Ros for some personal business, a month beforehand he had requested the diplomat to let him know when Lord Ros was expected to arrive in Paris²⁴⁵. The English agent was not sure he was telling the truth. *To speak truly, if his occasions were not very pressing; they should have donne well; to have awayted a fitter opertunity.* The road from Brussels to Paris was littered with thieves and soldiers. Travelling at this time could not be done without danger to one's goods or even one's life²⁴⁶. Mathew arrived in Paris at the start of March²⁴⁷. Trumbull's counterpart in The Hague was sure Mathew travelled to Paris to meet Ros or Sir Griffin Markham²⁴⁸. Lord Ros was in Paris, reported John Woodford, and had been visited by Mathew. Possibly Mathew wanted Ros's intervention to be able to return to England²⁴⁹. Departing from Spain at the start of February 1617 he arrived back in England by April²⁵⁰.

Six months later Ros had fled England. Thomas Locke informed Trumbull that it was no secret that he left because of his debts. Locke further wrote that it was *conjectured that he had in his purse and made by exchange 8 or 10,000 li, which mony he made of the sale of plate, hangings, etc., and some he received out of the Exchequer upon somewhat harde conditions*²⁵¹. Robert Branthwait reported that Ros gave out he had left for France to duel with Sir

²³⁸ SP 77/13 f^o 181r-161v, Trumbull to the Secretary of State, Brussels, 18/28 February 1619.

²³⁹ SP 77/13 f^o 363r-363v, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 30 September 1619.

²⁴⁰ Bellany, 'Cecil, William, sixteenth Baron Ros (1590-1618)'.

²⁴¹ HMCD, v, 547 (letter 1155), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 10 July 1616.

²⁴² HMCD, vi, 4 (letter 10), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 6 September 1616.

²⁴³ HMCD, vi, 89 (letter 189), Castle to Trumbull, London, 1 January 1617; HMCD, vi, 97 (letter 224), Cottington to Trumbull, 19 January 1617.

²⁴⁴ HMCD, vi, 65 (letter 153), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 10 December 1616.

²⁴⁵ HMCD, vi, 114 (letter 262), Mathew to Trumbull, Louvain, 20 February 1617; HMCD, vi, 118 (letter 270), Mathew to Trumbull, Louvain, 25 February 1617.

²⁴⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 279r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 4/14 March 1617.

²⁴⁷ HMCD, vi, 127 (letter 287), Woodford to Trumbull, Paris, 6 March 1617.

²⁴⁸ HMCD, vi, 134 (letter 294), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 7 March 1617.

²⁴⁹ HMCD, vi, 146 (letter 320), Woodford to Trumbull, Paris, 20 March 1617.

²⁵⁰ HMCD, vi, 113 (letter 259), Cottington to Trumbull, Madrid, 16 February 1617; HMDC, vi, 156 (letter 350), Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 3 April 1617.

²⁵¹ HMCD, vi, 258 (letter 564), Locke to Trumbull, s.l., 20 August 1617.

Arthur Lake in Amiens²⁵². Landing in Dunkirk he first travelled to Antwerp and Brussels. By the start of September 1617 Wolfrad de Plessen, the Palatine agent in Cologne, wrote that Ros had left for Dieppe and subsequently was reported to be in Paris²⁵³. James VI/I ordered him to return, but John Castle doubted that Ros would obey, who added that his challenge to Sir Arthur Lake was *in so poore termes and so childishly as the world wonders how ever he could so much deceave the King as to be trusted with the carriadge of so much as the message of Lewys the Xith his barber*²⁵⁴. George Abbot informed the English agent of the order and added that he had written Ros personally to instruct him to return from his *idle, ridiculous and discontented journey*²⁵⁵. Of course Ros did not return and remained in Italy. After the death of the Sir Ralph Winwood, Trumbull had to address his dispatches to Sir Thomas Lake. Lake informed Trumbull of this decision in a letter dated at the end of October 1617. The only instructions Trumbull got in that letter concerned Lord Ros. The English agent was to collect all possible information for Lake.

Lake was interested in every detail. Was he only passing through Rome or planning to reside there? What happened to his servant Diego de Silva? What money did he get in Genova? From whom in England did that money come from? Trumbull repeated what he had sent to Sir Dudley Carleton. The only thing he was able to find out after his trip to Paris, was that Ros had left that city for Orleans and that at this time he most probably was in Avignon²⁵⁶. Ten days later Trumbull was able to confirm that Ros had arrived on 5 November (n.s.) with only one servant. Trumbull's source was *a frende resyding here at Bruxelles*. On his way to Rome Ros stopped in Genova. There he waited for some things and money to be sent out of England. The servant with him was not the Spaniard Diego. In Rome Ros already had visited Scipio Caffarelli-Borghese, one of the pope's nephews, and some of the cardinals. Trumbull assured the secretary of state that he could rely on this information, *for I esteeme this relation to be true, & certayne*²⁵⁷. Lake was pleased at the end of November 1617 with the information the English agent had sent because it *was the first piece of definite information that we had received about him*²⁵⁸. According to Trumbull's information Lord Ros had arrived in Dunkirk with money and jewels²⁵⁹.

Trumbull's friends and letters out of Rome kept him apprised of the actions of Lord Ros. Ros had hired a *Scholler* to read him *mathematicks*. He had retreated to a city near Rome, but Trumbull did not know which town. He had been joined by his Spanish servant Diego de Silva. Although Ros had met with several cardinals he had not had access to pope Paul V. There was little doubt of the money he brought with him, 20,000 or 30,000 pounds sterling, enough to lead a life concordant with his status. Originally he had intended to buy a coach and rent a palace, but subsequently changed his mind. How

²⁵² HMCD, vi, 268-269 (letter 580), Branthwait to Trumbull, St. Martin's Lane, 28 August 1617.

²⁵³ SP 77/12 f^o 401r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 12/22 August 1617; HMCD, vi, 274 (letter 589), De Plessen to Trumbull, s.l., 3 September 1617; HMCD, vi, 281 (letter 604), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 10/20 September 1617.

²⁵⁴ HMCD, vi, 292 (letter 618), Castle to Trumbull, s.l., 18 September 1617.

²⁵⁵ HMCD, , Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 19 December 1617.

²⁵⁶ HMCD, , Lake to Trumbull, Whitehall, 30 October 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 422r-422v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 12/22 November 1617; HMCD, , Lake to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 28 November 1617; HMCD, vi, 335 (letter 721), [Trumbull to Buckingham, Brussels, 29 November 1617].

²⁵⁷ SP 77 12 f^o 425r-425v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 22 November 1617.

²⁵⁸ HMCD, vi, 333 (letter 718), Lake to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 28 November 1617.

²⁵⁹ SP 77/13 f^o 1r, Trumbull to the Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 1 January 1618.

he was able to transport money from England to Genova was something Trumbull's informant had not been able to ascertain²⁶⁰.

Ros died in Naples on 8 June 1618. It took until the end of July before this information reached Lake. Even then he was not sure and requested the English agent in Brussels to verify those reports, *since it concerns my daughter to have the administration, if he is dead*. Lake already had received some information that there was still some *household stuff* left behind in Antwerp. Trumbull had to inform himself what all that was worth²⁶¹. Lake's principal dealer in this matter was William Jones. Trumbull was asked by Lake to forward some letters to him. Jones wrote Trumbull at the end of July, *It much concernes your frende [Sir Thomas Lake] to knowe howe my Lord Roos died, howe he disposed of his soule and estate, what wordes and actes passed at his death*. To acquire information Trumbull could *employ Mr Worthington to write to the Abbot at Naples, my Lord Cardinals nephew, or some Irishmen to sounde the prior of Malta in whose house he fell sicke as we heere*²⁶². In September 1618 Lake stressed their importance to Trumbull writing, *They concern me closely for they have to do with Lord Ros's will*²⁶³. Sir Thomas Leedes was another man who helped Lake in his case. Sir Thomas sent him a letter through Trumbull concerning *my daughter's administration, Anne Lake (1599x1601-1630)*²⁶⁴ married William Cecil in February 1616. Jones was gone to Italy to find out if Lord Ros had left a will²⁶⁵.

Diego de Silva was an important player in the proceedings after the death of Lord Ros. In his will Ros had given him all his goods in England, according to Abbot who was informed of the existence of a will two months before Lake. Lake's agent, Jones, did not get the trunks, *which must needs discontent Secretary Lake*, according to Trumbull. Abbot did not believe that the conde of Gondomar would *loose nothing by the custody of the goods of that foolish lord*. The archbishop further mentioned that

*the house of Exeter do not sticke to say that the Ambassador had secretly committed to him goods to the valew of 6,000 li being carryed away in 19 carts, besides 2,000 li in ready gold and jewels to a greate valew. It was this that would not be reputed. And judge you what a shuffle Diego is like to have for the getting of these, when the Lord Ros dyed at Naples, and the Ambassador is in Spaine and his sonne at Bruxelles, and Diego is commorant nowwhere, and the goods are in severall countries if my conjecture bee any thing*²⁶⁶.

Abbot confirmed that de Silva did have the information to talk accurately about anything concerning Lord Ros, but the archbishop did not know if de Silva told the truth. Returning from Rome through France to travel to England or somewhere near that kingdom he got letters from the conde of Gondomar in Lyon. He then travelled to Madrid,

²⁶⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 436r-436v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 13/23 December 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 438r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, December 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 440r-441r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 18/28 December 1617.

²⁶¹ HMCD, vi, 460 (letter 998), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 27 July 1618.

²⁶² HMCD, vi, 464 (letter 1011), Johnes to Trumbull, London, 31 July 1618.

²⁶³ HMCD, vi, 497 (letter 1074), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 4 September 1618.

²⁶⁴ Bellany, 'Cecil, Anne, Lady Ros (1599x1601-1630)'.

²⁶⁵ HMCD, vi, 598 (letter 1293), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 2 December 1618.

²⁶⁶ HMCD, vi, 559-560 (letter 1211), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 27 October 1618.

where doubtles the late Ambassador will sucke out of him whatsoever hee can concerning that which is in question, and if hee finde any thinge conducint to his good frende heere, then shall Diego with all speed come for England, but if otherwise wee shall not heare of him till the cause bee determined²⁶⁷.

Lake, naturally was very interested in de Silva. Trumbull was requested to send him all possible information in November and December 1618. In December Lake did not know if de Silva was in the Southern Netherlands or on his way to Spain²⁶⁸. Sir Thomas Lake's political career ended in 1618 but he nevertheless retained the title of secretary of state until 1619. Main motive behind the disgrace was a family dispute concerning Lord and Lady Ross. He was accused of making *unethical use of his position as secretary to advance his family's financial position*, as Schreiber puts it, which is confirmed by the Trumbull correspondence. For about six months Lake remained secretary of state only in name. Most of the diplomatic correspondence passed to Sir Robert Naunton. Only William Trumbull remained corresponding with Lake because Naunton told him to do so. On 21 December 1618 he told Trumbull that he should keep addressing his dispatches to Sir Thomas Lake until the king or Sir Thomas Lake himself gave permission to send them to Naunton²⁶⁹.

Ros's case, although only instigated by Lake, makes it clear that Trumbull had not trouble in gathering information in Italy. Trumbull not only had friends and fellow ambassadors who informed him but also had access to letters of notorious enemies such as Hugh Owen and the rector of the English Jesuit College in Rome.

Recusants residing in the Archducal Netherlands

It is not surprising that one of the duties the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Edmondson, had to perform after his arrival in the Spanish Netherlands at the archducal court in May 1605 was to report back to London on those *gentlemen of quality* residing there. Salisbury instructed Sir Thomas to warn these men that joining foreign service under the banner of religion rendered them suspicious in the eyes of king James and his ministers. Personal gain, according to the principal secretary of state, was another vicious motivation, adding that it did not bode well for Protestantism or for the safety of the realm when the active population only acted on greed. But he was most persistent on the matter of religion²⁷⁰. Francis Tregian is a good example of the kind of suspicious man the secretary of state had in mind. Tregian informed the Privy Council in August 1606 that the only reason he had left his native soil was for *wante of meanes*²⁷¹. He received a pension of 30 escudos on order from the archduke in November 1596²⁷². September following Sir Thomas reported that Tregian had left for Spain, which was no great surprise as Jesuits

²⁶⁷ HMCD, vi, 625-626 (letter 1352), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 28 December 1618.

²⁶⁸ HMCD, vi, 584 (letter 1264), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 17 November 1618; HMCD, vi, 607 (letter 1311), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 9 December 1618.

²⁶⁹ Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635*, 19-20.

²⁷⁰ SP 77/8/2 f^o 4r-5r, draft, [Salisbury] to [Edmondson], 9 October 1605.

²⁷¹ SP 77/8 f^o 150r, Tregian to Privy Council, Brussels, 10 August 1606 (n.s.).

²⁷² Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans. The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II*, 261.

were his companions. While pleading with the king of Spain for some kind of assistance, he would be able to bare witness to the prosecution of the Catholics in England²⁷³.

The Southern Netherlands received many young men and women from the British Isles to which would receive education in Catholic colleges. William Trumbull stressed the number of young gentlemen, of ancient and noble houses, that were sent to Douai and St. Omer, *to abiure their allegiance to his matie, and render themselves to captayns of the Pope, and the Jesuitts, our capitall enemyes*. Trumbull stressed that like his predecessor, Sir Thomas, he had complained about this, *but could not yet ever fynde any redresse*. It was not possible to procure a satisfactory solution in the Archducal Netherlands. The only way to remedy the situation was *at home*. The liberality with which *Papists* could travel to the *Idoll of Sichem*, Scherpenheuvel, gave cause to the maintenance of the seminaries and the building of new monasteries which, with time, could cause a dangerous rebellion²⁷⁴.

The interest of Edmondes and Trumbull in the British and Irish refugees and the monasteries and colleges erected is evident throughout the correspondence as argued above. There are, however, few lists in the diplomatic correspondence identifying the most important exiles in the Archducal Netherlands. Furthermore, the interest was not constant and peaked at times. This depended largely on whom was secretary of state at a certain time. When Sir Ralph Winwood became secretary, the attention for English refugees increased exponentially. When James VI/I was ready to appoint a new principal secretary of state in 1614 there were two candidates: Sir Thomas Lake and Sir Ralph Winwood. As he was about to convene a new parliament, he appointed Sir Ralph Winwood, a staunch Protestant, which can be considered a wise political move to appease the parliamentarians who had to give James VI/I money. Trumbull knew Winwood from the time he was stationed in Düsseldorf and the United Provinces as ambassador of James VI/I. Winwood wanted the English agent in Brussels to keep an eye on James's subjects in the Southern Netherlands. He was especially interested in the Irish regiment and asked Trumbull for a *perfect statement* of it, concluding that Trumbull's watchful eye would be a good service to the king. The following year, in February 1615, Winwood widened his scope, as he wished a list of families living in the Southern Netherlands, *who ordinarily hawnt the Masse as Leedes, Parhamm and others*²⁷⁵. Trumbull sent an extensive list of refugees, monasteries and colleges in response. This list which already has been mentioned in the paragraph on the monasteries and colleges dates from 1615²⁷⁶. Besides the monasteries, convents and colleges the English agent referred to the recusants in the following cities: Brussels, Louvain, Malines, Antwerp, Douai, Tournai, Lille, St. Omer, Gravelines, Dunkirk and Cambrai. In total Trumbull mentioned over 60 men and women of importance residing in the Archducal Netherlands²⁷⁷.

Winwood, as became apparent in May 1615, was only interested in four men and their wives who appeared on Trumbull's list: Sir Thomas Leedes and Sir Ralph Babthorpe (1561-1618) in Louvain, Sir Edward Parham in Brussels, and Sir William Roper in

²⁷³ SP 77/8 f^o 169v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 24 September 1606.

²⁷⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 231r-232v, Trumbull to Overbury, Brussels, 8 October 1612.

²⁷⁵ Sir Thomas Leedes and Sir Edward Parham.

²⁷⁶ [who ordinarily haunt the mass as Leedes, Parham and others]; HMCD, v, 144 (letter 309), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 February [1615].

²⁷⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 25r-26r, *The names of Certaine Principall men of the Englishe, and Scottishe nations, now residinge in the Archds Provinces*.

Cambrai²⁷⁸. Christopher Porter was sent that same month to the Catholic Netherlands to urge the four men to return with their wives and children to England. Privy Seals to that end had been made. Trumbull was requested to advise him, which he did by delivering Porter detailed instructions on how to proceed. First he was to deliver the Privy Seal to Sir William Roper, then to Sir Thomas Leedes and his Lady, then to Sir and Lady Babthorpe and finally to Sir Edward Parham. The first two lived in Louvain. Porter had to visit the English Augustine canonesses at St. Monica to enquire where he could find the house called Placet, where Sir Thomas Leedes lived and perhaps also Sir William Roper. If Roper could not be found there Porter was instructed to enquire where he could be found. Eventually it became clear that Roper was lodged *at the house of one Mr Connyers, an Englishman, next doore to the Lady Crosses house in the streete or neare unto it which leadeth from the towne towards the Castle*²⁷⁹.

Porter's report mentioned that he received instructions from *his Majesties Agente in the City of Brussels* on 25 May. Arriving at the house of Mr. Connyers the elder, possibly Sir John Conyers (c.1587–1664)²⁸⁰, he was told by one of the servants of Roper that he was there, but later changed the story and requested Porter to go to the house of Dr. Worthington, who assured Porter that Roper was at Conyer's house. When Porter returned, Roper, not surprisingly, had left. Returning to the monastery of St. Monica he was refused entrance. It was clear that the Babthorpes were near, argued Porter. The only Privy Seal in Louvain he could deliver was at the house Placet. Although Sir Thomas himself was at Spa or in France, Lady Leedes received it with due respect. Porter's ordeal was only beginning, because at that time he was seized by the mayor and his officers, *taken, searched and all my papers and 2 Privy Seales taken and sente to the Archduke, and close putt in prison with two keepers and 2 great dogges to watch me until the Mayor retourned againe, which time was 3 days and twoe nights*. Porter was able to send a message to Trumbull in the mean time, who procured Porter's discharge. The Mayor of Louvain returned and told Porter that he could not execute his business without leave from archduke Albert. Back in Brussels on 29 May, he tried to deliver the Privy Seal to Sir Edward Parham, but did not succeed although both Sir Edward and his wife were present²⁸¹.

Trumbull reported to Winwood in May 1615 that Lady Leedes had visited him after receiving the Privy Seal. She told Trumbull that Sir Thomas was in France and she did not have the means to comply and travel to England. According to her doctor she had to travel to Spa to remedy her failing health. She therefore asked that she would get two or three months respite to find the money to travel to England and pay the debts in Louvain. She promised to appear before the Privy Council to answer all the charges against her. She was also trying to contact her husband to inform him of the situation.

²⁷⁸ Cliffe, 'Babthorpe family (*per. c.1501–1635*)'.

²⁷⁹ HMCD, v, 214 (letter 448), James VI/I to Bathorpe, Thetford, 12 May 1615; HMCD, v, 214-215 (letter 448), *Directions give to Christopher Porter*, Brussels, 25 May 1615; HMCD, v, 215 (letter 449), Instructions to Christopher Porter by Winwood, Thetford, 12 May 1615; HMCD, v, 215 (letter 450), Winwood to Trumbull, Thetford, 12 May [1615].

²⁸⁰ Hopper, 'Conyers, Sir John (c.1587–1664)'.

²⁸¹ HMCD, v, 227-228 (letter 470), copy, *Christopher Porter's Report*, [after 29 May 1615].

Trumbull asked Winwood to look favourable to this request²⁸². Lady Leedes wrote in July 1615 mentioning that her husband had been *bitterly and unjustly critised*, due to the rumour that he was seeking to become a colonel in service of the archdukes. She asked Trumbull, who knew Sir Thomas very well, to inform the Lords of the Privy Council and king James of the *incontrovertible truth*²⁸³.

The bad treatment Christopher Porter received in the Archducal Netherlands did not go unnoticed in London. Winwood instructed Trumbull to complain and he would do the same to de Boisshot, Albert's ambassador in London.

For those letters were not (as they seeme to understande them) any Cytations or Edicts of Justice but only simple and ordinary letters written by his Majestie under his Privie Seale to his native and proper subjects; and as well might they punish any courier whom his Majestie with letters under his signett shall sende to yow, or open them when there is noe other difference then in the forme and manner of the seales.

Trumbull launched a formal complaint. Basis for the judicial argument were that the letters carried by Porter were not summons, citations or any judicial warrants, but *lettres missives, simples et ordinaires escrites par Sa Majesté soubs son seel privé a ses propres et naturels subjects*. If it was legitimate to seize Porter's, then all the letters to Trumbull were at risk. De la Faille only replied that king James would receive Albert's decision from Ferdinand de Boisshot in London²⁸⁴. By 22 July the English agent had already complained twice, as is evident from Albert's vexed answer. This was the second time Trumbull brought this matter up, Porter should be content with what had already been done. Albert nonetheless would consult with Maes. Not a fortnight later there was a note on the remonstrance of Christopher Porter, but that was the end of it²⁸⁵. According to Henry More (c.1587–1661)²⁸⁶, assistant to John Gerard, the novice master in subsequently Louvain and Liège, king James backed down under Spanish diplomatic pressure²⁸⁷.

Babthorpe does not figure prominently in the correspondence. While William Trumbull was on leave in England in 1618 his secretary in Brussels, John Wolley, reported that he received word of the death of Babthorpe in May. His wife was in England at that time²⁸⁸. William Rooper requested a licence to travel in 1617, but according John More secretary Winwood did not favour such a request, *perhaps because they [Mr. Stonars and Rooper] live where so many of His Majesties subjects have ben corrupted*²⁸⁹. More assumed he would have more success after the death of Winwood in October 1617.

²⁸² HMCD, v, 211-212 (letter 442), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8 May 1615; this date is impossible as Christopher Porter was only in Louvain from 25 May.

²⁸³ HMCD, v, 296 (letter 600), Leedes to Trumbull, s.l., [July 1615].

²⁸⁴ HMCD, v, 297 (letter 604), Trumbull to the Archdukes, [Brussels], [Before 13 August 1615], the part from de la Faille was dated, 13 August 1615.

²⁸⁵ SP 77/11 f^o 386r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 375r, *Note on remonstrance about Chr. Porter*, 13 August 1615 (n.s.).

²⁸⁶ McCoog, 'More, Henry (c.1587–1661)'.

²⁸⁷ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 58 n. 134; Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, i, 246-7.

²⁸⁸ HMCD, vi, 417 (letter 909), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 16 May 1618 (n.s.).

²⁸⁹ HMCD, vi, 249 (letter 541), More to Trumbull, London, 5 August 1617; HMCD, vi, 285 (letter 611), More to Trumbull, Windsor, 14 September 1617.

If Roper wanted a license to travel for three years, renewable every three years, More thought he might be successful²⁹⁰. While Trumbull was in London in 1618 he pleaded with Sir Thomas Lake for that same license. Lake told Trumbull to remember him of this once he was back in Brussels, which he did²⁹¹.

Sir Thomas Leedes and Sir Edward Parham provide us with the most interesting cases. Although Parham does not come into the Trumbull papers until the end of 1613, it is clear that Trumbull knew him. Robert Sidney (1563–1626)²⁹², viscount Lisle since 1605, requested Trumbull to recommend him to Sir Edward Parham and his wife, who in December 1613 were in Liège²⁹³. John Thoris formulated Parham's association with the Spanish faction pointedly when writing, *Mr. Shelton is as much in love with the French as Sir Ed. Parham is with the Spanish*²⁹⁴. This did not mean that Parham was ready to do the bidding of those who meant king James ill, according to Trumbull:

*These men that learne no manner of practise unthought upon, that may any wayes undermyne, or enfeeble the foundations of yor Matie estates; have ben tampering with Sr. Edward Parkham. the 2. Captens Blountes, mr. Nevell (the pretended earl of Westmorelande) and Sr. Thomas Studder, in this tyme of trouble and confussion to raise a Regiment of Englishe. But Sr. Edward Parkham and the Blountes (as I am informed) have refused to medle in that bussines, unlesse the Archd. will promisse to procure them yor Matie permission and approbation*²⁹⁵.

Parham claimed to be against the capture of Wesel by Spinola in 1614 in a letter commenting that Trumbull *shall dow well to perswad Prince Brandinburg to goe in to his one [own] cuntry, and the Stats to slepe quietly in ther durty hole, but this is bey the way meryly between y ou and me*²⁹⁶. At that time, according to Sir Thomas Leedes, Parham had entered Sir Griffin Markham's regiment in service of the duke of Neuburg²⁹⁷. It is evident that Markham (*b. c.*1565, *d.* in or after 1644) and Parham held correspondence. Trumbull was able to acquire three letters from Markham to Parham²⁹⁸. Early July 1615 Parham reported to the English agent that he and his wife had safely arrived in Spa, adding *I wish I weer safly at Brusills agayne, all things are soe extreame deere and we have heer fowle wether*²⁹⁹. Henry Wriothesly (1573–1624)³⁰⁰, third earl of Southampton, spoke to Winwood concerning Parham early July 1615³⁰¹. The intervention of Southampton must have had some success, as is evident from Parham's letter to Trumbull

²⁹⁰ HMDC, vi, 327 (letter 701), More to Trumbull, London, 13 November 1617.

²⁹¹ SP 77/13 f^o 151v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 16 January 1619.

²⁹² Shephard, 'Sidney, Robert, first earl of Leicester (1563–1626)'.

²⁹³ HMCD, iv, 272, Lisle to Trumbull, 23 December 1613.

²⁹⁴ HMCD, iv, 350, Thoris to Trumbull, Paris, 26 March 1614.

²⁹⁵ SP 77/11 f^o 89r-89v, Trumbull to James VI, Brussels, 30 June 1614.

²⁹⁶ HMCD, v, 1 (letter 1), Parham to Trumbull, Dusseldorf, 8 September 1614 (n.s.).

²⁹⁷ HMCD, v, 1 (letter 2), Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 9 September 1614 (n.s.).

²⁹⁸ HMCD, v, 464 (letter 979), copy, Markham to Parham, Tours, 13 April 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 490 (letter 1031), copy, Markham to Parham, Tours, April 1616; HMCD, v, 583 (letter 1246), Markham to [Parham], Louvain, 3 September 1616.

²⁹⁹ HMCD, v, 255 (letter 515), Parham to Trumbull, Spa, 2 July 1615 (n.s.).

³⁰⁰ Honan, 'Wriothesley, Henry, third earl of Southampton (1573–1624)'.

³⁰¹ HMCD, v, 268 (letter 544), Southampton to Trumbull, s.l., 5 July 1615.

Yf yt be soe that I must desier a time for my returne for England, I pray asist me soe as I may have three yeres, but I desier chefly that I may stand to my licence, and I understand that the King if content not to call us³⁰².

By July 1625 he was the colonel of the English regiment³⁰³. Sir Edward and the English regiment took part in the siege and eventual capture of Breda in 1625³⁰⁴.

Sir Thomas Leedes was made a knight of the Order of Bath by king James VI/I in July 1603. When exactly he left for the Southern Low Countries is unclear. In October 1606 he sold East Pollingfold in Surrey. He must have arrived in the Archducal Netherlands after October 1606 and before the end of 1607 as he figures on a list sent by Sir Thomas Edmondes in that year³⁰⁵. It was especially the family of Sir Thomas' wife, Mary Leedes, from Yorkshire who were known as ardent Catholics. Although Catholicism was their prime motive behind their departure from England, their accumulated debts offered an additional incentive³⁰⁶. Trumbull corresponded with Sir Thomas from at least November 1613, at which time Leedes's wife had obtained permission to join her husband³⁰⁷. In a letter at the start of that month he expressed his joy at the return of Trumbull's wife, Deborah³⁰⁸. The correspondence only ended in 1626 a year after Trumbull's departure from Brussels³⁰⁹. Apparent from the annual letters of the Jesuit College is that Sir Thomas was a benefactor of the Solidarity of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. His son, Sir Thomas, was the first prefect of the college established in Louvain³¹⁰. Sir Thomas was given permission to be buried in a Jesuit Church in 1622³¹¹.

Sir Thomas Leedes, as becomes evident from his letters, was well connected in England: Edward Sackville (1590-1652), fourth earl of Dorset³¹², Sir Thomas Lake, junior secretary of state (1616-1619). Trumbull, always looking for people who could assist him with his financial troubles because of the irregular payment he received, also solicited for Sir Thomas Leedes's assistance. In April 1615 Leedes sent Trumbull a letter from Sir Thomas Monson (1563/4–1641) and one of his sons which would inform Trumbull about what had been done in his case.

It appears that the matter of your allowance for letters presents less difficulty now, and I have pressed Sir Thomas to follow it up. Regarding your business with the Lord Treasurer, I have advised my son to proceed more warily or drop it altogether, 'for in my opinion we have enoughe

³⁰² HMCD, v, 269 (letter 548), Parham to Trumbull, Spa, 16 July 1615.

³⁰³ SP 77/18 f^o 184r-184v, Trumbull to Conway, [Brussels], 21/31 July 1625; SP 77/18 f^o 257r, Officers of the English and Scottish regiments, [December 1625].

³⁰⁴ SP 77/18 f^o 121r-121v, copy, Captain John Langworth serving Sir Edward Parham in the English regiment before Breda, 18 May 1625 (n.s.).

³⁰⁵ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 57; Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, i, 247; SP 77/8/2 f^o 210r, *The names of such persons of note as live in the Provinces of the Netherlands under the King of Spaines obedience beeing his Mats subiects*.

³⁰⁶ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 56-57.

³⁰⁷ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 57.

³⁰⁸ HMCD, iv, 246, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 4 November

³⁰⁹ All the letters from Sir Thomas to William Trumbull can be found in BL Add. 72298.

³¹⁰ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 58; Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* I, 246.

³¹¹ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 58.

³¹² Smith, 'Sackville, Edward, fourth earl of Dorset (1590–1652)',.

*in knowinge my Lord Treseror is well conceited of you and to rubbe such a thinge over much as this was may breed jelousie and so doe more harm then good*³¹³.

Trumbull also sounded Leedes on the reshuffle in 1614, the time Winwood was appointed principal secretary of state. Sir Thomas stressed that he now lead a life without state business, *being therunto called by the undeserved affronts my ld. Of Caunter*. [George Abbot] *heretofore unjustly cast on me*. According to Leedes Rochester, the Lord Chamberlain, had become so powerful that a change of offices was likely. He, however, could not understand why Lord of Wooster was appointed High Steward and not Henry Howard (1540-1614), earl of Northampton. On a possible marriage between England and France he commented that it was more probable as Sir Thomas Edmondes was returning to England³¹⁴. Two months later Leedes confessed that he was amazed that Sir Henry Neville (1561/2–1615)³¹⁵ and Sir Thomas Edmondes *are left unpreferred*. Furthermore he reported that the Lord Chamberlain and the Lord Privy Seal, Henry Howard, were sick, and that they would be sorely missed when they died³¹⁶. In the second half of 1614 Sir Thomas sometimes mentioned the Jülich-Kleve crisis. In September 1614 he reported that he had heard rumours that Spinola had taken five cities, among which Wesel. Two months later he professed to be an adherent of peace, unless it was prejudicial to his country. Trumbull also wrote Leedes on matters about this crisis. Leedes was sure that Spinola would not surrender Wesel³¹⁷. These kind of comments, however, are sparse.

A certain familiarity is obvious from Sir Thomas Leedes' letters to William Trumbull as they contain a lot of personal information. In March 1614 Leedes mentioned that his wife Mary was ill which had prohibited them from attending some ceremonies in Brussels. At the time of writing the letter he also felt ill, *yet not so ill as I need a physician, though here they are dog cheap*³¹⁸. In February 1614 he expected a visit from Trumbull and his wife in Louvain. In April 1614 he mentioned that he would be a happy man if Trumbull would call at his house³¹⁹. In April 1615 Leedes mentioned some nightingales for Trumbull's wife³²⁰. In December 1617, after the death of Winwood, Trumbull promised to go to Louvain and eat *christmas pie* with Sir Thomas³²¹.

In December 1614 Leedes was already wary of his position and wanted to meet Trumbull to have his advice. *I will not stay here to be in ranke of them that shalbe caled home*. While Winwood, known to be a staunch Protestant, was principal secretary of state, he disapproved of Leedes and warned Trumbull not to be associated with him. Trumbull

³¹³ HMCD, v, 192, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 22 April 1615 (n.s.); Bellany, 'Monson, Sir Thomas, first baronet (1563/4–1641)'.

³¹⁴ HMCD, iv, 316-317, Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 22 February 1614.

³¹⁵ Greengrass, 'Neville, Sir Henry (1561/2–1615)'.

³¹⁶ HMCD, iv, 376, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 16 April 1614.

³¹⁷ HMCD, v, 1 (letter 2), Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 9 September 1614; HMCD, v, 53 (letter 127), Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 17 November 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 68 (letter 162), Leedes to Trumbull, [Louvain], 8 December 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 183-184 (letter 378), Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 14 April 1615 (n.s.).

³¹⁸ HMCD, iv, 351, Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 27 March 1614.

³¹⁹ HMCD, iv, 316, Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 16 February 1614; HMCD, iv, 376, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 16 April 1614.

³²⁰ HMCD, v, 183-184 (letter 378), Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 14 April 1615 (n.s.).

³²¹ HMCD, vi, 345 (letter 743), Leedes to Trumbull, Placet, Louvain, 13/23 December 1617.

had recommended Leedes to Sir Thomas Monson who showed Winwood Trumbull's letter. Winwood advised Trumbull that,

*The less you have to doe with thys kind of men, the better service you shall doe his Majesty, for howsoever he doth temporyse him selfe and pretends the Spaa waters, yet I heare of what cariage hys wife ys, who trots up and downe at all processions and hawnts all pilgrimages, and omitts noe superstition that may stain and dishonor her cowntrye*³²².

Trumbull acknowledged in June 1615 that he had indeed in the past given more letters of recommendation to subjects of king James than he wanted to. He promised to be more frugal in the future³²³. The fact that two of the sons of Sir Thomas and Mary Leedes were Jesuits did not help their case. Thomas (1594-1668) and Edward (1599-1677) who had joined the Society of Jesus by 1610. Edward became notorious for his writings in the 1630s against the Jacobean oath of allegiance, according to Questier,³²⁴.

As Leedes was not in the Archducal Netherlands in 1615 there are but few letters, save some from Lady Leedes concerning the Privy Seals brought by Sir Christopher Porter. She expected her husband back any time in December 1615³²⁵. Winwood's warning proved prophetic as Sir Thomas Monson was mentioned in a confession concerning the death of Sir Thomas Overbury in 1613 in the Tower. Although the confessor, Sir Gervase Elwes (bap. 1561-1615)³²⁶, did not think that Monson had any idea of the intentions of Richard Weston, whom he recommended as keeper of Overbury, this led to an investigation which Bellany terms *the most sensational court scandal of the age*. Trumbull helped Winwood to get some general information on the man. As Monson was a respected man in the Archducal Netherlands gathering information on him was difficult if not impossible. Trumbull stressed that everything he sent through on that matter had to be kept secret. If made public, it *should make me more odious to this people then I am already in regarde of my place, and Relligion, to conceale my name; and the name of the Towne where they were written*³²⁷. In the end of 1616 or at the start of 1617 Monson was pardoned because of a lack of evidence.

In March 1616 Trumbull was in Louvain, probably because of the matter of *Corona Regia* and stayed at the Leedes residence, as is evident from a letter of John Chandler, an English merchant in Antwerp. The letter is addressed to *A Monsieur Trumbul, Agent pour son Majesté de la grande Bretagne, pres les serenissimes Archducs, se tenant pour le present A Lovaine A Placet chez le Chevalier Leedes*³²⁸. Trumbull explained his relationship to the Leedes family to Sir Ralph Winwood in September 1616. He informed Winwood that Lady Leedes had gone to England in disguise. One of her errands concerned their destitute state in Louvain. About Christmas 1615 they had been forced to pawn their plate and had been refused a loan of five pounds sterling by the English Jesuits. When she

³²² HMCD, v, 214 (letter 447), Winwood to Trumbull, Thetford, 11 May [1615]; Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 58.

³²³ SP 77/11 f^o 339r-339v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 June 1615.

³²⁴ Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 58.

³²⁵ HMCD, v, 374 (letter 774), Leedes to Trumbull, s.l., endorsed 4 December 1615.

³²⁶ Bellany, 'Elwes, Sir Gervase (bap. 1561, d. 1615)'; for the Overbury affair see, Bellany, *The politics of court scandal in early modern England: news culture and the Overbury affair, 1603-1660*.

³²⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 31r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616.

³²⁸ HMCD, v, 438 (letter 916), Chandler to Trumbull, s.l., 15 March 1616 (n.s.).

returned, Sir Thomas was planning to travel to Spain to request the Spanish king the command of a regiment of Englishmen, a project favoured by Sir Griffin Markham.

For once Trumbull clearly explains where he got his information. He had intercepted letters written from Louvain to Madrid. Trumbull got them by chance and copied them. Winwood could use this information, but it would be best if it were concealed where it came from, *in regarde that I doe holde an outward freindshippe, and correspondence, wth Sr. Thomas and his lady; who doe not wante their Intelligencier in the Courte of Englande; and are informed of all things that passe their by the Jesuitts at Louwayne*³²⁹. The intelligencer Trumbull refers to is possibly another son of the Leedes who served James as a Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber³³⁰.

A letter from Sir Griffin Markham to Sir Edward Parham confirmed the information contained in the intercepted letters. Lady Leedes had travelled to England on domestic business, and Sir Thomas planned to travel to Spain after her return, but that would not be soon³³¹. Trumbull had received information that she was malcontent because of what Trumbull had written to London concerning her husband and *his pretentions for a regiment*. The English agent confirmed that he had written nothing but the truth, *or else the letter sent to Sir Griffin Markham at his beeing in Spaine, whereof I took a coppie, was fraught with fictions*³³².

After Winwood's death in 1617 Trumbull had to direct all his correspondence to Sir Thomas Lake, the junior secretary of state appointed in 1616. Sir Thomas Leedes was no longer on the radar of the secretary of state, on the contrary. Lake was not the champion of Protestantism as Winwood had been. In contrast with Winwood's displeasure with Sir Thomas Leedes, Lake now corresponded regularly with the recusant in Louvain. Thirteen Letters survive in the Trumbull Papers from Sir Thomas Lake, dated between 30 October 1617 and 20 December 1618. On three occasions he sent a packet to Trumbull to be delivered to Sir Thomas Leedes³³³.

Lake was finally discharged in February 1619 and succeeded by Sir George Calvert (1579/80-1632)³³⁴, first baron Baltimore, who had been a secretary to Salisbury, and considered as a man sympathetic to Roman Catholics³³⁵. After the appointment of Calvert, Naunton corresponded with those ambassadors and agents with assignments unfavourable to the interests of Spain: Sir Dudley Carleton (Republic of the United Provinces), Sir Henry Wotton (Venice), Sir Isaac Wake (Savoy), William Trumbull (Archducal Netherlands), Sir Edward Herbert (France) and Sir Francis Nethersole (Princes of the Germanic Union). Calvert corresponded with Cottington and Ashton, who were both sent on missions friendly to Spain, including the negotiations for a Spanish Match³³⁶.

³²⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 180r-180v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 16/26 September 1616.

³³⁰ HMCD, vi, 247, Leedes to Trumbull, Louvain, 6 November 1613; HMCD, vi, 138-140 (letter 307), *James I's entourage*, before 15 March 1617.

³³¹ HMCD, v, 583 (letter 1246), Markham to [Parham], Louvain, 3 September 1616 (n.s.).

³³² HMCD, vi, 112 (letter 258), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 February 1617.

³³³ HMCD, vi, 446-447 (letter 974), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 16 July 1618; HMCD, vi, 584 (letter 1264), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 17 November 1618; HMCD, vi, 598 (letter 1293), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 2 December 1618.

³³⁴ Krugler, 'Calvert, George, first Baron Baltimore (1579/80-1632)'.

³³⁵ Schreiber, *The Policial Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635*,

³³⁶ Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton*, 36-37; for the most recent research on the Spanish Match see, Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*; Cogswell,

The Spanish match, the search for a marriage between prince Charles and the Spanish infanta Maria was the main *leitmotiv* of James' foreign policy and entailed some consequences for the English Catholics in general and those residing in the Southern Netherlands in particular. James first hoped to have a marriage between his heir, prince Henry and the infanta Anna. Digby, arriving in Spain as ambassador, soon learned that she was engaged to Louis XIII of France. In 1614 Digby returned to Madrid. King James now proposed a marriage between prince Charles - Henry had died in 1612 - and infanta Maria Anna. Although back in London in 1616 with the news that the marriage could not take place without papal consent, Digby was sent back to Madrid in 1617 to open the formal negotiations.

Word of the negotiations for a Spanish match between prince Charles and a Spanish infanta gave the British exiles in the Spanish Netherlands hope and courage, *who nowe lifte up their heads; and expect that if the matche goe forwarde, they shall have liberty; or at the leaste tolleracion of Relligion*. Not all of British and Irish Catholics believed in the possibility of such a marriage. In February 1617 it was generally believed that the match had been arranged, according to Trumbull. The Jesuit Joseph Creswell³³⁷ who was at St. Omer had asked for the opinion of Tobie Mathew (1577-1655) and George Gage (c.1582-1638) on the proposed Spanish Match. What were the advantages and the disadvantages to such a marriage? Sir Thomas Leedes, whom Trumbull termed *another great man of state* at that time, heard of this and considered himself more fit for that job. In the fall of 1617 George Gage was sent to Spain. He was instructed by the English Jesuits *to observe what is done in the Treaty of Allyance betweene his Majestie and the King of Spaine*, for which Sir John Digby had been sent to Spain as ambassador extraordinary. By his presence he had *to procure and sollicit the more advantagious conditions for the Roman Catholicks of England*³³⁸. In the early 1620s king James even employed Gage. He was sent to Rome in May 1621 to find where the new pope, Gregory XV (1621-1623), stood on the dispensation required for the Spanish Match. Better treatment of Catholics was the predictable response. The following year Gage was sent again with credentials signed by king James, prince Charles and the duke of Buckingham. He returned in 1623 convinced that his mission was successful, but as Charles and Buckingham began to oppose the Spanish match after their disastrous trip to Madrid, Gage's political career was over.

What did the recusants residing in the Southern Netherlands think of the Spanish Match? The Spanish king would never allow it, even according to the most passionate people in 1617, unless king James had conceded some stipulation which would be detrimental to the reformed religion and the United Provinces. All were convinced that the kings of Spain and England were only negotiating *for matters of State* and that their true purpose was being kept secret. Trumbull only wrote this information to Winwood and no one else,

'England and the Spanish Match'; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*; Redworth, 'Of pimps and princes: three unpublished letters from James I and the prince of Wales relating to the Spanish match'; Pursell, 'The end of the Spanish match'.

³³⁷ See also Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans. The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II*, 182-229, this chapter is entitled "A Seminari": Joseph Creswell, S.J.

³³⁸ HMCD, 335 (letter 721), [Trumbull] to [Buckingham], Brussels, [29 November 1617 endorsement]; Loomie, 'Gage, George (c.1582-1638)'; Loomie, 'Matthew, Sir Toby (1577-1655)'.

*there beeing nothing (almoste) contayned in my former pub. dispatches, wch is not againe brought backe into these Countryes; so great as the aucthority of the Sp. Pistoletts, or the perfidiousness of some Romanists, in England*³³⁹.

A fortnight later Sir John Digby's (1580-1653)³⁴⁰ mission to Spain was being discussed in the Low Countries as a *fait accompli*, Trumbull wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton. The English Jesuits could not believe that this was possible, *but upon exorbitante condicions and liberty of Concience for or. Papists, or at leaste as a connyvence, or tolleration of their Relligion*³⁴¹.

Archbishop Abbot protested to Trumbull that he had never spoken in favour of the Spanish match, a rumour which seemed to be circulating amongst the English Catholic refugees in the Archducal Netherlands,

*But indeed the place where you live, and the circumjacent townes of the Archduke are the very forge of fictions concerning the state of England, and it hath bene long my observation that as Popery itselfe is made of lies, so must bee perpetually nourished with up-springing untruths*³⁴².

He further described the consequences of the negotiations for the English Catholics:

*For the moment there is to be no interference with visits made to the Spa or with the resorting of our youth to Louvain and Douai. Perhaps the situation may alter after we know what is become of the Spanish treaty*³⁴³.

During the negotiations for the Spanish Match the number of priests, at an all time low of 160 after the Gunpowder Plot, rose to 800 or 900³⁴⁴. Abbot had always been critical of the attitude towards the English Catholics:

*I commend that you resent the perils which may arise from fugitives English and Irish which are entertained in the dominion of Popish princes, whereof we here are not so sensible as I wish we were ... I see many things here suffered in these kinds, partly because we know not how to amend them, partly because we are asleep and cannot be wakened by any noise unless it be more than ordinary*³⁴⁵.

Trumbull's letters to Sir Dudley Carleton tell us what he knew of the Spanish Match. In November 1618 he briefly told his counterpart in The Hague that the proceedings against Sir Walter Raleigh either meant the successful conclusion of the negotiations or at least that the project was well underway³⁴⁶. In December 1618 Abbot reported to

³³⁹ HMCD, vi, 112 (258), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 February 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 383r-384r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11/21 July 1617.

³⁴⁰ Smith, 'Digby, John, first earl of Bristol (1580-1653)'.

³⁴¹ SP 77/12 f^o 389v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 4 August 1617 (n.s.).

³⁴² HMCD, v, 547 (letter 1155), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth 10 July 1616.

³⁴³ HMCD, vi, 500 (letter 1082), Abbot to Trumbull, Croydon, 9 September 1618.

³⁴⁴ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vi, 570.

³⁴⁵ HMCD, iv, 291, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth 19 January 1614.

³⁴⁶ SP 77/13 f^o 101r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 10/20 November 1618.

Trumbull that Sir John Digby had been elevated to baron Digby of Sherborne. Digby's elevation led to renewed rumours on the success of the talks. On the other hand little had been heard since the conde of Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, had left England. Bristol returned from Spain in April 1618 with the news that the portion of the bride would be £ 600,000. King James, however, refused to give the English Catholics liberty of conscience. That ended the negotiations. Abbot formulated his own opinion,

But the constitution of Christendome as it standeth at this day might seeme to incline us another way, while the Princes of the Union together with the Kinges of denmark and Sweden do desire a more strict confederation betweene those of the reformed religion, and the termes wherein the Hollanders and also those of Bohemia and Silesia may require the same. And which may helpe that forward, the Duke of Savoy and the State of Venice have entred a close league of assistance both invasive and defensive which cannot bee effected but by some stronge opposition against the Spanyards³⁴⁷.

Four years later, after the death of Philip III, the negotiations were reopened. The stakes this time were higher. King James hoped that in securing the marriage he would be able to assist his son-in-law, Frederick V, to recover the Palatinate. In January 1623 that the treaty for the match was well advanced. The only problem remained the request for the liberty of conscience for English Catholics. Three months were now allotted to get papal dispensation. Trumbull, however, was convinced that that could easily take six months adding, *En fin, all is spunne out to the lenght; and all must be borne wth patience here³⁴⁸*. The Spanish infanta would arrive in England during spring 1623³⁴⁹. In March 1623 prince Charles and the marques of Buckingham surprised all when they arrived in Madrid, not even the secretary of state had been informed. They took the negotiations into their own hands. It ended in disaster. In the end Charles married Maria Henrietta, daughter of the French king.

What is clear is that the recusants residing in the Archducal Netherlands and the monasteries and colleges of British and Irish origin gave Trumbull cause to observe and report. On numerous occasions Edmondes and Trumbull complained on this matter. Few instructions, however, were sent by the English government. Sir Ralph Winwood was the only exception and even he took only interest in four men and their families. Neither of the four men returned to England. Besides the numbers joining colleges and monasteries, money was also smuggled out of England. Trumbull had no sympathy for the men and women joining convents and youth sent to the colleges maintained by Jesuits. For him such women were either deluded women or that they had been seduced by the Jesuits. The Jesuits had the status of usual suspects which is confirmed in Trumbull's letters to London and his correspondents in Europe.

It was Trumbull's opinion that the support in Spain and from the archdukes was too great to effect anything of moment in the Catholic Low Countries. Abuses had to be stopped across the Channel. The importance of the Spanish Match for the policy of king James can not be overstated. For the *Rex Pacificus* the Spanish Match was pivotal to his

³⁴⁷ HMCD, vi, 625 (letter 1352), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 28 December 1618.

³⁴⁸ SP 77/16 f^o 6v-7r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 7/17 January 1623; SP 77/16 f^o 16r-16v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 18/27 January 1623.

³⁴⁹ SP 77/16 f^o 21r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 24 January/3 February 1623.

policies. Abbot commented that one of the consequences of these proceedings were a relative slackness when it came to British and Irish exiles in the Southern Netherlands.

It were a few high profile refugees which concerned London most, for obvious reasons, but even then the attention diminished rapidly. William Seymour and his marriage to Arabella Stuart had been a direct affront to king James. The departure of Carier and Bull whom both served the king, was an embarrassment. The importance of Lord Ros was more instigated by profit for Sir Thomas Lake than religion. Even those high profile refugees were never of any consequence.

After the death of secretary Winwood in October 1617 Trumbull had a frank discussion with Charles de la Faille, secretary of state of the archdukes, about the fugitives and the monasteries and the colleges. Trumbull urged

that it was againste the condicions of the peace betweene his matie, and the Archds. to suffer their Countryes to be a receptacle for his mats Rebels, and ill affected subiects; who were both harbored here, and nourished wth pencions: permitted to buylde Monasteryes & Colledges without lymitation³⁵⁰.

Such an argument had been part of the usual repertoire of the representative of king James in Brussels since 1605. Interest in those refugees was not always constant. Although reports were being sent to London there was seldom an official response, unless from staunch Protestants such as Sir Ralph Winwood and George Abbot. After Winwood's death, and the start of the Thirty Years' War the concern for those men and women who sought a kind of sanctuary in the Southern Low Countries definitively moved to the background. Even in the previous decade the interest of London in the recusants had been minimal, despite Trumbull's reports, a part from some financial implications of recusancy. It is clear that they never formed a serious threat to the Crown of England, but were of great use as propaganda, for which Trumbull's could have been very useful. As interest shifted from 1617/1617 onwards to the international crisis, the British and Irish refugees in the Southern Low Countries returned to oblivion.

³⁵⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 416r-417r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 12/22 November 1617.

Chapter 5 Corona Regia: that infernall libell, and woorke of darknes

The presumed danger books could entail was not new in the early Stuart age. Already under the previous dynasty of the Tudors the book trade was watched closely. As printing had helped spreading the Reformation, it spread other things. Ways had to be found to control the printing of books. Recent research on this matter has been conducted by Alexandra Walsham. She offers a categorization of the books which the Elizabethan and early Stuart government wanted to suppress. She distinguishes between two categories: political and polemical theology. There was a variety of books with a political nature: from support to Mary Queen of Scots to an endorsement of a possible Spanish invasion to books and pamphlets on toleration and clemency. Succession and the presumed power of the pope to depose kings as opposed to royal supremacy also fit into that category and were of special interest to James VI/I. Polemical theology¹ was a second type of books. During the reign of James the two English champions in polemical theology were Matthew Kellison (1561-1642)², president of the English College at Douai, and William Bishop (c.1554–1624)³. The landmark was Bellarmine's 1586 book *Disputationes ... de controversiis Christianae fidae*⁴. Book after book was published. Questier called this *a systematic answering machine*. It was considered a defeat if a book from the opposing side was not answered⁵. Besides the two categories put forward by Walsham a third type of books can be discerned: scurrilous pamphlets, which would cause the Jacobean diplomats much trouble.

In the two decades Trumbull spent in the Southern Low Countries representing the interest of his king and his countrymen it was a book that consumed much time and money: *Corona Regia*. Published in 1615 this scurrilous pamphlet would dominate the life of the resident agent in Brussels for eighteen months. The importance of the case is evident as king James even sent an ambassador extraordinary to get satisfaction against the author and printer, whom Trumbull originally had identified as Erycius Puteanus (1574-1646)⁶ and Christophorus Flavius. The following years the matter remained on the agenda until 1624. The English agent did not only spend a lot of time, but also a lot of money. It is the only case throughout Trumbull's mandate which is documented in such great detail. The English agent delivered a detailed account of what he had spent on the affair in November 1616:

	£	s	p
<i>For the expense of my self and 2 servants with 3 horses in my travells from London to Doway and Tournay</i>	20	10	00
<i>For my charges at Antwerp where I did continewe 14 dayes to enquier for the printer of the said lybell</i>	15	00	00
<i>More disboursed in a second journey to Antwerp where was</i>			

¹ For an overview see Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*.

² Milward, 'Kellison, Matthew (1561–1642)'.

³ Holmes, 'Bishop, William (c.1554–1624)'.

⁴ Walsham, "'Domme Preachers'?: Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print', 88-89.

⁵ Walsham, "'Domme Preachers'?: Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print', 89; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625*, 17-18.

⁶ Roersch, 'Puteanus, Erycius'.

<i>forced to remayne six dayes for the same purpose</i>	07	00	00
<i>Item for my expences at Louvayne, going thether with the Archdukes commissyoners to examen certayne witnesses, where stayed 4 dayes</i>	05	00	00
<i>More payde there for the bedles fees in adjourning the witnesses. To them for their vacations and other petty charges</i>	03	05	06
<i>More paid to Henry Taylor for sundry voyages to Louvayne, Mechlen, Antwerp, Doway and into the United Provinces to seek out Jehan Henricks van Onse</i>	10	00	00
<i>More payde to the said Taylor in recompence of his travells and paynes</i>	20	00	00
<i>More for his journey to Cullen to seek out Flavius the printer</i>	03	00	00
<i>More paid to Valentine de Moulder of Louvayne for his labor and expences in 2 severall journeyes to Namur, Cullen, and Confluence to seek for Flavius and speak with him, in which journeyes he spent 98 dayes at 2s per diem</i>	12	00	00*
<i>More given to 3 advocates to assist me with his [sic] councill upon all occasions of doubt in lawe; and for drawing the intergatoryes wheupon the witnesses were to be examined</i>	15	00	00
<i>More paid to the Archdukes officers and their servants for fees and gratuities given them for the dispatch of divers letters and commissions concerning this busines</i>	05	00	00
<i>More given to certayne persons for secrett intelligence in discovering the authors and printers of the abovesaid lybell</i>	30	00	00
<i>More payd for my servants chardges in going to Doway and bringing John Henricks van Onse from thence to Bruxelles to be ther examined, for their charges at Doway and by the way</i>	06	10	00
<i>More for my said servants expences in going thether the second tyme to bring Henry Taylor from thence to Bruxelles to be examined</i>	05	12	06
<i>For the charges of John Henricks and Taylor at Bruxelles 14 dayes with their vacations at 3s per diem</i>	02	02	00
<i>More given to John Henricks van Onse in reward for his paynes and travels</i>	09	00	00
<i>Paid to Sdragan the Notary for examining the said Taylor and Henricks and wryting their examinations 6 tymes over</i>	02	00	00
<i>More for my expences in a journey to Namure to apprehend Flavius, being the lodged at the Signe of the Foxe ther, as it was written to me from Cullen, but was not there to be founde; in which I was abroad 5 dayes</i>	06	00	00
<i>For the interest of these moneys one whole yeere at 10 li per centum</i>	16	00	00

Total 176 10 00

* This number was altered from £9 16s, as were also other numbers, the correct total in that case should be £ 193.

When Trumbull had finally been able to get hold of Flavius and got his confession, he also mentioned the cost of the case. In total Trumbull had spent £756 5s 10d above his extraordinary allowance of £75 per year, the English agent who had not been paid for several years, stressed in his letter to his sovereign. Order was given in May 1624 to pay Trumbull £765 5s. 10d., which must have been for Trumbull's expenses, although the amounts differs ten pounds⁷. According to Philip in 1970 that amounted to about \$ 40.000. That money was spent *on bibliographical aids, secret information, some bribery, a certain amount of corruption and at least three plans for kidnapping*⁸.

War of pamphlets

That James VI/I could be offended by books printed throughout Europe was not new in 1615. When leaving for England in September 1609 Sir Thomas Edmondes did not only mention the presence of British and Irish Catholic refugees in the Southern Low Countries, he also referred to the books and pamphlets that were published there. A controversy erupted after the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. In June 1606 the oath of allegiance became law in England⁹. In effect the Jacobean oath of allegiance denied the presumed power the pope had to depose kings: politics and polemical theology became entwined¹⁰. It was not only a discussion with Protestants on the one hand and Catholics on the other. Even within the Catholic community in England and on the Continent divisions were aparent¹¹. It became clear that the Jesuits in Europe were vehemently opposed to the oath. It was from that corner that most opposition, both direct and underhand, came. Archpriest George Blackwell (1547-1613)¹² first allowed the English Catholics to take the oath. After condemnation from Rome he retracted his support. Imprisoned in June 1607 he took the oath and wrote a letter to the English Catholics backing it. Anonymously king James defended the oath himself in his *Triplici nodo, triplex*

⁷ HMCD, vi, 56-57 (letter 140), draft, *Account of moneys disbursed by William Trumbull in 1616 by his Majesty's special command and by instructions from Sir Ralph Winwood for the discovery of the author of Corona Regia*, November 1616; SP 77/17 f^o 186v-187r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 7/17 May 1624; SP 77/17 f^o 144r, *Memorial for payment to Trumbull*, Greenwich, 20 May 1624.

⁸ Philip, *Dragon's teeth*, 16.

⁹ For recent research see, Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements*; Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance'; Edwards, 'Reformation and Excommunication'; Patterson, *James VI/I and the reunion of Christendom*, 75-123.

¹⁰ For more information on the controversy and its participants see, Richgels, 'Scholasticism meets Humanism in the Counter-Reformation: The Clash of Cultures in Robert Bellarmine's use of Calvin in the *Controversies*'; Richgels, 'The pattern of controversy in a Counter-Reformation Classic: the *Controversies* of Robert Bellarmine'; Frajese, 'Una teoria della censura: Bellarmino e il potere indiretto dei papi'.

¹¹ See also, Lunn, 'English Benedictines and the oath of allegiance, 1606-1647'; Clancy, 'English Catholics and the Papal Deposing Power, 1570-1640.

¹² Arblaster, 'Blackwell, George (1547-1613)'; Patterson, *James VI/I and the reunion of Christendom*, 82-84.

*cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*¹³. This started a furor of publications, over 150 tracts were published¹⁴. Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), also anonymously, replied to this royal writing in his *Responsi Matthfi Torti*¹⁵. James VI/I now reprinted his original book with his name under it and an addition: a *Premonition*¹⁶ to all Christian princes and a list of discrepancies in the work of his opponent. Bellarmine followed suit, dropped his anonymity and published *Apologia pro responsione ad librum Jacobi I*¹⁷. The answer this time did not come from the king himself but from William Barclay (1546-1608)¹⁸, a Scotsman, in his *De Potestate Papae*¹⁹, which provoked Bellarmine's *Tractatus de potestate summi pontificis in rebus temporalibus*²⁰. Reference can also be made to Blackwell and others, who were opposed by Robert Parsons, the president of the English College in Douai. According to him all that took the oath withdrew themselves from the authority of the pope²¹. Authors in the Archducal Netherlands also joined the discussion. At the start of 1611 the English agent, William Trumbull, reported that the Jesuit Leonard Lessius (1554-1623)²², considered the most learned of the Society of Jesus, was ready to print a book against James's *Apologie*, referring to *De Antichristo et ejus præcursoribus*²³. In it the doctrine of the papal power over all Christian monarchs was again stipulated. The French ambassador in Brussels protested but archduke Albert refused to forbid it. In October Trumbull reported that after much deliberation in Spain and Italy and much contestation in France the book of Lessius had been printed but remained unpublished²⁴.

¹³ For the political writings of James VI/I including *Triplici Nodo, The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* and *Basilicon Doron* see, Sommerville (ed.), *King James VI and I. Political Writings*.

¹⁴ Smuts, 'The making of *Rex Pacificus: James VI and I and the problem of peace in an age of religious war*', 381.

¹⁵ Matthaeus Tortus, [Robert Bellarmine], *Responsio ad librum inscriptum, Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus* ([St. Omer, English College], 1610), for a copy see BL 860.c.28 (2).

¹⁶ James VI/I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance: First Set Forth without a Name, and Now, Acknowledged by the Author, the Right High and Mightie Prince, James by the Grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.; Together with a Premonition of his Maieseties to All Most Mightie Monarches, Kings, Free Princes and States of Christendome* (London, Robert Barker, 1609), for a copy see BL 719.c.9.

¹⁷ Robert Bellarmine, *Apologia Roberti S.R.E. Cardinalis Bellarimini pro Responsione sua ad librum Iacobi Magnae Britanniae Regis, cuius titulus est, Triplici nodo triplex cuneus; in qua apologia refellitur Præfatio monitoria Regis eiusdem. Accessit seorsim eadem ipsa responsio, quæ sub nomine Matthaei Torti anno superiore prodierat* (Cologne, Stephanus Hemmerden and Ioannis Kinckij, 1610), for a copy see BL 860.f.15.

¹⁸ Marie-Claude Tucker, 'Barclay, William (1546-1608)'.

¹⁹ William Barclay, *De potestate Papæ: an & quantenus in reges & principes seculares ius & imperium habeat: Guil. Barclaii I.C. liber posthumus* ([London, Eliot's court press], 1609), for a copy see BL 847.h.12.

²⁰ Robert Bellarmine, *Tractatus de potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus, aduersus Gulielmum Barclaium ... ad exemplar Romanum impressus* (Cologne, Bernardi Gualtheri, 1611), for a copy see BL 1115.a.3.

²¹ SP 77/8 f^o 167r-167v, Edmondes to Salisbury, Brussels, 17 September 1606.

²² Le Roy, 'leys (Léonard)'.

²³ Leonard Lessius, *De Antichristo et eius præcursoribus disputatio apologetica gemina: qua refutatur Præfatio monitoria falso, vt creditur, adscripta Magnæ Britanniae Regi* (Antwerp, Plantin, 1611), for a copy see BL 1650/4.

²⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 3v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 16 January 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 21v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 March 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 110 v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 28 August 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 125r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 3 October 1611.

Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614)²⁵, unwillingly, became a key figure in the whole episode. Casaubon, a classical scholar and ecclesiastical historian, migrated to England in 1610 with the help of Benjamin Buwinckhausen (1568-1638), Sieur de Walmerode²⁶. According to Considine he was known as *a scholar with high international reputation* and received a warm welcome in England. His own point of view, stipulated in *De libertate ecclesiastica*²⁷ was close to that of king James. While in England he befriended two archbishops of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft (*bap.* 1544-1610) and George Abbot (1562-1633); Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), bishop of Ely (until 1618, afterwards of Winchester) and also involved in the controversy with his *Tortura Torti* (1609); and John Prideaux (1578-1650)²⁸. In 1610 he was requested to read and comment on Andrewes *Responsio ad apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini*²⁹ before it was published. Casaubon joined the controversy under his own name in 1611 publishing *Epistola ad Frontonem Ducaem*³⁰ against the French Jesuit Fronton du Duc in which he defended king James and the oath of allegiance. It was published by John Norton (1556/1557-1612)³¹, royal printer. According to Considine at least three replies were published in 1612 of which *Responsio ad epistolam Isaaci Casauboni*³² by Andreas Eudaemon-Joannes, a Jesuit controversialist, attacked Casaubon personally. In August 1612 Trumbull referred to another book, *In Is. Casauboni ad front. ducaem ... Epistolam stricturae liber prodromus*³³, written by Erycius Puteanus, professor of rhetoric at the Collegium Trilingue in Louvain³⁴. The book was dedicated to Remacle Roberti, commissary-general of the provisions of the army in the Archducal Netherlands. Puteanus justified this publication twofold. He joined the discussion first and foremost to clarify his own Christian beliefs. Furthermore he had been summoned by important men to make his contribution³⁵. Trumbull wrote that he

²⁵ Considine, 'Casaubon, Isaac (1559–1614)'; for the library of Casaubon see, Birrell, 'The Reconstruction of the Library of Isaac Casaubon'.

²⁶ HMCD, v, 465 (letter 981), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Stuttgart, 4 April 1616.

²⁷ Isaac Casaubon, *De libertate ecclesiastica liber singularis. Ad viros politicis, qui de controversia inter Paulum V. Pontificem Maximum & Rempublicam Venetam, edoceri cupiunt* (Paris, s.n., 1607), for a copy see Bodleian Library Oxford Vet. E2 f.146.

²⁸ Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, 'Bancroft, Richard (*bap.* 1544, *d.* 1610)'; McCullough, 'Andrewes, Lancelot (1555–1626)'; Hegarty, 'Prideaux, John (1578–1650)'; Lancelot Andrewes, *Tortura Torti: sive, ad Matthaei Torti librum Responsio, qui nuper editus contra Apologiam serenissimi potentissimique principis, Iacobi, Dei gratia, Magna Britanniae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Regis, pro ivramento fidelitatis* (London, Robert Barker, 1609) for a copy see BL 1007.f.15.

²⁹ Lancelot Andrewes, *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, quam nuper edidit contra Praefationem Monitoriam ... Iacobi ... Regis, etc.* (London, Robert Barker, 1610), for a copy see BL 860.l.12.

³⁰ Isaac Casaubon, *Ad Frontonem Ducaem S. J. theologum epistola; in qua de Apologia disseritur communi Jesuitarum nomine ant aliquot menses Lutetiae Parisiorum edita* (London, John Norton, 1611), for a copy see BL 477.a.13 (1).

³¹ Gadd, 'Norton, John (1556/7–1612)'.

³² Andreas Eudaemon-Joannes, *Responsio ad epistolam Isaaci Casauboni* (Cologne, s.n., 1612), for a copy see BL 860.b.17 (3).

³³ Erycius Puteanus, *In Is. Casauboni ad front. ducaem ... Epistolam stricturae liber prodromus* (Louvain, 1612); there were two editions in 1612, both published in Louvain but by different printers: J.C. Flavius and J. Hulzium, for copies see respectively BL 522.d.33 (3) and BL 4071.c.42.

³⁴ For more information see, besides the works mentioned also, Simar, *Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Ier, roi d'Angleterre: une episode des controverses politico-religieuses au XIIIe siecle.*

³⁵ Tournoy, *Puteanus, Casaubon and the Corona Regia*, 382.

thought it my duty to sende it unto yor matie, wth all speed, to be disposed of, as yor matie in yor great wisdom, & prudence shall thinke fiting, & convenyent. The subiect, & manner of his wryting, wch is in favor, and defencce of the Harpian Loyalites, will (in my poore opinyon) furnishe sufficient matter, for an answer, and confutation. And I will not be wanting to make dilligent enquiry, what advantage may bee taken at his condition, & carriage; as by my future dispatches, I hope to make it appeare. He is esteemed only to be a Rhetoritian, and somewhat versed in Humanitie; but wthall as he succeedeth Lipsius, in his Lecture at Louvayne, so doth he ymitate him, in his superstition, and farre exceedeth him in pryde, and arrogance. I will endeavor to guett some other of his woorks, and sende them to yor matie, or my l. of Canterbury, for yor mats service, supposing that yor mats continuall occupations in the weightie affaires of yor kingdomes, cannott affoord sufficient leisure, to peruse his ympertinencies, and foolish scriblings³⁶.

This dispatch appeared to be profetic as it almost anticipated the trouble *Corona Regia* would cause the English agent in Brussels from the end of 1615 onwards.

The first time Trumbull opposed a book at the court of the archdukes was in August 1613. It was written by Edward Weston (1565?-1635)³⁷ and entitled *Iuris Pontificii Sanctuarium*³⁸. In 1612 the government searched the house of the Gage family at Bentley in West-Sussex to look for Weston. This was not just because he was a seminary priest, but he had written manuscript attacking the enforcement of the oath of allegiance³⁹. Presumably it was this book that was published in the Southern Netherlands. In it Weston supported the position of Cardinal Bellarmine against the Benedictine Thomas Preston (alias Roger Widdrington) (1567-1647)⁴⁰. Trumbull had sent the book to London in May 1613 and assured king James that Weston did not appeal to the more moderate minds in the Archducal Netherlands. The censor had refused to give his allowance and approbation. Thanks to the Jesuits, however, it was printed at Douai without permission from the archducal authorities. Archbishop Abbot commented on the author. *We here well know how impure and unworthy a fellow this Weston is reputed among his own both overseas and here in England.* Abbot instructed Trumbull to learn as much as he could about Weston and his book. The English agent, during an audience in August 1613, stressed that such a publication was contrary to the laws and statutes as well as against the treaties between the Crown of England and the House of Burgundy. Trumbull delivered a copy of the book. The English agent described Weston as *altogether transported wth passion and ambition to sett discord, and warre among Christian Princes.* He further emphasized that the thesis defended by Weston, papal superiority over kings, was not only of consequence to James but also the sovereignty of the archdukes themselves. He described the reaction of archduke Albert as giving him a kind audience and assuring the English agent that he did not in any sort allow or tolerate *such fyery spiritts in his provinces.* He promised to investigate the matter and punish the offenders according to their faults. The book was sent to his Privy Council with instructions to investigate. Trumbull was sceptical about

³⁶ SP 77/10 f^o 213r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 13 August 1612.

³⁷ Milward, 'Weston, Edward (1565?-1635)'.

³⁸ Edward Weston, *Juris Pontificii sanctuarium, defensum ... contra R. Widdringtoni in Apologia et Responso apologetico impietatem* ([Douai], s.n., 1613), for a copy see BL 1020.h.12.

³⁹ Questier, 'What Happened to English Catholicism after the English Reformation', 36.

⁴⁰ Cramer, 'Preston, Roland (1567-1647)'.

the possible outcome because of the possible intervention of the papal nuncio and the Jesuits, *whose power is omnipotent in this region*. Investigations were made by the officers of the archdukes at the request of Trumbull against Jean Hingam and Pierre Auroy concerning the book of Weston between 30 August and 8 October 1613 (n.s.)⁴¹. Trumbull's presentiment proved to be correct as the book was republished in April 1615 by Pierre Borremans in Douai⁴².

That same year Trumbull sent George Abbot a book, *treatise unto Catesby*, written by T.S. Abbot identified T.S. as Thomas Stephenson (1552-1624)⁴³, an English Jesuit, who had been deported out of England in 1585. Abbot annotated the book before delivering it into the hands of the king and complemented Trumbull, *It was a good service to recover this book, as I shall signify to his Maty*. Meanwhile the archbishop promised to do all he could to intercept the book of Weston. He praised Trumbull for sending copies to Sir Thomas Edmondes in France and the French ambassador in Brussels to ensure *that it may receive the censure it deserves*⁴⁴.

Trumbull reported a new book in April 1614, *Anglorum Horror, haereticorum terror*, written by the Neapolitan Pietro Arlense, who had arrived in the Southern Netherlands that same month, and *some other evil affected English*. Trumbull hoped that the book would not be published as the confessor of infanta Isabella had a copy. In June 1614 Trumbull complained about the new book and renewed his plea against Weston.

Moreover, the English agent stressed with what liberty the Irish Franciscans in Louvain printed seditious books preaching rebellion. In June 1611 they had received permission to print a catechism in Irish written by they own Bonaventura Hossius⁴⁵. Trumbull petitioned Albert to refuse the license requested by the friars who wanted to print books in their monastery. Trumbull was backed by James and Winwood. He was instructed not to

desist to procure redress for that insolency and contumelious abuse, and require that not only for hereafter inhibition be made and that upon very severe penalty, but that all the copies of such books be called in and publicly burnt.

King James already informed the archduke's ambassador in London of the *unworthy proceedings* of the Irish friars in Louvain who printed seditious books in the Irish language. The only purpose of which could only be to stir open rebellion in Ireland. But the Irish Franciscan friars in Louvain had already received their licence in May 1614 to install a press in their convent and print books in Irish to be sent to Ireland and counter the Reformation⁴⁶. Irish books were printed in Louvain, despite protests in Brussels and

⁴¹ Archives du Royaume, Conseil Privé Espagnol, form now on CPE 1276/349, the documents concerning these investigations.

⁴² SP 77/10 f^o 290v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels 13 May 1613; HMCD, iv, 113-114, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 25 May 1614; SP 77/10 f^o 294v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 26 May 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 322r-322v, Trumbull to Rochester, Brussels, 25 August 1613; SP 77/10 f^o 341r, Trumbull to James IV/I, Brussels, 15 October 1613; HMCD, v, 205 (letter 430), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [endorsed April 1615].

⁴³ Rhodes, 'Stephenson, Thomas (1552-1624)'.

⁴⁴ HMCD, iv, 193-194, Abbot to Trumbull, Croydon, 9 September 1613.

⁴⁵ CPE 1276/300.

⁴⁶ CPE 1276/30.

London. Thymon reported to Trumbull at the end of 1616 that they had printed an octavo almost a finger thick. The bookbinder Jean Sassenus in Louvain had a great number to bind. When he was finished, the books would be sent to Ireland⁴⁷.

During this audience, Albert responded only in general terms and referred Trumbull to his Philippe de Prats to receive his answer⁴⁸. Trumbull prepared a petition in the second half of the year about books published in the countries of the archdukes. He sent it to James VI/I for approval before starting to negotiate. In September, October and November he requested that the petition would be returned and asked for further instructions. In November he added an extract of a treaty as proof that it was forbidden to print books in English in the Southern Low Countries⁴⁹. A lengthy remonstrance can be found in the State Papers under the year 1617. Most probably this remonstrance was written between 1613, because it mentions *Iuris Pontificii Sanctuarium*, and before the publication of *Corona Regia* in 1615, which is left unmentioned. First, Trumbull argued that the close proximity of England and the Archducal Netherlands had always furthered trade and cooperation. Several treaties were made between both countries from the times of Henry VII of England and Philip the Fair until the Treaty of London in 1604, which testified of that cooperation. Trumbull then gave an enumeration of treaties, ordinances and edicts. In 1582 it was prohibited to print English books in the Low Countries and Flemish books in England. By 1609 John Chandler, an English merchant in Antwerp, had already reported what he had heard from Richard Versteghan. The Jesuit in St. Omer only printed English books⁵⁰. Although the remonstrance had a large general aspect, Trumbull focussed on the work of Edward Weston and the printing of Irish books in the monastery of the Irish Franciscan friars in Louvain. After a chronological enumeration of treaties and ordinances Trumbull concluded that Weston was an English fugitive, a subject of the king of Great-Britain, *et que son livre est fameux et seditieux, qu'il ne porte aulcune visitation ou approbation du censeur, ny insertion du privilege ou sommaire d'icelle, ny nom ny surnom de l'Imprimeur ny lieu d'impression*⁵¹.

⁴⁷ HMCD, iv, 454, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 9 July [1614]; HMCD, vi, 67 (letter 1616), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [16 December 1616 endorsed].

⁴⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 42r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels 28 April 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 88v-89r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 30 June 1614; HMCD, iv, 443, Trumbull to Albert, Brussels, June 1614.

⁴⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 138v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 18 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 147r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 166r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 6 October 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 178v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 28 October 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 191v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 1614.

⁵⁰ HMCD, ii, 111, Chandler to Trumbull, Antwerp, 5 July 1609; for more information in general see also Blom, 'English and Irish books and convents in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: the link with the Low Countries'; for more information on English printing at St. Omer, see Walsh, 'The publishing policy of the English press at St. Omer, 1608-1759'; Newdigate, 'Notes on the seventeenth century printing press of the English college at St. Omers' and Schrickx, 'An Early Seventeenth Century Catalogue of Books from the English Jesuit Mission in Saint-Omer'.

⁵¹ SP 77/12 f^o 453r-457v, *Remonstrance de l'Agent de sa Mate de la Grande Bretagne aux Archiducs. Sur les abus et exces qui se commectent en ce pays au faict de l'Imprimerie en prejudice de Sa Mate*, [between 1613 and 1615].

Scurillous pamphlets

Besides the books concerning the controversy, others were also published which attacked people, and king James especially, personally. The Jesuits topped the list of malicious authors in the eyes of the English agent at Brussels. At the end of 1609 a 'pasquil' was seized at Danzig which attacked the British monarch and his defence of the oath of allegiance in scurrilous terms. It was entitled *Εξέτασις* [*Examinatio*] *epistolae, nomine Regis Magnae Britanniae ad omnes Christianos Monarchas, Principes et Ordines scriptae*⁵². It was written under the pseudonym of Bartholus Pacenius, I[uris] C[onsultus] Montensis and printed at Mons by Adam Gallus. In reality it was printed in Braunsberg by Jerzy Schönfels, which was discovered after comparing the typeface and the printer's devises. Patrick Gordon (died before 1657)⁵³, the English agent to Poland and Prussia, was aided by Andrew Aidie, a Scottish professor of philosophy to find the author of the libel. It was another English agent, George Montgomery, who reported to Salisbury that Robert Abercromby, a Jesuit, was the culprit. Gordon, however, was not that sure Abercromby was the author. His list of possible authors contained a Welsh Jesuit, Griffin Floyd, the Italian Jesuit superior at Braunsberg and a Scottish poet, Andrew Leech⁵⁴.

Reprinted in 1610 in Douai Trumbull sent Salisbury a copy to show him *that there is no end to the malice of our hypocritical Jesuits*. Trumbull, furthermore, informed him, that books were made ready for shipment to England and could be intercepted. He also protested at the court of the archdukes which, according to Murphy, was possibly successful as copies of the books are rare. A major diplomatic incident followed after the publication in 1615 in Krakow of *Alloquia Osiecensia* which incorporated large sections of the *Examinatio* comparing king James to Nero, Diocletian, Maximian, Julian the Apostate and the Arian emperor Constantius, and denouncing him as a matricide, usurper, bastard and perjurer. James VI/I sent John Dickenson (c. 1570-1635/1636)⁵⁵, resident agent in Düsseldorf on a special embassy to Warsaw in September 1615. Dickenson demanded of the Polish king, Sigismund III Wasa, the punishment of author and printer. He stressed that if the English king did not get satisfaction he would withdraw as a mediator in the upcoming negotiations between Poland and Sweden. The Polish chancellor simply replied that the Polish monarch did not have power over the subjects of the ecclesiastical estate, an argument also used by archduke Albert. According to the English agent, in a letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, the Polish king condemned the libel publicly and urged the author's ecclesiastical superiors to punish him and requested the same of the authorities of Krakow concerning the printer.

*This episode is a striking example of how far King James was prepared to go in using the long arm of law to defend his reputation. He was mainly concerned with exact retribution for what he regarded as a 'blasphemous' affront, but he may also have had national honour in mind*⁵⁶.

⁵² Bartholus Pacenius, *Εξέτασις Epistolæ, nomine Regis Magnæ Britanniae, scriptæ; quæ, præfationis monitoriæ loco, ipsius Apologiæ pro iuramēto fidelitatis, præfixa est, etc.* ([Braunsberg, Jerzy Schönfels], 1609), for a copy see BL 3936.bb.52.

⁵³ Stevenson, 'Gordon, Patrick, of Ruthven (fl. 1606–1649)'.

⁵⁴ Murphy, 'Robert Abercromby, S.J. (1536-1613) and the Baltic Counter-Reformation', 68-71.

⁵⁵ Alexander, 'Dickenson, John (c.1570–1635/6)'.

⁵⁶ Murphy, 'Robert Abercromby, S.J. (1536-1613) and the Baltic Counter-Reformation', 71-73.

That honour mattered to James VI/I became apparent at several instances. In the wake of the Gunpowder Plot Henry Jaye, a servant of Richard Verstegan, English printer in Antwerp, had spoken disrespectfully of the English king. According to Roger Marshall and Richard Pope he had said he hoped the king would hang. At the request of Edmond Jean Richardot questioned him. Henry Jaye confirmed all that had been said, but, much to the surprise of Edmond, he got off with a warning. The English ambassador did not leave it at that and interpellated Richardot. Richardot was pragmatical and told the English diplomat that it was impossible to punish everyone harshly if they made temperamental speeches. He assured Sir Thomas that the same would have been done if the outburst had concerned Albert. Furthermore he reminded Edmond that in England the same words were often used in respect with Philip III, a thing not altogether incomprehensible according to Edmond. Richardot promised to raise the matter with Albert. Edmond requested instructions from Salisbury, but the matter never came up again⁵⁷. The entire episode did not entail dire consequences for Henry Jaye, on the contrary. He settled as a printer in Malines and received several octroys to print books, e.g. *Les Coutumes de Malines* (12 November 1612) in Latin and Flemish, *Les Heures ou office de N.-D.* (11 January 1613) in English, a reprint of a *manuel de devotion* (19 October 1616) in English which had originally been printed in Rouen in 1614. In 1618 he printed *Rules of the Englishe Sodality ... in the Englishe colledge of the Society of Jesus in Lovaine*⁵⁸.

Other clues which illuminate the character of James were given by Winwood and Abbot. As to how king James responded to such books is made clear when secretary of state Winwood offered Trumbull some insightful advice at the end of July 1614:

Let me advise you, in your letters to me which are to be communicated to H.M. not to write of any disgraceful or contemptible speeches they use against him, for the knowledge of such reports are grievous unto his spirit, which is sensible and apprehensive of his honour: yet in private to me it is "behooveful"⁵⁹ for his service they should be known⁶⁰.

The comment of Abbot did not refer to books but to the British and Irish refugees in general. He advised Trumbull that informing their sovereign of the growth of these exiles was a good service, but that

it would be advisable not to comment to vigorously on these matters in your letters to the King, who is sufficiently disquieted by internal as wel as foreign affairs, and might react intemperately. And advise written quietly and without passion is better considered of then when it beginnes with perurbation, which argueth the zeale of the writer but remembreth not the person of the receiver⁶¹.

⁵⁷ SP 77/8 f^o 152r, *Affidasit of Roger Marshall and Ric. Pope against Henry, servant to Versteghen*, s.l., 4 August 1606; SP 77/8 f^o 154r, Edmond to Salisbury, Brussels, 6 August 1606.

⁵⁸ HMCD, vi, 417 (letter 909), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 16 May 1618 (n.s.); Rogers, 'Henry Jaye (15?-1643)', 98; a facsimile of the book can be found in the British Library, 1654/80.

⁵⁹ Advantageous.

⁶⁰ HMCD, iv, 475-476, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 29 July 1614.

⁶¹ HMCD, v, 457 (letter 964), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 29 March 1616.

Another defamatory book, written by Gaspar Schoppe or Scioppius (1576-1649) (under the pseudonym Holofernes Krigsoederus), against king James, had been published in Ingolstadt under the title *Holofernis Krigsoederi, Landspergensis, Bavari, Scholae Meitingensis Monarchae, Responsio ad Epistolam Isaaci Cazoboni, Regii in Anglia Archipaedagogi, pro viro Cl[aro] Caspare Sc., Patricio Romano ...*(1615). Abbot reported that Scioppius had been handing out pamphlets in Madrid⁶². Sir John Digby, James's ambassador in that city, plotted to have Scioppius's nose and ears cut off, but failed. Eventually a brother of Sir Everard Digby met the author and intended to cut off his nose, but only managed a cut in his face. The authorities in Madrid originally refused to protect him because he had abused the English king so vile. Others, however, did not think that a councillor of the emperor could be treated in such a way. The Inquisition sent a letter to the Spanish ambassador in London to complain. A letter from Francisco de Sandoval y Rojas, duke of Lerma and principal minister of Philip III, arrived in London stating that the first letter had been but a formality⁶³.

Enter Corona Regia

In October 1615 king James renewed his plea against books published in the Southern Netherlands by English refugees. William Trumbull had been on leave in England and returned to resume his duties in Brussels. Two books were mentioned in particular. Weston's *Iuris Pontificii Sanctuarium* of which lots of copies had been sent to the bourse of Frankfurt. A second book also came to the attention of king James, *Corona Regia*, of which the English agent had brought some copies to England. On 20 October 1615 Jean Thymon wrote Trumbull that, *At the last fair in Frankfort there was published a highly offensive small book entitled Corona Regia. It is a libel or a satire at the expense of the King of England.* King James asked archduke Albert to intervene and make sure that Trumbull would get all the assistance he required⁶⁴.

*Is. Casauboni Corona Regia. Id est, Panegyrici cuiusdam vere aurei, quel Iacobo I. Magnae Britanniae &c. Regi, Fidei defensori delinaerat*⁶⁵... was supposedly written by Isaac Casaubon and printed in London. *Corona Regia* falls into the same category as *Examinatio* and *Alloquia Osiecensia*. It described James's vices as virtues, called into question the his parentage and a swing was taken at the Anglican Church. In it the Church of England was compared to the Church of Rome. While the pope stood at the head of the Church of Rome, the Anglican Church also had a pope: the English monarchs. Since its foundation the heads had been Henry VIII, an adulterer, Edward VI, a child, Elizabeth I, a woman and was now headed by James *whose amiability and kindness passed all bounds of*

⁶² For the enmity between Scioppius and Abbot see, Schleiner, '“A Plott to Have His Nose and Eares Cutt off”: Schoppe as seen by the Archbishop of Canterbury', for further research see, Schleiner, 'Scioppius' Pen against the English King's Sword: The Political Function of Ambiguity and Anonymity in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature'.

⁶³ HMCD, iv, 380, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 20 April 1614.

⁶⁴ HMCD, v, 353 (letter 712), Thymon to Trumbull, Brussels, 20 October 1615 (n.s.); SP 77/11 f^o 399r-400r, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Royston, 27 October 1615.

⁶⁵ *Isaaci Casauboni Corona Regia, id est Panegyrici cuiusdam vere aurei, quem Iacobo I, Magnae Britanniae Regi, Fidei Defensori, delinearat, fragmenta, ab Euphormione inter schedas ΤΟΥ ΜΑΚΚΑΡΙΤΟΥ inventa, collecta, en in lucem edita.* For a copy see BL 1389.a.49 (2).

royal condescension. According to Philip *Corona Regia* was the most damning and damaging indictment of James that had seen the light of day⁶⁶.

Both the name of the author and the place where it was printed were false, Casaubon was dead by that time. From 1615 onwards *Corona Regia* would demand the most extraordinary devotion of William Trumbull. The English agent first had to identify author and printer and subsequently to sue them for exemplary punishment. There were several candidates as author of the pamphlet: Gaspar Scioppius, John Barclay, Erycius Puteanus. That Gaspar Scioppius was a likely suspect is not hard to imagine, taking his history into account. Scioppius's name was mentioned in a letter of Jean Thymon who had seen the book at the fair in Frankfurt. Sir John Digby, ambassador in Madrid, was convinced that Scioppius was the culprit⁶⁷. John Barclay (1582-1621)⁶⁸ had lived at court and worked for James VI/I until 1615. He had done a variety of literary tasks. In 1615, however, he left England for the papal court, citing reasons of conscience. Christian Remonde, the glove maker of the archdukes, reported to Trumbull that Barclay was a possible candidate for the authorship. Barclay, in Rome in August-September 1616 neither denied nor affirmed this, according Sir Henry Wotton, Trumbull's counterpart in Venice. Abbot on the other hand was convinced that, whoever the author was, the substance for the book came from Barclay. Winwood also had information from a young man born in Antwerp who was in Venice in 1617 that *Corona Regia* was made on *pieces rapportées* from Barclay and other English Jesuits and digested by Puteanus⁶⁹. Erycius Puteanus (1574-1646), professor at the University of Louvain, was already known as he had written against Isaac Casaubon. Puteanus, much to his own dislike, would become the focal point in Trumbull's investigation. The most likely printers were Hieronymus Verdussius of Antwerp, Johannes Christophorus Flavius, Gerard Rivius and Philippus Dormalius of Louvain. Verdussius was put forward by Abbot in February 1616⁷⁰. Flavius, on the other hand, had been able to set up a printing press in Louvain in 1611 thanks to the intercession of Puteanus, subsequently Flavius was virtually a personal printer of Puteanus⁷¹.

Trumbull's hunt to discover the identity of author and printer of *Corona Regia*

Returning to Brussels in October 1615 Trumbull did not waste any time and travelled to Douai and Tournai, but was unable to uncover any information. Back in Brussels he deliberated with the French ambassador, Gilbert marquis de Preaux. De Preaux asserted that it had been printed in Louvain and possibly had been written there. He was equally sure that a man called Rose, originally put forward by Trumbull, was not skilled enough

⁶⁶ Philip, *Dragon's teeth*, 14-15.

⁶⁷ HMCD, v, 353 (letter 712), Thymon to Trumbull, Brussels, 20 October [1615] (n.s.); HMCD, v, 411 (letter 851), Digby to Trumbull, Madrid, 18/28 January 1616.

⁶⁸ Royan, 'Barclay, John (1582-1621)'.

⁶⁹ HMCD, v, 356-357 (letter 721), Remonde to Trumbull, Brussels, 28 October 1615 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 422, Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 February 1616; HMCD, v, 531 (letter 1124), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 17 June 1616; HMCD, v, 588 (letter 1258), Wotton to Trumbull, Venice, 9 September 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 2111 (letter 472), Abbot to Trumbull, 26 June 1617; HMCD, vi, 285 (letter 610), Winwood to Trumbull, Windsor, 14 September 1617.

⁷⁰ HMCD, v, 421-422 (letter 874), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 February 1616.

⁷¹ Tournoy, 'Puteanus, Casaubon and the *Corona Regia*', 385-386.

to write such a satire and moreover did not have the information at his disposal necessary to write it. De Preaux promised to assist his English counterpart, but was sceptical of the aid Trumbull could expect from the archducal authorities. By the end of November 1615, Trumbull had been unable to obtain a copy of *Corona Regia* other than those that he had brought with him to England⁷². He had asked Guillaume de Maulde to make enquiries in Tournai. Boucher had a copy, according to the principal bookseller there, but he refused to contact Boucher. De Maulde confessed, *I do not remember having read such a mischievous book*. De Maulde asked another bookseller to make enquiries in Douai and if possible to obtain a copy. The English merchant John Chandler was equally unable to acquire a copy. He thought that *there were no more dispersed in these parts then onely those that came by hasard unto the hands of Monsieur Remond the Gauntier*. Chandler had first seen the book two months beforehand. He accompanied Remonde from Antwerp to Brussels and

came to the sight and reading of one of the said books which a Jesuite of this country, having then in his hands, offered mee to read over, who seemed to bee much in love both with the matter and smoothe stile of the author.

Arriving in Brussels the English merchant made enquires about the identity of the author. Someone dependant of the *Blacke robes* told Chandler that it was conceived by Barclay, son of William Barclay. The English merchant did not believe this because he knew of the antipathy that existed between Barclay and the Jesuits⁷³.

By 7 December Trumbull had been able to obtain two copies. Both missed folio 91 and the last lines on folio 90 were blotted out as in those copies that Trumbull had brought to England earlier that year. However, at the end of one of the books there was an addition. Trumbull left it to the wisdom of Winwood to devise what this meant. The English agent nevertheless offered two explanations, *to disguise and coullor the printing of that wicked lybell in these parts, or to shewe that it hath ben made and printed in France as a recrimination and answere to his Majesties booke against the Cardinal du Perron*. Winwood instructed Trumbull to find as many copies as possible. Benjamin Buwinckhausen assured Trumbull he would look out for it and in the mean time sent another book, unidentified, that had been printed and was highly offensive to the English king⁷⁴.

Trumbull informed the secretary of state of the French ambassador's conviction *Corona Regia* had been printed in Louvain, others however insisted that it had been published in Paris. As the Jesuits had presses in cities as Cologne, Liège, Lille, St. Omer, Arras and Cambrai it could have been in any of those places. Trumbull was *now employing secret means to find out wheter it was printed in these provinces or elsewhere*. The common opinion was that John Barclay had composed the book and printed it in Paris. Trumbull had interrogated Remonde with permission of the archduke⁷⁵.

Thymon reported that he had used the visit of De Font to discover the true author and the city where the libel was printed. *But these are matters to be imparted to you by word of mouth rather then by the pen*. The first time Puteanus was considered to be the author

⁷² SP 77/10 f^o 406r-406v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 29 November 1615.

⁷³ HMCD, v, 374-375 (letter 775), Chandler to Trumbull, [Antwerp], 15 December 1615 (n.s.).

⁷⁴ HMCD, v, 405 (letter 842), Buwinckhausen, to Trumbull, Hagh, 11/21 January 1616.

⁷⁵ HMCD, v, 377 (letter 778), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 December 1615.

was in December⁷⁶. In a following dispatch Trumbull detailed that it had been written by Puteanus and that the French ambassador concurred with that opinion. It had been printed in Louvain but the English agent was not sure yet by whom. He considered three possibilities: Rivius, Dormalius and Flavius. Trumbull brought in a student to find out who had done it. If this plan failed Trumbull intended to travel to Antwerp⁷⁷. Trumbull received a letter from Louvain of which he sent a copy to London. The author of the letter had not been able to obtain a copy and a Mr. Vanderhaer's efforts were also unsuccessful⁷⁸.

To discover the identity of the printer and to collect evidence Trumbull, advised by some trustworthy friends, travelled to Antwerp in January 1616 to see if he could learn who the printer was and to establish the identity of the author beyond doubt. That it was printed in the Archducal Netherlands was evident to Trumbull as a lot of copies had been seen in Brussels and Louvain, about five in Antwerp and one in Tournai. None were found, as far as Trumbull knew, in Cologne, Liège, Ingolstadt or Frankfurt, cities where Trumbull had given order to make enquiries. For Trumbull at that time it was evident that Puteanus had written it, Flavius had printed it and Remacle Roberti, the commissary-general of the victuals, had revealed it⁷⁹. In a lengthy dispatch at the end of January Trumbull reported what he had done in that month concerning the *defamous libell*. Trumbull remained in Antwerp for a fortnight.

First he contacted *some of the moste discreete, & best affected English marchants* to help him find Protestant printers and stationers. They produced Abraham Verhoeven⁸⁰, who held correspondence with the Republic and had travelled through France, Italy and the empire. Trumbull met Verhoeven twice. During the first meeting he told the English agent that in Antwerp there were only two founders of letters, of which Gerrard was the most important one. At their second encounter Trumbull showed him *Corona Regia*. Verhoeven was convinced that the letter had been made in France but the book itself had been printed in the Southern Low Countries within near Antwerp. Trumbull promised him a reward for information on the printer, one crown for each copy and *honest consideracion* for his expenses. Although Verhoeven agreed to assist Trumbull he undertook nothing.

Trumbull then turned to six discreet Protestant Netherlanders. He wanted them to round up their co-religionists in Antwerp who were involved in the book business. This consultation round did not yield further information. They agreed, as Verhoeven already had stipulated, that it had been printed in the Southern Netherlands. They, however, were unable to determine the city or the printer because the letter, which was indeed French, was used by different printers throughout the Archducal Netherlands. Some thought it was printed in Louvain, others in Douai. Trumbull sent a friend with a copy of *Corona Regia* to all important stationers shops in Antwerp. The English agent wanted to

⁷⁶ HMCD, v, 389 (letter 811), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [26 December 1615 endorsed].

⁷⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 410r-410v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14 December 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 414r-414v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 December 1615.

⁷⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 4r, Trumbull to Winwood, Antwerp, 4 January 1616 SP 77/12 f^o 6r, *Copie d'une lettre escrite a louvayn le 9 de Janvier 1616, sto. no.*

⁷⁹ HMCD, v, 405-406 (letter 843), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Antwerp, 11/21 January 1616.

⁸⁰ Vander Linden, 'Verhoeven (Abraham)'.

see if one of them would talk in exchange for money. Even this ploy failed. Trumbull could think of two reasons,

either throug a prohibicion, made by the Archds. upon Madme de Boischots speeches to the Infanta, they durst not expose the book to sale; or through their naturall inclynacion, wch detayneth them from accusing one another, for feare of incurring a note of infamy, (as all Informers doe, who are accompted here, as badd as traytors).

The Spanish Anne-Marie de Camudio, wife of Ferdinand de Boischot had already figured in the correspondence between London and Brussels. When Ferdinand de Boischot received permission to return in 1614, his wife first took her leave in June 1615. According to Willaert it was customary for an ambassador taking his leave to ask for the release of some Catholic priests which would travel with him to the Continent⁸¹. De Camudio requested Queen Anne, and later king James, for the release of some priests at Wisbitch. Such a request had been refused to the French ambassador, but the intervention of Anne would presumably yield a better result. In July king James consented on condition that the priests promised not to return to England. This they refused, *his Matie in his wisdome hath thought it convenient to hold them where they are*, wrote Winwood. If de Boischot's wife made an issue of this, and Winwood was sure she would do just that, Trumbull knew what to respond, *for I never mett a more violent woaman*, the secretary finished. In October 1615 Ferdinand de Boischot renewed the plea of his wife with Queen Anne. She promised to intervene with her husband. James approved and asked the diplomat for names. Ferdinand de Boischot reported to Albert that his request had been succesful and five priests had been set free. In March 1616 Trumbull got a letter from captain Henry Cheyney informing him of a letter he had received from his cousin, Kempe. Kempe was a Benedictine monk who had been imprisoned at Wisbitch and was released thanks to Ferdinand de Boischot. In May 1616 de Camudio again pleaded for the release of Catholic clergymen. In her opinion, she had done king James all good offices in the matter of *Corona Regia*, as she had been the first who informed the infanta of the libel⁸².

Lack of success brought Trumbull back to Brussels where he received Winwood's letters of 3 and 20 January. King James had compared *Corona Regia* with the book that had been written against Casaubon, Puteanus's *Stricturae*, and found similarities in stile. This was proof enough to identify Puteanus as the author. Winwood informed the English agent that *his mats expresse will is, you shall strongly employ your very best endeavors, without sparing cost nor paines namely there you make a iorney to Louvain for that purpose*. If Trumbull had uncovered the whole truth he had to submit it to archduke Albert. He was

⁸¹ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', viii, 83.

⁸² Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', viii, 83-84; SP 77/11 f^o 357r, draft, [Winwood] to Trumbull, Greenwich, 21 June 1615; HMCD, v, 254 (letter 514), Winwood to Trumbull, Greenwich, 21 June 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 364v-365r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Ditton Park, 22 July 1615; HMCD, v, 286 (letter 585), Winwood to Trumbull, Ditton Park, 22 July 1615; HMCD, v, 438 (letter 915), Cheyney to Trumbull, Antwerp, 14 March 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 96r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9/19 May 1616; PEA, reg. 365, f^o 272r, 273v, 274r, de Boischot to Albert, [London], 30 October 1615 (n.s.); PEA reg. 365, f^o 380r, de Boischot to Albert, [London], 18 November 1615 (n.s.); PEA reg. 365, f^o 384v, de Boischot tot Albert, [London], 26 November 1615 (n.s.).

to request Albert that if the author was one of his subjects and within his jurisdiction he would get *exemplarie punishment*. Trumbull then had to divulge his research and the name of Puteanus and demand that justice be done. Further instructions were given two weeks later⁸³.

While Puteanus's connection to the infamous libel was deducted from comparing passages between the *Stricturae* and *Corona Regia*, Flavius's involvement became clear by comparing the letters that were used. In 1612 Flavius printed *Den Nieuwe Morghen wecker*⁸⁴, which had the same characters as *Corona Regia*. Trumbull sent a copy of the book and requested that John Bill, the James's printer, would compare *Corona Regia* with *Tractatus Novi*, possibly referring to *Tractatus Nove Anatome* by Puteanus and which had been printed on the presses of Flavius. If Winwood knew of other discreet and trustworthy stationers and printers they also could give their opinion. Trumbull then wanted that their opinions would be sent to Brussels, *under the hand of a pub. Notary* if Winwood deemed it necessary. Trumbull indicated the passages that deserved particular attention. According to George Abbot James, Winwood and the bishop of Bath were convinced that *Corona Regia* had been printed by John Christopher Flavius in Louvain. Abbot himself launched a little investigation of his own and went to a stationer and *some compositors for the presse* to compare the letters of a book published by Flavius and *Corona Regia*. Their answer was that *Corona Regia*, if the argument was solely based on the letters, could have been printed in London, Paris, Leiden as well as in Louvain. The letters for printing were made at Cologne, Antwerp or Paris,

they are bought thence and carryed into severall countries, so that you shall have printing upon one and the same sorte of letters in specie to bee out of severall shoppes in the same citty, and out of severall houses in severall countries.

Abbot's men identified the printer of *Corona Regia* as Hieronymus Verdussius of Antwerp. They substantiated their claim with two reasons. Firstly, Verdussius had published several works with exactly the same letters. Secondly, they argued that any great house of reputation had their own capital letters cut out in wood, *and adorned with flowers an knotts*. Comparing the P with which the Epistle of Euphormio in *Corona Regia* started with that of *Opus Chronographicum*⁸⁵, published in 1611 by Verdussius, no difference could be seen. Abbot had informed James of this, but it never seems to have

⁸³ SP 77/12 f^o 11r-13v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1616.

⁸⁴ Thomas Saily, *Den nieuwen morghen-wecker, wijsende de natuere, voort-ganck, vruchten, remedien, der ketterij; te voor-schyn ghebrocht, tot het welvaert der gheunieerde, ende andere Nederlandsche Provincien* (Louvain, J.C. Flavius, 1614). For a copy see Maurits Sabbebibliotheek Louvain, GBIB 53 C 4. This was a reply to Willem Baudartius *Morghen-wecker der vrye Nederlantsche Provincien, ofte, een cort verhael van de bloedighe vervolghinghen ende wreetheden door de Spanjaerden ende haere adherenten in de Nederlanden, gheduerende dese veertich-jarighe troublen ende oorloghen, begaen aen vele steden, ende ettelijcke duysent particuliere personen ...* (Danswick 1610) which was widely popular and republished several times.

⁸⁵ Peter Opmeer (ed.), *Opus chronographicum orbis universi a mundi exordio usque ad annum M.DC.XI., continens historiam, icones, et elogia, summorum pontificum imperatorum, regum, ac virorum illustrium, in duos tomos divisum / prior auctore Petro Opmeero ... a condito orbe ad suam usque aetatem bono publico a Petro fil. evulgatus, posterior auctore Laurentio Beyerlinck* (Antwerp, Hieronymus Verdussius, 1611), for a copy see University Library of Louvain BTAB CaaC26.

been taken up as the focus was on Flavius. Indeed, Henry Taylor had confessed that he had assisted Flavius in printing the libel⁸⁶.

Trumbull's dealings with the archdukes and their Privy Council

As instructed Trumbull launched a complaint with the archduke. The English agent requested that one of the ministers of the archduke would receive a commission *for the perfecting of my wished discovery*. Albert assured Trumbull that at the moment he received news of the libel he forbade it in his countries. The English agent counted that *a poore plaster for so great a wounde. Exemplar punishment inflicted upon the offenders*, whoever they were, was the only possible answer which would be acceptable to king James. Trumbull did not disclose the names of the suspects when Albert requested who the culprits were, only stating that they were his subjects. As to why he did not divulge the names *for feare of blamichinge the game*, until the commissioners had looked into the matter. In the mean time Trumbull wanted to collect further evidence and avoid that they would be warned, *beeing great in courte, & wth the Jesuitts*. Trumbull delivered the archduke a written memorial substantiating his requests⁸⁷. Albert, of course, would not handle the matter personally and instructed the agent of king James to turn to Maes, the president of the Privy Council. Guillaume de Steenhuyts (1558-1638)⁸⁸, was one of the commissioners appointed to assist Trumbull to discover the truth⁸⁹. According to the papal nuncio Bentivoglio, in February 1616, this was a minute enquiry, which yielded no results⁹⁰. Trumbull already had a list of men, amongst whom Remonde but also some councillors, who had the libel. Trumbull again turned to Maes who assured Trumbull that a decision was soon to be expected what would be done⁹¹. The de Steenhuyts commission together with Trumbull interrogated people who had seen the book. Trumbull requested Albert permission to be able to attend these examinations. Despite all professions of wishing the matter to be concluded quickly and satisfactorily Trumbull ended writing *I fynde them here to proceed with much coldness; and feare when all is donne, they will but slight this business*⁹².

Trumbull gave Winwood information about Christian Remonde from whom Trumbull brought the three copies to England. Trumbull wanted to know how he got the copies in his possession. According to Remonde they were thrown one morning in the entry of his house, which Remonde already had disclosed in a letter a few months beforehand⁹³. *Were we in England, I suppose such a frivolous answer would not be taken for current paymt. but here wee must be content, wth anything, when there is question of wronging his matie; his subiects; or rayling against their Relligion*, Trumbull stated in his length dispatch at the end of January.

⁸⁶ HMCD, v, 421-422 (letter 874), Abbot to Trumbull, Lambeth, 15 February 1615.

⁸⁷ CPE, 1277/224, This number contains several pieces relating to *Corona regia* dated between February and October 1616, e.g. Trumbull to Albert, Brussels, 5 February 1616.

⁸⁸ Bril, 'Steenhuys (Guillaume de), 756-758.

⁸⁹ CPE, 1277/224, 8 February 1616 (n.s.?).

⁹⁰ Simar, 'Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Ier, roi d'Angleterre', 74.

⁹¹ SP 77/12 f^o 11r-13v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 17r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 January 1616.

⁹² SP 77/12 f^o 21r-21v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 15 February 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 23r-23v, *Report to Archdukes on Corona Regia*, 19 February 1616.

⁹³ HMCD, v, 357-357 (letter 721), Remonde to Trumbull, Brussels, 28 October 1615 (n.s.).

Instructions from the court at Newmarket followed swiftly. King James let Trumbull know that *there was noe cause that you should bee so scrupulous, playnely to charge Puteanus to bee the Author of this infamous Libell, whet as it is more cleare then the sunn shine, that by him it was compiled, and printed by Flavius*. If it became clear that the commission appointed in Brussels did not mention Puteanus then Trumbull explicitly instructed to return to archduke Albert and accuse the Louvain professor point-blank and demand that justice be done. Winwood reiterated the arguments against Puteanus: similarities of stile between *Corona Regia* and the *Stricturae*, same lettering of *Corona Regia* and *Tractatus Nove*. If these arguments did not carry enough weight, James had reason enough to complain of Puteanus's *Stricturae*, a point which was repeated in June following. Winwood finally assured Trumbull that the comparison requested by the English agent would take place once the court had returned to London. Trumbull would receive the judgement of one of the most able and experienced printers in an authenticated attestation in Latin by a public notary⁹⁴.

Trumbull had a further audience with the archduke on 22 February, in which Albert promised to do whatever was necessary to procure satisfaction for king James. The archduke, however, did not elaborate on what he intended to do. Trumbull attributed this to the power of the Spaniards and the clergy. The English agent was convinced of the sincerity of the archdukes themselves, but *they wante of strength or zeale to punishe the offenders*. De Preaux concurred. Despite all their demonstrations to have justice done for foreigners, nothing ever came of it. Albert requested Trumbull to turn to president Maes to receive further information. Throughout the correspondence the English agent remained doubtful of the success he would achieve in the end. A month later Trumbull wrote that he would be glad if James VI/I and his ministers would be fully informed and persuaded of the truth,

wch is that they make faire wether, and temporeize wth us only to gayne tyme, to serve their owne tournes: and lyke a Cancker, (by their perfidious instruments the Jesuitts, Seminaryes, fugitives, and Rebbells, of or owne nation, who are mainteyned; and dayly encrease in these parts, to an excessive, & fearfull number) doe eate into bowells of our Countrey; and travell incessantly to undermyne the very foundacions of our State, and Relligion⁹⁵.

Guillaume de Steenhuyts informed Trumbull that Albert had decided on 10 March (n.s.) that de Steenhuyts should go to Louvain to interrogate the witnesses Trumbull proposed. As he could not leave immediately he deferred his departure for a short while⁹⁶. They arrived in Louvain on 4 March, armed with letters from the archduke to the rector and the officers of the university and the magistrates of Louvain. Trumbull feared *all wilbe little enough, seeinge the inhabitants there, are mutinnuous, and supersticious people; respectinge more the Popes aucthority; then the power of their owne Princes*. The English agent had insisted that de Steenhuyts would be sent to Louvain personally, but conceded that letters would be written to other cities like Tournai, Douai, Lille and St. Omer to

⁹⁴ HMCD, v, 420 (letter 872), Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 10 February 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 19r-19v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 10 February 1616; HMCD, v, 524 (letter 1106), Winwood to Trumbull, Greenwich, 5 June 1616.

⁹⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 38r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616.

⁹⁶ HMCD, v, 434 (letter 905), De Steenhuyts to Trumbull, 11 March 1616 (n.s.).

question those men Trumbull suggested. Trumbull, nevertheless, planned to travel to Douai as is evident from a letter from Jean Thymon. Thymon advised him to get himself a letter to the rector and the attorney-general of the town, to make enquiries concerning Weston's book. The interrogatories could be modelled on those used in Louvain, the advocate added⁹⁷. Finally, there was also some official progress in March 1616. The attorney-general went in person to some bookshops to prohibit the sale of *Corona Regia*⁹⁸.

All evidence against Puteanus and Flavius was circumstantial: style, characters, etc. Trumbull acquired a confession of Henry Taylor. In exchange for money and a reward an unnamed English printer led Trumbull to Taylor the day he went to Louvain with de Steenhuis. Taylor wanted several things in return for his confession: a competent reward, an act by Trumbull for a royal pardon and agent's protection against the Jesuits. Trumbull, who knew that Taylor would be a key-witness, offered him £ 20 and the act. Henry Taylor was a poor man who had to support his wife and children, Trumbull wrote. Besides English he only knew some Dutch, which he learnt when he came to the Netherlands. He had learnt his trade as an apprentice in London of which city he was now a freeman. He lived in Scotland and printed James's *Basilicon Doron* in eight or ten copies. *Basilicon Doron* contained James's instructions to his son, prince Henry. It was printed in Edinburgh in 1599 and only seven copies were made at that time. James gave him £ 8 for this work besides paying for the expenses. Taylor confessed that in July 1615 Flavius printed *Corona Regia*. As he did not know any Latin and was ignorant what was being printed he helped the Louvain printer in the production of 400 copies. While printing *Corona Regia* a canon of a meane stature, with a redd bearde, of a sanguine complexion; and was in his mid forties, visited the printing shop daily. Once the copies had been finished he had taken them with him. Taylor believed, but was not completely sure, that Puteanus was the author. If he did not write it, he surely corrected it. Henry Taylor was ready to make a full confession to the archducal commissioners if Trumbull could safeguard him from the displeasure of king James and the repression of the Jesuits. Furthermore he would do what he could to find out the names of the author and the canon. Trumbull informed Winwood that the canon was one of three possible persons who were good friends of Puteanus: *Adrianus Backs*, praeses of the Collegium Trilingue; *Henricus Bemdenus*, curator of *Hilurenbeck* on the countryside of Brabant and *Johannes Sestiche*, praeses of the college of St. Donatius in Louvain. On Thursday 7 March Taylor had seen the canon walking in Louvain, most probably on his way to the English Jesuits or Puteanus. Taylor told Trumbull he did not dare follow him and added that he was expected in Malines that same morning.

According to Taylor there was another man helping Flavius at that time, Hans, of whom he did not know the last name. Flavius and Hans had had an argument because Flavius refused to pay him. Hans went to the rector of the University, according to Trumbull in *Auguste, or Harveste laste 1615*. At the same time the parish priest of St. Peters in Louvain informed the rector of a book that was being printed against king James without licence and approbation, which violated the laws of the country. Flavius was summoned and assured that he had a licence but refused to reveal who had given it. According to Trumbull this evidently implied the Jesuits who apparently stood above and

⁹⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 24r-24v, 25v-27r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616; HMCD, v, 471-472 (letter 997), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [10 April 1616 endorsed].

⁹⁸ HMCD, v, 450 (letter 944) Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [20 March 1616 endorsed].

beyond the law. Trumbull was able to identify the second man which Taylor mentioned: Hans Van Once. Several names for this man can be found John Henricks Van Once, was used more frequently. Born in Antwerp he had been employed by several people. In Louvain he worked for Flavius and in Brussels for Roger Velpius. His whereabouts in early 1616 were unknown but Trumbull thought he could be found in Antwerp or Douai. The archduke issued orders to find Flavius and Van Once⁹⁹.

The English Jesuits did not waste time when rumour reached their ears that Taylor confessed to the English agent. They had already intimidated him. He was sent for by an English Jesuit in Malines. He was forbidden to tell anything concerning *Corona Regia* and was ordered to burn any evidence of the prints and the corrections. If he refused to do that, he would be banished from the Archducal Netherlands. He burnt the books at the start of March. An English gentlewoman residing in Louvain had offered him money for one of the proofs. According to Trumbull this was a test proposed by Lady Lovell or Lady Crosse, *who are their* [English Jesuits] *creatyures, and wholly devoted to their Society*¹⁰⁰. Taylor was interrogated under oath by the commissioners of the archdukes and made a full confession.

Trumbull provided de Steenuys commission lists of names of witnesses he wanted to see interrogated. Two lists have been dated c. 11 January in HMCD, a third list has been catalogued in the State Papers under March 1616. The first list contains government officials such as president Maes, audiencier Verreycken¹⁰¹ and registrar Kinschot; British refugees such as Tobie Mathew, George Gage, Stoner, Sir Thomas Leedes and Sir Ralph Babthorp; clergymen, such as the abbot of Vlierbeek and the abbot of Park; British clergymen such as the head of the Irish Franciscans in Louvain and English Jesuits in Brussels. The second list only mentioned Remacle Roberti, his oldest son and his son-in-law; and the secretary of the count of Emden, Maximilian Plouvier, an intimate friend of Puteanus¹⁰². Jean Libigny, secretary to the Council of the prince of Brandenburg, informed Trumbull in February 1616 that he would see what he could do concerning the business of the libel. He had written to Mainz, the Jesuits at Wesel, Embrich, etc. He also knew that James VI/I had sent *interrogatories* to The Hague to be used for the enquiries at Emden¹⁰³. In addition, the English agent also offered de Steenuys different lists with questions: 27 for Remacle Roberti, his oldest son, his son in law and Plouvier, eleven for Erycius Puteanus, etc., seven for Christian Remonde, nine for Maes, Verreycken, etc., ten for Flavius and ten for Rivius, Dormalius, Zangiras, Hans Wickmans and the servants of Flavius¹⁰⁴.

The third list mentions names of possible witnesses in Brussels, Louvain, Antwerp, Lille, Tournai, Douai and St. Omer. Trumbull indicated with asterisks those who possessed or had read *Corona Regia*, which amounted to 37 individuals from, Charles

⁹⁹ CPE 1277, 14 April 1616 (n.s.); BL Add. MS 72387 f^o 119r, copy, *Petition for the arrest of C. Flavius for printing Isaaci Casauboni Corona Regia to Southern Provinces*.

¹⁰⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 55r-57v, *Confessions drawn from Henry Taylor, at severall tymes; in the presence of W. Trumbull his Maties Agent, his servant John Wolley and another witsnesse: but not soubsigned by the said Taylor*.

¹⁰¹ Dony, 'Verreycken (Louis)'.

¹⁰² Tournoy, *Puteanus, Casaubon and the Corona Regia*, 383

¹⁰³ HMCD, v, 426 (letter 882), Libigny to Trumbull, [19?] February 1616

¹⁰⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 61r-66r, *Interrogatories*, [March 1616].

Bonaventure de Longueval (d. 1621), count of Bucquoy over Dr. Caesar Clement¹⁰⁵, *vicaire general* of the army to professors of Louvain, e.g. Cornelius Jansenius, the future bishop of Ypres. Those without an asterisk, Trumbull added, were *persons of note, and quality; and moste of them to be novellists; and curious of newe bookes*. They were supposed to have seen or heard of the libel. Trumbull concluded that fifteen or sixteen of the persons mentioned in Brussels had already been examined¹⁰⁶. Thymon advised Trumbull what he should reply if doctors in theology or other ecclesiastical persons refused to answer questions claiming that they did not fall under secular jurisdiction. As members of the university they were subject to the decrees of the archdukes. Furthermore this was a matter of state in which exemption or ordinary immunity did not apply. If it were possible the task of examination should be given to the rector who could appoint a replacement. If Trumbull encountered refusal then he was to send two attorneys and three or four witnesses to protest,

*and to declare that it was proof enough that they were attempting indirectly to obstruct the punishment deserved by the author and printer (already known) of the infamous book Corona Regia in accordance with written law*¹⁰⁷.

The archducal commissioners, still in Louvain with Trumbull after the confession of Henry Taylor, interrogated others: the rector of the university, the burgomaster, Monsr. De Sanvietores, the wife of Flavius, John Thorys and others. Flavius, according his wife, had left for Cologne three weeks earlier because he was unable to pay his many debts in Louvain. Trumbull, however, had reports that the printer had been sighted in Louvain the previous week which led him to the conclusion that Flavius had gone into hiding presumably in the house of Puteanus or in a monastery (of the Jesuits). Trumbull insisted that besides the lodgings of Flavius also those of Puteanus would be searched. This was refused because it was against the privileges of the university, unless Puteanus had been accused by two witnesses. For Trumbull it now became imperative to find Taylor's Hans, John Henricks Van Once. He intended to travel to Antwerp to find his second key-witness. If this did not succeed, the English agent would travel to Douai, but he feared that all his attempts would be thwarted by the Jesuits¹⁰⁸. Trumbull's trip to Antwerp was not entirely useless. The English agent did uncover some information about the man, however. He had been raised by John Van Once, a merchant with a good reputation. As an apprentice he worked for Anthoine Balloe, a printer who lived near the cathedral. Since that time he had been employed by Trognesium, a printer in Antwerp; Momarte, a printer in Brussels and finally Flavius in Louvain. According to Trumbull's information it was possibly that Van Once could be found in Douai. Trumbull would use Taylor to look for Van Once, as will be seen further on¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁵ For more information see, Hoppe, 'Dr. Caesar Clement, chaplain to Archduke Albert'.

¹⁰⁶ HMCD, v, 406-407 (letter 844), *Corona Regia*, s.l., [c. 11 January 1616]; HMCD, v, 407 (letter 845), *Corona Regia*, s.l., [c. 11 January 1616]; SP 77/12 f^o 58r-59v, *Names of persons to be examined upon the Intergatories*, [March 1616].

¹⁰⁷ HMCD, v, 421 (letter 873), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [10 February 1616 endorsed].

¹⁰⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 32r-34r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13 March 1616.

¹⁰⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 38r-38v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616; HMCD, v, 475 (letter 1001), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13/23 April 1616.

New instructions reached Trumbull after he had returned from Antwerp. Trumbull did not have to bother any more to go to Antwerp or Douai; look for Flavius's second workman or anyone else for that matter. The only course Trumbull now had to take was to go to the archduke Albert and charge Puteanus as the author of *Corona Regia* and Flavius as the printer. As both were his subjects and none were ecclesiasticals they belonged to his jurisdiction. King James did not expect anything more from Albert and Isabella than from any other allies in similar circumstances. Trumbull was to add that if Englishmen were culpable of such a crime,

noe mynister of his should have bin forced as yow have bin, to trot up and downe from towne to towne, much less when he had found out the autor to have bin shifted of as yow have ben with so sleight and ridiculous evasions but his owne officers should have founde them out and being found he should have bin sent Lie & garottes to and deliverd into the Archdukes hands at his mats charge to have received that condigne punishmt. wch the haynouseness of his offence had demerited.

Trumbull was to demand an immediate response as the honour of king James could suffer no further delays. If there were more deferrals, Trumbull had to inform London diligently. James would then take a further decision. Winwood, in the mean time, received instructions from James. He contacted the Spanish ambassador and the archducal agent in London. The former diplomat wanted to see the matter resolved as quickly as possible but had little hope it was achievable. He expressed the possibility that James VI/I would send *an Em. Express* to demand justice. Both foreign diplomats had an audience with king James on the matter. Both stressed that archduke Albert made every effort to accommodate the demands of James, although his agent in London was the more verbose of the two¹¹⁰.

Trumbull proposed to Winwood that the archdukes would be urged, in the name of king James, to offer a reward for any information leading to the culprits. He also propounded a more radical solution. Puteanus was staying in the castle of Louvain. With two or three *resolute fellowes* it was possible to kidnap him to the United Provinces *to give him his payment*. How revenge could be taken against the Jesuits, was a matter more difficult as they were a corporation. The English agent was convinced that Van Once could be found and if that happened Puteanus en Flavius could be judged. But all this would require patience, time and money¹¹¹.

When Trumbull received his instructions of 17 March he had a new audience with Albert. archduke Albert professed that he took the matter to heart. He had summoned de Steenhuyts before receiving James's representative. He had instructed the councillor to do anything possible to discover author and printer of the book. If the ensuing accusations were verified he would punish the perpetrators. Trumbull's accusations had not been adequately verified by sufficient witnesses, *that he could not in justice condemne Flavius and Puteanus unlesse he should proceed both against the ordinary formes of the lawe and the prifileges of these countryes*. Trumbull was requested to disclose the names of everyone

¹¹⁰ HMCD, v, 446-447 (letter 936), Trumbull to Winwood, Whitehall, 17 March 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 36r-37r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, [Whitehall], [17 March 1616].

¹¹¹ SP 77/12 f^o 42r-42v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616.

the English agent could think of who could shed light on the issue. Flavius's guilt, emphasized Trumbull, was established beyond reasonable doubt. Firstly it was clear from the confession of Henry Taylor. Flavius himself, furthermore, corroborated it by fleeing to Cologne. Henry Bilderbeck, the Dutch agent in Cologne, confirmed Flavius's whereabouts in April 1616¹¹². Puteanus's guilt, on the other hand, was confirmed *by the common fame, the resemblance of style, his strictures, his familiarity with the English Jesuits, professed enemyes to the Kings Majesty, his conversation with Flavius and employing him commonly to print his woorke*. Once more Trumbull requested that both of them would be brought to justice.

As to the names of those who thought Puteanus was the author, Trumbull had provided a list to de Steenhuyts a long time ago. Trumbull had left out the names of those who had given him private information and were not subjects of the archdukes or those to whom he had promised to keep their name secret. Referring to the slackness of the proceedings of the commission and their refusal to call Puteanus before them Trumbull was cut short by Albert who brought the audience to a close simply by stating that *he would give His Majesty satisfaction in this matter*. As Trumbull perceived that his speech did not really impress Albert, he delivered a petition of his request and asked for a speedy answer, which Albert promised. As often after an audience Trumbull went to see the president of the Privy Council to inform him of what had occurred and request his assistance. Maes duly obliged.

Trumbull also was instructed in January 1616 to enlist Ferdinand de Boisshot, who had been the ambassador of the archdukes in London. The English agent had to remind him of his promise to help find the author and bring him to justice¹¹³. By 15 February Trumbull had visited de Boisshot who guaranteed to effect miracles, but, added the English agent, he had undertaken nothing *to make the promised discovery*¹¹⁴. Trumbull contacted de Boisshot in the following months. He reminded de Boisshot of his promise. The only thing de Boisshot had done in the mean time was informing Albert of the displeasure of James VI/I. Trumbull had met the former ambassador in the Presence Chamber before his audience with Albert in March. He castigated Trumbull for speaking *too precipitately in anticipating the intentions of the Archdukes* when he wrote to king James that they would never bring Puteanus and Flavius to justice. He promised to do his utmost in seeing that both would receive their deserved punishment if they were found guilty. He proposed that Flavius would be summoned to present himself to the archducal officers. If he came he would be detained, if he refused, then he acknowledged his guilt. According to Trumbull this proposal was untimely. Two weeks later de Boisshot informed the English agent that order had been given to the fiscals of Brabant to proceed criminally against Flavius. He would make sure that a proclamation was issued as he already had suggested. He furthermore was of the opinion that the archdukes would issue a reward for anyone who could give information about *Corona Regia*. De

¹¹² HMCD, v, 454 (letter 954), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 4 April 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 463 (letter 975), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 11 April 1616.

¹¹³ HMCD, v, 412, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 January [1616]; SP 77/12 f^o 11r-13v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1616.

¹¹⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 2r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 3 January 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 3r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 3 January 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 7r-7v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, [20] January 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 21r-21v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 15 February 1616.

Boischot was confident the matter would be resolved within the next fifteen to twenty days.

As the Spanish and archducal ambassador/agent avouched that Albert was prepared to do his utmost, king James was willing to show more patience in the matter, just as Trumbull had suggested. De Boischot's course to proceed judicially against Flavius was agreeable to James. Jean Thymon informed Trumbull in May that the attorney-general had at that time collected all the data concerning *Corona Regia* and had been instructed to start criminal proceedings against Flavius, which confirms de Boischot's story. The proclamation against Flavius was issued on 17 May 1616 (n.s.)¹¹⁵.

King James's consort, Queen Anne, also took the matter to heart as she observed *how sensitive he is to the slight upon his personal honour*. As she wanted to preserve the amicable relations between the English crown and the archdukes she wrote the infanta and de Boischot¹¹⁶. Trumbull elaborated on the case and informed Isabella that despite his best endeavours to discover the author and printer of *Corona Regia* neither had been punished for. Such neglect could only lead to a breakdown of the amity between both countries. Queen Anne therefore wished the infanta to intercede and prevent such a turn of events, which was desirable to none. Concerning Flavius she told Trumbull that proceedings against him would be started according to the crime he had committed. As for the author, he remained anonymous, but she would do her utmost to discover the name. If she knew his name she would give her officers orders *de muy bien castigarle*. Trumbull informed de Boischot of this audience and requested him to use his authority and credit with the archdukes to further the case. The former ambassador renewed his advice that Trumbull should request for a reward for anyone with information and that a proclamation should be issued summoning Flavius. Meanwhile an act was passed in the Council of Brabant. All copies of *Corona Regia* were called in and the subjects of the archdukes were forbidden to read it, *upon greivous penaltyes*.

As the archdukes left for Sichem Trumbull could do no more until their return seventeen days later. He presented a remonstrance based on his conversation with de Boischot and according to the letter of Winwood of 22 April. Grandly wording the injustice done to king James, Trumbull stated that both Puteanus and Flavius had *labored de luy coupper la verne jugulaire de sa reputation: wch was of much more esteeme wth his matie, then his life*. Trumbull also cited precedents. In private quarrels between Marcello del Judice and Don Francisco d'Aquaviva and the murder of Don Francisco de la Torre Albert had published rewards, Trumbull hoped that more would be done in a case involving James VI/I, one of the greatest kings in all Europe, his neighbour and ally, Trumbull stressed. With a Placate in his hands of 11 March 1616, with regulations concerning printers, Trumbull furthermore complained of Puteanus's Epistle to N.N. The English agent read out loud some passages concerning himself

and therepon inferring the little regard wch was had by some libertynes, to his ordinances; enjoyning, that all things published wthin his jurisdictions, should passe the hands of his

¹¹⁵ HMCD, v, 475-476, draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13/23 April 1616; HMCD, v, 483 (letter 1014), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 22 April 1616; HMCD, v, 494 (letter 1045), Thymon to Trumbull, s.l., [6 May 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, v, 495 (letter 1046), *Proclamation by the Archdukes*, 17 May 1616 (n.s.).

¹¹⁶ HMCD, v, 460 (letter 969), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 30 March 1616.

Censors and cary wth them the names of the Printers, and place where they were printed: I complayned to him of the insolence of Puteanus; and the wronge he had donne me in proclaimeing to the world, that I was a second divulger of Corona Regia, appealing to himself, whether it were true, or noe; and whether I had donne anythinge, beyond the expresse commandement of the kings matie: and the Archds owne allowance, and knowledge. And I besought him duly to consider, whether Puteanus might not justly be accused, & taxed as Author of the Corona Regia: that durst thus ympudently caste those aspercions upon me without cause; and violate his Edict, without feare of punishment.

As before Albert promised to inform himself. The English agent again turned to Maes, de Steenhuys and de Boisshot. He nevertheless was convinced that nothing had been done against Puteanus for his Epistle *and rayling upon me his mats servante for doing my duty, and that I was commanded*. Flavius was a different matter altogether. In April or May 1616 Trumbull requested that both he and Van Once be apprehended as principal witnesses¹¹⁷. Such an order was given in June.

The English agent acted on any piece of information he got. According to Trumbull order had been sent to the magistrate of Cologne for the arrest of the printer. Flavius would either be sent back or be detained in that city until the accusations against him were sent. Yet again Trumbull feared that all this was but *superficial dilligence: it beeing to late to shutt the stable doore, when the steede is stolen*. The archducal officials now confirmed that at de Steenhuys and Trumbull's first visit to Louvain Flavius had been in town and not in Cologne as originally had been alleaged. Friends had assured Trumbull that while de Steenhuys was in Louvain, Flavius stayed in his own house, *and laye hidden in the Garret*. Trumbull had little hope that Flavius would be caught in Cologne.

Archduke Albert furthermore issued a reward for anyone who could bring information to identify the author of *Corona Regia*. The reward was a ere 500 florins, which according to Trumbull should have been 1.000 Crowns, for Puteanus was rich and powerful and could easily spend more money keeping the information concealed. For Trumbull their was another deficiency. It would have been better, he wrote, if the order explicitly stated that anyone withholding information would also be considered a delinquent¹¹⁸.

The ultimatum set for Flavius elapsed without the printer presenting himself to the authorities. Flavius was banished perpetually from the Archducal Netherlands, but the sentence was only dispatched at the end of October 1616. Trumbull now again pointed his arrows at Puteanus. After an audience in July 1616 Trumbull presented a memorial on several outstanding issues, among other things *Corona Regia*. Albert once more promised an answer would be given by Maes. In his own turn the president of the Privy Council assured the English agent of a response that same week. On several occasion in his letters to secretary Winwood Trumbull complained of the slackness of the ministers

¹¹⁷ HMCD, v, 520 (letter 1099), copy, Trumbull to the Archdukes in their Privy Council, [April or May 1616].

¹¹⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 89v-90r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 7/17 May 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 91r-96v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9/19 May 1616; HMCD, v, 491 (letter 1036), *Proclamation by the Archdukes*, 11 May 1616 (n.s.) and an order for the translation of the proclamation in French and Spanish, 13 May 1616 (n.s.).

of the archdukes. The English agent finally procured a reply to his memorial at the start of September 1616¹¹⁹.

Henry Taylor, in the mean while, kept looking for the second key-witness who could divulge information on the printer and the author of *Corona Regia*. In August Trumbull's informant reported that Van Once was staying at the Jesuit College in St. Omer. Taylor was trying to find means to speak with him¹²⁰. In October 1616 Trumbull reported to London on the subject. After travelling for a time Van Once had finally settled in St. Omer. Trumbull instructed Taylor to take Van Once to Douai. From Douai he would be accompanied by servants of Trumbull to Brussels. Trumbull took him to a public notary and questioned him in the presence of several witnesses. Afterwards James's agent let him appear before the archducal commissioners. Van Once promised to say the same as he had done in the presence of the notary. Trumbull was sure that *they have been much startled, to finde that he did so deeply, and peremptorily charge Puteanus, wth the correcting, of the prooufes of Corona Regia*. Taylor by that time had returned to Douai. A friend advised Trumbull that Van Once's deposition was only *semi plena probatio*. The English agent sent for Taylor, *pour leur donner la mesure plaine*. Both were ordered by the commissioners to stay in Brussels for a few days. Trumbull supposed that they wished to confront them with Puteanus, but the commissioners kept delaying and postponing. Taylor had to return to Douai to resume his work. Van Once remained in Brussels on the charge of Trumbull.

Eventually de Steenhuyts summoned both men. In his house they were confronted with Puteanus. The Louvain professor accused Van Once of abusing the wife of Flavius. Puteanus evaded the matter at hand: *Corona Regia*. After the commissioners read the depositions both men assured that what they had said was true. Trumbull gave a vivid relation of the reaction of Puteanus:

Hereat the chollerick Gentleman [Puteanus], burst out into such a flame of passion, as he began to swete, ad foame like a Beare, that had been well bayted, and nowe he sett upon the one with threats, then upon the other with furious lookes, thincking to Intimidate, the poore men, wth his imperious woords menacing, first one then the other, with the prison, the whipe and the Gallowes. Taylor kneeled downe, upon his beare knees, before the whole companie and prayed, that God would shewe some extraordinary judgement upon him, by opening the grounde, and letting him sinck alive into it, if so bee that which he had deposed against Puteanus were not true.

Afterwards the commissioners asked Taylor how many pieces of gold he got for accusing an innocent. The witnesses were brought to separate rooms and called one by one, *and their Pulces felte, by promises, and fayer woords (as they reporte) whether, they would retracte, what formerly they had signed, or not*. If they would retract their depositions they

¹¹⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 135v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 June 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 141v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 145r-145v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 149r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 August 1616; SP 77/12 152r-152v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 August 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 163r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 September 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 183r-184r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 September 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 203v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 October 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 205r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 November 1616.

¹²⁰ HMCD, v, 571 (letter 1214), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 15 August 1616 (n.s.).

would find the means and the friends to *repayer the decayes, of their miserable, and wretched estates*. All this, according to their own words, did not help as they stood their ground. Trumbull requested de Steenhuyts for a report, which was delivered orally. The Privy Council also received an account but took no decision. Leaving the house of de Steenhuyts Puteanus repaired to archduke Albert to complain. In 1616 Trumbull reported that Puteanus was writing *Scutum Innocentiae* to proclaim his innocence. That same year he had another book ready to be divulged, *Rufi et Gibbosi peiurium in caussa Coronaria*, maintaining his innocence and accusing the two witnesses of perjury. The only information Simar in 1910 could find on the identity of both was a reference to them in a letter from Puteanus to Gérard de Coursèle, *Rufus Anglus est, ministri filius ob flagitia inde ex instula sua profufus sive ejectus*¹²¹. Thanks to the correspondence of William Trumbull it is clear that Rufus was Henry Taylor and Gibbosus John Henricks Van Once. Being sick Trumbull wrote, *I shall quitt the world so much better contented, nowe that Puteanus, is proved to be Author of Corona Regia; or at leaste, in so farre charged wth the correction thereof, as he must (if they will doe any Justice here) reveale the Author*¹²².

In October 1616 Trumbull again turned to the Privy Council and stressed that *Corona Regia* was one *des livres seditieux et scandaleux, sans privilege, sans expression des noms des imprimeurs, sans permission des Senseurs des livres, mismis contre les ordonnances & placcards de ces Païs*, but the investigation of the de Steenhuyts commission seems to have ended at that time¹²³. Trumbull requested Winwood's personal instructions on some matters concerning *Corona Regia*. Firstly, as Puteanus had been charged in the confessions of Taylor and Van Once, how was Trumbull to proceed, what was he to request further of the archduke for punishment? Secondly, it was true that in all outward appearance everything was done to give king James satisfaction, but in fact the archdukes and their ministers were reluctant. Trumbull suggested that the Spanish ambassador and the archducal agent should be asked to support Trumbull's representations in Brussels. Thirdly, as Flavius could not be traced, Trumbull wanted to apprehend his wife in Cologne and commit her to prison. By torture or threat of torture she presumably would reveal her knowledge of the authors and correctors. If that was feasible, letters ought to be sent by James to the magistrate of Cologne, the elector Palatine and other allies in the Holy Roman Empire. If Trumbull was to be sent to the Holy Roman Empire, he requested an allowance for his expenses. Fourthly, about forty or fifty copies of *Corona Regia* were for sale in the Archducal Netherlands at one place. Was Trumbull to buy them and ship them to England to be burnt? Fifthly, what should be done about the English translation of the defamatory libel and whether the services of Taylor at Douai would be allowed an annual allowance of £20 or £30? Finally, Trumbull requested if Van

¹²¹ Simar, 'Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Ier, roi d'Angleterre', 75-76, Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vi, 824-826; Erycius Puteanus, *Ruffi Gibbosi perjurium in Causa Coronae Regia* (Louvain, 1616). The Bodleian library in Oxford still holds a copy, Vet. M1 c.3 (32) and attributes it to the year 1617. Besides the references in the diplomatic correspondence Puteanus showed it to the philologue George Richter, who reported on in his letters, see, Georg Richter, *Epistolae selectiores* (vol. i, Nurnberg, s.n., 1662), 20, for a copy see BL 1454.d.13.

¹²² SP 77/12 f° 12 f° 194r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 16/26 October 1616; SP 77/12 f° 196r-196v and 198r-199r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 24 October 1616; SP 77/12 f° 200r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 October 1616.

¹²³ CPE 1277/224.

Once was to be sent to England to give his testimony. Trumbull concluded that Taylor had done his utmost and deserved a royal pardon and a reward of £20¹²⁴.

In London king James consulted with his Privy Council. They were of the opinion that James should send *a gentleman of quality expressly* to Albert. Sir Robert Naunton, however, refused to accept the assignment¹²⁵. The king was inclined to follow the advice of the councillors because Trumbull was seriously ill that fall. But as the health of the English agent was improving and as he had *travayled in this business wth so great paines and wth the happie successe, it wold have bene some wrong unto you to have taken the matter out of yor hands*¹²⁶. Trumbull got a new letter he had to deliver to Albert. In it James wrote *in exprese and precise tearmes, sithence the proofes are so pregnant avowed by two wittnesses; and in ore duorum vel testium omne verbum*¹²⁷ and such witnesses as were employed in the selfe same business: and therefore are omni exceptione maiores, Puteanus wrote *Corona Regia*. Trumbull, once more, was instructed to demand the punishment of Puteanus. If there were more deferrals, Trumbull had to inform Albert that it would be taken as *a flatt refusall*. Trumbull had to report back as quickly as possible. Meanwhile Winwood gave the Spanish ambassador in London the depositions of Taylor and Van Once. The archducal agent was quite another matter. Winwood held him *unworthey to receive so much honour, as that his assistance should be required*.

As for Trumbull's other points Winwood also provided a set of instructions. If the two witnesses Trumbull produced, Taylor and Van Once, were insufficient and the commissioners refused to believe Flavius's wife,

they would not beleeve an Angell from heaven, though he should comme, and confirme their testimonies: neither were these any reasons that could bear water; but meere shifte, & subterfugs, to declyne the execution of justice; and to frustrate his mats demands.

Trumbull was furthermore instructed to buy all copies of *Corona Regia* he could find and send them to Winwood, who would make sure Trumbull was refunded¹²⁸.

Trumbull did as instructed and obtained an audience which was granted only at the start of December because of the bad health of the archduke Albert. Trumbull cited the Spanish reply the archduke gave him:

Yo estoy prevenido de lo que me avey apuntado, yo vere las caritas des Rey dela Gran Bretana; y como en todas las demas ocasiones, que se han offrecido, yo he siempre procurado servir, y contentarle; ansy en esta yo mandare que se haga la Justicia.

After delivering his speech and arguments in a memorial Albert promised him an answer *con la brevedad possible* which Trumbull would get from Maes. Trumbull

¹²⁴ HMCD, vi, 35-36 (letter 91), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 October 1616.

¹²⁵ Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635*, 9; *Chamberlain Letters*, ii, 30, Naunton to Chamberlain, s.l. 9 November 1616.

¹²⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 209r-210v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 14 November 1616.

¹²⁷ In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established, 2 Cor. 13, 1.

¹²⁸ HMCD, vi, 48 (letter 119), James VI/I to Albert, Whitehall, [10 November 1616 endorsed]; SP 77/12 f^o 209r-210v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, [Whitehall], 14 November 1616; HMCD, vi, 47-48, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 14 November 1616.

immediately visited Maes after the audience to inform him of his instructions and of what had occurred. President Maes promised to do his utmost to get an answer. Due to the feeble health of Albert and other pressing matters, the response would only be delivered at the end of the week. The week passed without Trumbull getting a reply; afterwards he *dayly sollicitated for my dispatch*. When Trumbull received the letter from archduke Albert for king James and the reply to his remonstrance he went to see Maes again because he was discontent as he did not get a copy of the letter to his sovereign. He requested a copy but Maes was evasive in his answer but nevertheless promised to consult with his fellow councillors. Trumbull delivered a second remonstrance. Despite assurance of de Boisshot, nothing happened. De Boisshot did not do anything, or he had little power over his fellow councillors, was Trumbull's conclusion.

It was Charles de la Faille who informed Trumbull more fully. He stressed that it was needless to give Trumbull a copy. The contents of the letter matched that of the answer to the remonstrance. On the two witnesses Trumbull had produced de la Faille stated clearly that they were *vacillans, & gens peu d'estoffe*. If Trumbull could produce some other witnesses he was advised to do so. Trumbull *did not want sufficient matter, to shape him an answer suiteable to his language*. Only four or five men had been informed of the printing of Corona Regia. Two were the witnesses the English agent had already supplied and the third one, Flavius, had fled the country. Would the testimony of *great men, & councllrs.* be the only sufficient evidence? According to Trumbull it was now up to king James. Or he was content with the new letter or he would take another course. If necessary the two witnesses could be interrogated before the English Privy Council, the Spanish ambassador and the archducal agent. Van Once already was in London, the other, Taylor still lived in Douai, but would readily travel to England.

Sir John Bennet, ambassador extraordinary of king James VI/I (April-June 1617)

Secretary Winwood told Trumbull that nothing could be done until answer was received from Albert. If that answer was unsatisfactory an ambassador extraordinary would possibly be sent to Brussels. The secretary of state added that such an ambassador could do little more than reiterate what Trumbull had already said and done in the case. James VI/I, however, wanted to do all to preserve the good relations between the archdukes and himself. If there were unpleasant consequences then Albert and Isabella would be to blame. Albert notified king James that he had instructed his agent in London, Van Male, to inform him of what had been performed in the Southern Low Countries. Albert stressed that Flavius had been banished perpetually and all his goods had been confiscated. He furthermore agreed that there were two witnesses who accused Puteanus. He nevertheless remained convinced of Puteanus's innocence. It was especially the second deposition that was suspect according to the Privy Council in Brussels. There was not enough evidence to proceed against Puteanus. By the end of December 1616 king James had put all the pieces, *the Interrogatories and Answeres of the twoe witnesses, the Archdukes letters, certaine passages in Corona Regia and in certain pamphlets*

written by Puteanus against Casaubon, into the hands of a council with common and civil lawyers. When he got their advise he would take a decision¹²⁹.

At the end of February 1617 Trumbull was informed Sir Thomas Edmondes or Sir John Bennet, or both, would be sent to Albert and Isabella to charge Puteanus. Trumbull feared that Edmondes's presence was required in Paris because of the troubles in France between Maria de Medicis and her son Louis XIII. Trumbull did not want to prescribe anything but requested that the ambassador extraordinary

may have inspection of a long Remonstrance, wch heretofore I sente yor. Hor. aboute the printing of Englishe boocks, and scandalous libells in the Archds. Provinces; being a direct violation of the Treatyes of 1542 and that of Cambray: both of them confirmed by the laste concordate, made at London in the yeare 1604¹³⁰.

The remonstrance focused on treaties and ordinances which forbade the printing of English books in the Southern Low Countries. Trumbull further requested a copy of the letter Albert had written and that John Henricks Van Once would confirm his deposition in England before the archducal agent. Trumbull would ensure that Henry Taylor was in Brussels when the ambassador extraordinary arrived. The English agent added that he could not believe they would undertake anything against Erycius Puteanus because of his contacts in Rome, Spain and with the Jesuits¹³¹. Bennet, informing Trumbull of his commission, requested the English agent's assistance as he was a stranger in that country. He asked Trumbull to find him a suitable house. He also requested for advice: should he bring horses from England or hire them in the Southern Low Countries? Meanwhile Bennet already had sent three hogsheads of English beer for his own use in advance, confessing, *I knowe not howe I shall relishe the drinke that is brewed there*. Trumbull suggested that Bennet would reside in his own house, which, to Sir John Bennet, would be *more acceptable unto mee then the best lodginge that towne or Court can afford*¹³².

Winwood informed Trumbull fully of Bennet's mission. Arriving at Antwerp, Trumbull had to travel towards Bennet to accompany him to Brussels. As Sir John was not acquainted with the Southern Low Countries or with the ceremonies of the archdukes's court, Trumbull was to assist him. Winwood also appealed to Trumbull to support Bennet with advice concerning his negotiations. To inform Trumbull fully the secretary of state sent him a copy of the instructions, but Winwood wanted to add one thing

¹²⁹ HMCD, vi, 68 (letter 164), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 18 December 1616; HMCD, vi, 64-65, copy, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 20 December 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 79 (letter 186), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 31 December 1616.

¹³⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 453r-457v, *Remonstrance de l'Agent de sa Mate de la Grande Bretagne aux Archiducs. Sur les abus et excès qui se commectent en ce pays au faict de l'Imprimerie en prejudice de Sa Mate* [1613-1615].

¹³¹ HMCD, vi, 119 (letter 273), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 26 February 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 279v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4/14 March 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 284r-284v, 285r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 March 1617.

¹³² HMCD, vi, 135, 298 and 299, Bennet to Trumbull, 10 March 1617; HMCD, vi, 153 (letters 339 and 340), Bennet to Trumbull, s.l., 29 March 1617.

*The ayme and scope of all is this, that his Majestie may have reparation of his honour wherein wee will not be precise or punctillous, so that the world may see and take notice that wee are not scornfully or basely disesteemed. But in case we shalbe so unhappy nor to finde reason, yow will see what his Majestie doth requyer at your hands, that it, to take your leave of the Archdukes and with Sir John Bennet to return home*¹³³.

Bennet took the advice Trumbull had given him when he decided to bring a chaplain¹³⁴. Sir John Bennet arrived in Antwerp on 12 April and informed Trumbull immediately. Trumbull in his own turn informed the archdukes of his arrival¹³⁵. With him he had a letter from king James to Albert, dated 30 March 1616¹³⁶. Bennet was joined by his two sons Sir John and Thomas, by Sir John Cromptoz, Sir Henry Butler, Dr. Duck, Mr. Weekes, Mr. Brent, a chaplain, Mr. Prince and twelve or thirteen domestics. Trumbull arrived in Antwerp two days later. The English agent had inquired when the archdukes would be back in Brussels. Charles de la Faille told Trumbull that there was no certain date as the infanta intended to do her devotions on foot, *which she has at times been unable to do owing to the foul weather and incessant rain*¹³⁷. Bennet complained that he was not visited by any man from the archduke, *a neglect, (in my oppinyon) so greate as hardly would be digested by any monarch in Europe; and such as was never used by his Matie, towards any minister sente from these Princes*. This did not bode well for the outcome of Bennet's negotiations, the ambassador extraordinary confessed in unison with Trumbull¹³⁸. Trumbull described the reception given Bennet by the archdukes, *who are generally most ceremonious and courteous, as meagre*¹³⁹.

As the archdukes only returned from Scherpenheuvel on 30 April, Bennet did not have his first audience until 1 May¹⁴⁰. Trumbull requested the audience in the morning and it was allowed that same day at five o'clock. This was to be a public audience. Bennet would first visit the infanta and then the archduke. Between four and five o'clock Bennet was collected by Ferdinand d'Anelot (d. 1638), maître d'hotel to the archduke, with three carriages from the archdukes accompanied by Jean de Spanghen (d. 1618), Mr. de Lignecourt and M. de Coppigny. Only de Rodrigo Niño y Lasso, conde d'Anouer, mayor domo mayor, the papal nuncio and the marquis of Spinola were present at Bennet's audience with the infanta. Bennet addressed her in Italian and she replied in Spanish, *reasonablie well understanding one the other*. More noblemen were present at the audience with archduke Albert. The conversation between both men was in Latin. As these first audiences were public, only compliments were exchanged and Bennet delivered his letters of credence. According to Bennet, *they both treated mee well in outward shew*.

¹³³ HMCD, vi, 153-154 (letter 342), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 29 March 1617; HMCD, vi, 154 (letter 343), copy, *Instructions to Sir John Bennet*, s.l., [c. 29 March 1617].

¹³⁴ HMCD, vi, 157 (letter 352), Bennet to Trumbull, Sittingbourne, 4 April 1617

¹³⁵ HMCD, vi, 161 (letter 362), Bennet to Trumbull, Antwerp, 12 April 1617; PEA reg. 1976 Trumbull to Albert, Brussels, 23 April 1617 (n.s.).

¹³⁶ For the publications see, Gachard 'Ambassade extraordinaire envoyée par Jacques Ier ... à l'Archiduc Albert', 138-141.

¹³⁷ HMCD, vi, 163 (letter 367), De la Faille to Trumbull, Brussels, 25 April 1617 [29 April 1617 endorsed].

¹³⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 302r-302v, 303r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 5 May 1617 (n.s.).

¹³⁹ HMCD, vi, 169 (letter 385), Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 28 April 1617.

¹⁴⁰ PEA reg. 1976, [unknown] to Trumbull, s.l., 3 May 1617 (n.s.).

On 2 May Bennet was visited by several noblemen. Afterwards he returned to court with his own followers and William Trumbull. archduke Albert had agreed to meet Bennet in private. After greeting Albert, who was standing, the English ambassador extraordinary was permitted to cover his head. Albert requested if Bennet would not take it ill if he sat down because of his *late fitte of the Goute*. The English ambassador addressed archduke Albert in Latin as the day before. During this second audience Albert requested if he might give his answer in Spanish. Trumbull was the interpreter¹⁴¹.

The Archd. addressed himself to me, speaking in the Spanishe tongue, & sayeing, that in regarde he was not so prompte in the Lattin, as in the other Language; he woulde take the liberty to answeere by an Interpreter; and so commanded me to tel his L: that he had well comprehended, what had then ben delivered by his L: alleageinge; that he did hope the king had ben setisyed, wth the precedent endevors, wch he had used, by waye of jutice, to discover, & punishe the Printers, and Authors of the booke mencioned by my L: Ambr.

Archduke Albert promised to use all possible means to proceed in the case. Bennet stressed the importance of the suit and asked that he would personally inform himself of what had already been done and what would be done in the future. Although great matters of state consumed his time Albert promised *de tener la mano en elle*. For Bennet this answer was reasonable enough and thus he appealed to Albert to appoint some councillors with whom this matter would be entrusted. The archduke proposed Engelbert Maes which Bennet considered acceptable. Bennet furthermore referred to a request of Trumbull to the Privy Council to have authenticated copies of all the pieces of the process. This had always been delayed, which seemed to be nothing less than a refusal. Bennet asked Albert's intervention to procure the copies.

Although Bennet was gratified with the answer he did not assume a satisfactory result would be prompt. Puteanus had visited the archduke twice privately since Bennet's arrival. Furthermore the papal nuncio used his influence with Albert to get Puteanus of the hook. *I strongly coniecture, I shalbe but dallied, and trifled wthall, upon everie incident point, and occasion*¹⁴². On 3 May Bennet visited Maes who *made a courteous answeere suteable to his gravity, and the tenure of m L: speeche: & promised to deale wth the Archds. and his fellowe Councillors for the procureing of his L: satisfaction*, thus wrote Trumbull. Bennet sent Trumbull and Dr. Arthur Duck (d. 1648) that same day to inform what had been undertaken. Maes already had passed the request to the Privy Council. He had not spoken yet to the archduke because Albert had been attending mass. Although the rest of the day was also reserved for devotion, Maes would try and speak with Albert that evening. Subsequently he would inform Bennet of that conversation. On 4 May Pentecost was celebrated and nothing could be done in the matter. The following days (5-6 May), despite insistence from Bennet, he had no luck in procuring an answer, which in his eyes was nothing less than negligence. He furthermore learned that Albert and Isabella were planning to travel to Mariemont¹⁴³. Bennet therefore requested a third audience which was given to him that same day (6 May).

¹⁴¹ SP 77/12 f^o 310r-310v, Bennet to [Winwood], Brussels, 8 May 1617 (n.s.?).

¹⁴² SP 77/12 f^o 310r-310v, Bennet to [Winwood], Brussels, 8 May 1617.

¹⁴³ PEA reg. 1976, Trumbull to [de la Faille], Brussels, 5 May 1617.

Bennet stressed the slackness of the proceedings and that king James, his master, expected that all past dilapidations were going to be recompensed with present diligence. After spending 24 days in the Archducal Netherlands Bennet had not received the requested papers, which made his mission extremely difficult *not knowing whether he wente; or what was donne already, or to be donne hereafter*. As the archducal ministers were so cold and dilatory with James's ambassador extraordinary while he was present to urge them on, *there was reason to fear, they would be much more tedious when he should be absente*. Bennet argued that James truly was a *Rex Pacificus* and that he only wanted to strengthen the amity with Albert and Isabella. If the matter remained unresolved, which James was convinced Albert wanted to avoid, *it would be lesse offensyve to his matie, to have a speedy refusall, then after a tedious & unproffitable expence of tyme, to have his Ambr. renvoyed, wth empty hands*. Albert reminded James's ambassador that despite this being a time for devotion he had convened the Privy Council twice for this case onely. He had given Maes instructions to conduct the investigation and report back. The archduke would renew his orders and exhort Maes to make haste. While it was true that he and his wife were leaving for Mariemont, he stressed that it was not far off and he would keep in touch with the Privy Council to receive reports and give instructions.

As for the documents, although it was not the custom to pass them on, Albert assured, he would give order to do so. Bennet underlined that those papers were to be delivered to Trumbull because he was *the Actor for his matie* in this case. Bennet finally mentioned to Albert that Maes was present in the adjacent room but Albert did not respond to that comment. The archdukes left for Mariemont, and stayed there until July. Trumbull was sure that Bennet was going to have to leave emptyhanded. Bennet had been referred to Maes, who, according to Trumbull, was an honest man, *but as timerous as may be, and no lesse slowe in his resolutions*¹⁴⁴.

Mid-May Winwood sent Bennet further instructions. He was to request of Albert a commission *to examine such witnesses wthin his territories and dominions* which Bennet would propose. According to the secretary of state this could only be to the advantage of king James. If they refused, it was clear to the entire world that they feared interrogating Puteanus because that could lead to the truth. If archducal authorities conceded, which Winwood thought improbable, Bennet could, by choosing his witnesses, prove *by evident demonstration or by circumstances unproveable* that Puteanus was guilty. Winwood stressed that Bennet had to do his utmost, not only with the archduke but also with his councillors and all those who had been delegated to treat with the matter, *for that will iustify the course his matie doth take to leave nothing undone that both his [James's] honr. may be preserved and the mutuall amity on both parts maintayned*¹⁴⁵.

Trumbull remained sceptical of possible success in his letters to Winwood and Carleton, writing that he did not think Bennet was going to stay much longer and that he himself was not going to be much longer in Brussels as the king's resident agent¹⁴⁶. Bennet negotiated with Maes in writing. He delivered up to ten memorials in Latin and got ten

¹⁴⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 313r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 May 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 314r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 21 May 1617 (n.s.).

¹⁴⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 316r-317v, draft, Winwood to Bennet, s.l., 17 May 1617; HMCD, vi, 179-180 (letter 410), Winwood to Trumbull, Greenwich, 17 March [1617].

¹⁴⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 320r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21/31 May 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 321v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 1 June 1617 (n.s.).

back in French, although he had requested a Latin answer. Their answers were *briefe, drie, dull, unrespective, yea and uniuist too, wch I will maintaine upon perill not onely of my skill, but of my life also*. Still they refused to give Bennet the depositions. King James was expected to trust them and their proceedings without any possibility to check. As for further interrogations, Bennet had been refused to be present at those. Their comments on the depositions were also conflicting. On the one hand they stated that the wife of Flavius had no knowledge of what had happened, on the other hand they told *that she was but a Commere, and what she saide was not much to be regarded*. Despite further protests Bennet did not get any satisfaction.

Engelbert Maes told Sir John that if he had sufficient evidence to launch a criminal investigation against Puteanus, which they had been unable to uncover, that he should take the case to the Council of Brabant. The Privy Council could not give a definitive sentence in matters of this kind. This baffled Bennet, *as if a cause wch had long depended at the Counsell Table, or in the Starre Chamber in England should at the laste be referred to a tryall at the Common lawe in the kings bench*. Bennet was sure that another year would bring nothing novel if he had to start a new procedure. For the ambassador extraordinary this effectively ended his negotiations. The Privy Council appeared to be eager to get rid of Bennet requesting each time he delivered a memorial if it was his last. According to Trumbull their answer to the last memorial was both negative and absurd. Bennet intended to protest once more to the Privy Council and to travel to Mariemont and do the same. Afterwards he would return to England via Dunkirk. Bennet had instructed Trumbull *to take his leave wth me of the Archdukes at Mary mount*. Once Trumbull's private matters were arranged he also would return to England. Bennet was sure that due to the circumstances Winwood would approve of his decision to return without further delay¹⁴⁷.

Meanwhile Winwood had received the journal of Trumbull on the proceedings. In a letter to Buckingham he presented the account of what Bennet and Trumbull had done in the previous months. Winwood had also received information out of Lorraine that students there had seen *Corona Regia* before it was printed and that it was in the hand of Puteanus. Bennet furthermore requested that the commission would be reconvened to question new witnesses, but Albert seemed *to lend a deafe eare*. Winwood had instructed him to press for that demand. If the archduke did not yield, it was clear in the eyes of Winwood, that Albert was convinced that Puteanus was the author¹⁴⁸.

Trumbull once more stressed the impolite manner with which Bennet had been received in the Archducal Netherlands.

In the course of my long employmente here; I have seene the reception, entertainmt., & usage of many Ambrs. both ordinary, and extraordinary: and from Princes, & Common weales (except Venice) almoste of all condicions, and rancke in Europe: but no one of them, hath ben treated (as I conceive) wth so little respect, as that noble, woorthie, learned, & sufficient gentleman Sr. John Benet, employed from his matie, in and extraordinary legation.

¹⁴⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 323r-324r, Bennet to Winwood, Brussels, 25 May 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 329r-330r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 25 May 1617; HMCD, vi, 182 (letter 418), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 25 May 1617.

¹⁴⁸ Simar, 'Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Ier, roi d'Angleterre', 76.

After broadly outlining the case for the umpteenth time, Trumbull finished stating there was nothing left for him to do than follow Bennet back to England. He assured Winwood that he would obey all instructions which he would receive. If the councillors returned to Brussels or Trumbull happened to meet them at Mariemont he would make one last effort¹⁴⁹.

On 27 May, after negotiating for five weeks, Bennet appeared before the Privy Council in person to protest. After another lengthy discussion Bennet requested an answer in writing within two days, which he would present to king James. In the mean time he would travel to Mariemont and take his leave from Albert and Isabella. Bennet travelled to Nivelles and sent Trumbull to Mariemont to request an audience that same day. Bennet first had access to Albert, *a thing unusuall but that the liberty of that country house breaketh custome*, and only afterwards to the infanta. Albert was taken aback by Bennet's arrival, *not knowinge, as it seemed, what to say on the suddaine, or to doe in this affaire of himself*. He responded to Bennet's discourse in Spanish as before. Trumbull gave a detailed account of their discussion. Albert sent for Peter Peckius, Chancellor of Brabant but not a member of the Privy Council, and requested Bennet to postpone his departure a little while giving him hope for a more satisfactory answer from the Privy Council. It proved to be idle hope. The Privy Council was willing to interrogate further witnesses in the presence of Bennet. But the English ambassador could cite many reasons why he should not accept this new offer. He was convinced that it was a further ploy to cause delays, because the Privy Council had not decided yet if they were going to proceed criminally against Puteanus or not¹⁵⁰.

Bennet returned to England in June 1617 and received letters from the rulers of the Southern Netherlands to their counterparts in England mid-June in London¹⁵¹. Trumbull enumerated the great obstacles which hindered the gratification of king James's demands. The first and most important obstacles were *the scrupulousnes of their Consciencs* and their *superstitious beleefe* which made them fear the pope, whom king James, in his Admonitory Epistle to all Christian Princes, had proven to be the antichrist. Added to that was the opposition of the Jesuits, who, without a doubt delivered *argument, & subiect of Corona Regia*. Furthermore there was the *industry of the Romaine clergy* imposing silence. Trumbull described the reaction to the sudden departure of Sir John Bennet and his own:

All these parts doe resounde wth the eccho of my L: Ambrs. negotiation, & the newes of my departure. Some good Patriotts, professe to be sorry for these precursors of disguste betweene his maty, and the Archds. But the Jesuitts, and their adherents (who are disirous to fyshe in troubled waters) for ought, I can learne, are not much moved, wth any apprehension of change, or of the future inconvenyencies, wch by this accidente, may redounde to the common tranquillity, and present peace, of Christendome.

¹⁴⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 329r-330r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 25 May 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 333r-336v, *Trumbull's journal*, May 1617. The journal begins with the arrival of Bennet in Antwerp (12 April) and finishes with the third audience (6 May), before the departure of the Archdukes to Mariemont; for another copy see, HMCD, vi, 183-187 (letter 423), *Sir John Bennet's negotiations*, s.l., [May] 1617.

¹⁵⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 337r-337v, Bennet to Winwood, Brussels, 1 June 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 339r-229v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 1 June 1617; HMCD, vi, 189-193 (letter 427), draft, *Sir John Bennet's negotiations*, [c. 3 June 1617].

¹⁵¹ SP 77/12 f^o 343r-343v, Isabella to Anne, Mariemont, 15 June 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 345r-345v, Albert to James VI/I, Mariemont, 17 June 1617 (n.s.).

While Bennet was on his way back he passed Ghent on 8 June¹⁵². Trumbull had a long conversation with the marquis of Spinola. He stressed the advantages for the archdukes if they would gratify the just and reasonable request of James VI/I and the disadvantages that would follow because the case was ignored. After a discussion with other judicial examples Spinola,

requested mee to take information of the Privileges of these Countryes, & the nature of the Archs. Souverainty; and then (said he) yow well perceive that many things may be donne in Spaine, france, and England, wch cannott be donne in these Provinces, neither will it seeme for anger unto yow that this Prince, cannott further enlarge himself, for the king yor masters contentmt.

Spinola was ready to use his authority in the matter, but doubted that it would have any effect. Trumbull also requested the same of the duke of Anmale, the conde de Anouer and the count of Bucquoy. Anmale took the matter to heart and promised to do what he could. Anouer wanted to mediate with the archdukes, but as the matter had already been referred to the Privy Council, they would take it ill if he meddled in the business. Bucquoy defended Puteanus. Trumbull tried to convince him of the guilt of Puteanus, but as his arguments did not seem to have any effect the English agent *lefte him in his owne errors*¹⁵³.

In London Bennet delivered his report and gave a short memorial to the Privy Council and other men who had been appointed. They would discuss it and inform the James¹⁵⁴. Trumbull received word from Sir John that the Privy Council had approved of his embassy and dispatched Dr. Arthur Duck to to James in Edinburgh. At the end of June 1617 Bennet did not know what would happen to Trumbull himself, stating that Winwood had *written to the King on this point*. While Trumbull was sceptical of a satisfactory outcome in the Archducal Netherlands he was equally afraid of what would happen further in England. His comment to Sir Dudley Carleton is revealing: *Nevertheless I am still afraide, that in the ende all will be smothered up on our parte; by artifice of the Spanyards, & their friends in England, to the disreputation of or. Prince, & Countrey*¹⁵⁵. Mid-July Winwood informed Trumbull that they in London awaited the final royal decision.

At the end of July and in August 1616 rumours surfaced that archduke Albert had sent someone to Scotland in secret to counteract Sir John Bennet. The rumours were confirmed by one of Trumbull's friends on his way to Spa and by Beaulieu in Paris. To assure himself of the truth Trumbull went to the president of the Privy Council and the Chancellor of Brabant. They claimed that no one had been dispatched, which was confirmed by some of Trumbull's other friends, *whome underhande I have employed to enquier out the truth*. It was also possible that Albert had written to the Spanish ambassador, Sarmiento, the future conde de Gondomar, in London to influence James, but Winwood was in a far better position to learn the truth about that. Bennet reported that he had no information concerning someone sent by Albert to see king James. The archducal agent in London made an earnest attempt to convince king James of Puteanus's

¹⁵² HMCD, vi, 199 (letter 443), Bennet to Trumbull, Ghent, 8 June 1617.

¹⁵³ SP 77/12 f^o 77/12 f^o 364v-366r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 18/28 June 1617.

¹⁵⁴ SP 77/12 f^o 360r-362r, Bennet to James VI/I, London, 16 June 1617.

¹⁵⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 372v, 373r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 6 July 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 212 (letter 473), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 26 June 1617.

innocence. He furthermore complained about Sir John Bennet. Firstly, because he had said the Southern Low Countries were *cloica* [sic] and *sentita of all treacherous practizes against his Majestie*. James VI/I justified Bennet because he had obeyed his instructions. Secondly, being a Justice of the Peace, Bennet had allegedly stated that subjects of Albert only travelled to England to poison the good subjects of king James, which Bennet categorically denied. There were further meetings between some members of the Privy Council and the Jean-Baptiste van Male in the fall of 1617. As Winwood had fallen ill at the start of October George Villiers, baron Whaddon of Whaddon and viscount (later first duke of Buckinham), after the fall of Somerset, was now the intermediary between the Privy Council and James¹⁵⁶.

Trumbull's informants

Two persons were hunted by Trumbull in the matter of *Corona Regia*: John Henricks Van Once and John Christopher Flavius. The hunt for the two men shows on what scale Trumbull conducted his investigation into the *Corona Regia*. Trumbull worked on two fronts. First, he wrote to his correspondents who could offer assistance: Henry Bilderbeck, Dutch agent in Cologne; Wolfrad de Plessen, the agent of Frederick, elector Palatine, in Cologne; Benjamin Buwinckhausen, near the duke of Württemberg in Stuttgart; Sir Dudley Carleton, James's representative in The Hague; Sir John Throckmorton, lieutenant-governor of Flushing. Besides enlisting the help of these men, Trumbull also sent men out to actively seek Van Once and Flavius. The first was Henry Taylor, who remained an informant in Douai, although not always trustworthy and the second was a man from Louvain, Valentin De Meulder.

Theobald Maurice promised to take the matter up with the elector Palatine, but had failed to find a copy in Frankfurt. Some of his friends promised to make further inquiries. The elector Palatine wrote the bishop of Mainz and the magistrates of Frankfurt to prohibit the reprint and the selling of *Corona Regia* in Frankfurt, in or outside the fair, which was also confirmed by Hans Franz de Veiras, secretary of the elector Palatine. The prohibition did not miss its effect because the book was not to be found secretly or openly in Frankfurt¹⁵⁷.

Although Trumbull already had one witness, Henry Taylor, he wished to find the other man who worked for Flavius in Louvain, which Taylor only knew by his first name, Hans. Trumbull had been able to identify him as Hans Van Once. The English

¹⁵⁶ HMCD, vi, 212 (letter 473), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 26 June 1617; HMCD, vi, 236 (letter 514), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 22 July 1617; HMCD, vi, 240 (letter 522), Winwood to Trumbull, St. Bartholemew, 24 July 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 390r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 4 August 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 396r-396v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8/18 August 1617; HMCD, vi, 259 (letter 569), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 21 August 1617; HMCD, vi, 285 (letter 610), Winwood to Trumbull, Windsor, 14 September 1617; HMCD, vi, 304 (letter 648), copy, Van Male to Buckingham, London, 5/15 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 305-307, copy, Lake and Caesar to Buckingham, s.l., 6 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 307-308 (letter 651), Buckingham to Lake, Royston, 7 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 310-311, *Critical observations on the statement made by Van Male concerning Corona Regia*, s.l., 10 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 313 (letter 663), copy, Buckingham to Lake and Caesar, Hinchinbrooke, 19 October 1617.

¹⁵⁷ HMCD, v, 416 (letter 864), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 2/12 February 1616; HMCD, v, 422-423 (letter 875), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 16/26 February 1616; De Veiras to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 24 February/4 March [sic] 1616; HMCD, v, 458 (letter 966), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 29 March 1616.

agent sent Taylor to Douai, where Van Once possibly could be found. Taylor however returned emptyhanded¹⁵⁸. In April 1616 the English agent was making inquiries in the United Provinces and wrote Sir Dudley Carleton and Sir John Throckmorton to find Hans or John Van Once. He was *a little crooked backt fellowe; of the age of 20. yeares, or therabout*. Fifteen or sixteen weeks earlier he had been at Douai, after that he had travelled to Paris and Rome, as Trumbull had been informed. Because he was unable to find work in France, where only Frenchmen and Englishmen were allowed to be printers, he apparently resolved to try his luck in the United Provinces. As the staples of printers were in Amsterdam, The Hague and Leiden Trumbull assumed he could be found in one of those cities. Carleton promised that if Van Once turned up, *we shall soon unearth him*. Concerning Flavius in Cologne Carleton requested Trumbull to keep him posted of his movements. Throckmorton, despite his endeavours, had not been able to find Van Once nor could he hear any news of him, *in this our ilande of Walkeren*. He had written to some friends in Zierikzee and Ter Goes to enquire if he was there.

Trumbull sent Taylor to United Provinces to hunt for the second material witness who had been sighted in Bois-le-Duc and had since travelled to Utrecht. Sir John Ogle, English army officer in service of the United Provinces, informed Trumbull that Van Once had never worked in Utrecht but more importantly that he had found no information concerning his present whereabouts¹⁵⁹. In August 1616 Taylor had finally found Van Once¹⁶⁰. He was staying at the College of the Jesuits in St. Omer. Taylor was trying to find means to speak with him. Trumbull instructed Taylor to take him to Douai, from where servants of Trumbull would accompany him to Brussels. Van Once confessed and made a deposition¹⁶¹.

Flavius's flight to Cologne was confirmed by Henry Bilderbeck in March 1616. He forwarded a letter from G.E.L. who testified that he had done as instructed by Bilderbeck and had been able to ascertain that the Louvain printer had arrived in Cologne very recently. Not only was he planning to bring his wife and children, but also his printing press. At the time he was lodged at the house of Anton Hieratus, but G.E.L. did not now if he would stay there¹⁶². By mid-April Trumbull had also written to the governor of Jülich to detain Flavius, who was in Cologne, if he passed through that duchy. Sir Henry Wotton had again been appointed as English ambassador in Venice. On his way to his post he passed through Antwerp. Trumbull consulted with him what means could be

¹⁵⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 38r-38v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616; HMCD, v, 475 (letter 1001), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13/23 April 1616.

¹⁵⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 119r, copy a letter of Albert, signed by de la Faille, Brussels, 17 June 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 122r-122v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels; SP 77/12 f^o 126r-126v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19/29 June 1616; HMCD, v, 571 (letter 1216), Ogle to Trumbull, Utrecht, 6/16 August 1616.

¹⁶⁰ HMCD, v, 538-539 (letter 1138), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 10 July 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 559 (letter 1185), Taylor to Trumbull, 2 August 1616, Malines, (n.s.).

¹⁶¹ SP 77/12 f^o 68r-68v, Trumbull to [Carleton], [Brussels], 8 April 1616; HMCD, v, 478 (letter 1004), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 17/27 April 1616; HMCD, v, 494 (letter 1043), Throckmorton to Trumbull, Flushing, 6 May 1616; HMCD, v, 571 (letter 1214), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 15 August 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁶² HMCD, v, 452 (letter 947), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 31 March 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 452 (letter 948), G.E.L. to Bilderbeck, s.l., 31 March 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 454 (letter 954), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 4 April 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 463 (letter 975), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 11 April 1616.

found to get Flavius to confess the names of the authors, *either by faire meanes and for money (because he is extremely poor) or els by force and violence*. Henry Bilderbeck reported in May 1616 that Flavius had left town to travel to meet his wife and children who were on their way. According to his wife, he had gone to Louvain to collect some money that was still owed to him. Trumbull's correspondent, however, thought that the printer had been forewarned of the letters of the archdukes to the magistrates in Cologne, which were sent according to Trumbull, but of which Bilderbeck had not heard anything until July¹⁶³. A fortnight later Flavius was still not back in Cologne, where his wife and children pretended to be waiting. The Dutch agent thought he was hiding in a monastery in the neighbourhood of Cologne. Bilderbeck enlisted a friend of Flavius to ask the fugitive to reveal the name. If he could get a name, he would receive a reward. Nevertheless he had little hope of success. Another man who professed to help Trumbull against Flavius was Wolfrad de Plessen, the Palatine agent in Cologne¹⁶⁴.

As with Van Once Trumbull did more than just write. Flavius, according to James's English agent, was the key to unlocking the mystery of the author of *Corona Regia*. If he found the printer from Louvain, he would surely disclose the name. Trumbull sent two men to Cologne, Henry Taylor and Valentin De Meulder. Both were instructed to learn how Flavius got the original copy. To convince the printer they could use a reward or other means. Trumbull also had written to the Palatine to apprehend the printer if he should pass that province¹⁶⁵. Bilderbeck had given Taylor twenty francs, as Trumbull had requested. Receipts can be found in the Trumbull papers signed by Henry Taylor and Valentin de Meulder for receiving money from Bilderbeck. The Dutch agent, however, had urged both Taylor and De Meulder to stay a little while longer in Cologne. Taylor returned to Brussels at the end of May 1616 and started his search for Van Once. Valentin De Meulder apparently took the advice of the Bilderbeck to heart¹⁶⁶.

According to Trumbull Flavius possibly travelled to his mother in Stuttgart which was under the jurisdiction of the duke of Württemberg. If so Trumbull would try and get him apprehended. The English agent wrote to Benjamin Buwinckhausen, Sieur de Walmerode, to that end. Buwinckhausen assured the English agent that Württemberg would deal effectively with Flavius if he arrived. A year later he reiterated his willingness to help Trumbull, but unfortunately had little hope of success *since nobody here wishes to know anything about it*¹⁶⁷.

Henry Bilderbeck mentioned in one of his letters that Valentin had ingratiated himself with the wife of Flavius. He had found a letter from Flavius to her which revealed he was staying *a Lenseigne du Renardt* in Namur. Valentin had since gone to that town¹⁶⁸. Armed with a letter from Albert for the apprehension of Flavius Trumbull travelled with all possible speed to Namur himself. Again it ended in utter failure. The English agent

¹⁶³ HMCD, v, 544 (letter 1148), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 14 July 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁶⁴ HMCD, v, 533 (letter 1125), De Plessen to Trumbull, [Cologne], 19 June 1616.

¹⁶⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 107r-107v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 15/25 May 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 114r-114v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 27 May 1616.

¹⁶⁶ HMCD, v, 493 (letter 1042), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 16 May 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 502 (letter 1065), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 30 May 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 512 (letter 1085), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 6 June 1616 (n.s.); HMCE, v, 507 (letter 1077), *Receipts*, 2 June-1 August 1616 (n.s.)

¹⁶⁷ HMCD, v, 506 (letter 1074), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Stuttgart, 23 May 1616; HMCD, vi, 365 (letter 795), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Stuttgart, 8/18 January 1618.

¹⁶⁸ HMCD, v, 523 (letter 1104), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 13 June 1616 (n.s.).

suspected that Flavius had been warned as he was on his way to Koblenz in Germany. His wife, heavily pregnant, was still in Cologne. Trumbull sent Valentin de Meulder back to the Empire to Flavius with 50 Crowns or more if he would identify the author under oath.

Valentin returned to Cologne at the end of June from a trip from Koblenz where he had heard Flavius could be found. De Meulder had met and spoken with Flavius in Koblenz. He promised to remain there until the messenger returned. De Meulder travelled to Brussels and got bills of exchange and letters of credit for Bilderbeck in Cologne for £ 100 which were to be paid to Flavius's wife. Besides that sum he also would get the £ 50 the archdukes had promised in their proclamation for anyone who could give information about the author of *Corona Regia*. Trumbull furthermore promised to act as a mediator between Flavius and king James to procure his intervention with the archdukes for a pardon,

if he would under his hande, & oathe, declare by an authentick instrument to be signed, and verified by him before the magistrates of some Towne in Germany: who made that scandalous booke; & certaine other circumstances dependinge thereon; for the discovery of the truth, & his mats enemyes.

Flavius, as could have been foretold, had already left, supposedly to sell some patrimonial goods in the duchy of Württemberg. Trumbull lost track of him that time. Flavius, fortunately for the English agent, betrayed himself by writing a letter to his brother-in-law in Louvain, Scholliers. The printer was hiding on a farm of the Jesuits near Cologne, of whom he had gotten £ 200, according to Trumbull's information. The English agent repeated that he did not believe that the officers of the archdukes were sincere in their dealings. Bilderbeck kept de Meulder in Cologne to seek out a way to get him to meet Flavius. Flavius's wife had given birth and the child had been christened. Meanwhile Bilderbeck also wrote to Buwinckhausen to have Flavius arrested in Stuttgart if he appeared there. A few days later the wife of Flavius was packing her things to follow her husband. De Meulder, who was sick, was thinking of following her. Bilderbeck, however, feared he would be tricked a second time. The Dutch agent wanted to return de Meulder to Trumbull, as there was no point in keeping him in Cologne as Flavius had left, but because of his foot ailment, commonly called *la rose*, he was unable to walk an inch. Valentin de Meulder was back in Brussels by 8 August. The Dutch agent had given him eleven *rixdollars* to pay for his debts in Cologne and to cover his travelling expenses.

Flavius's wife, however, did not leave Cologne, which led Bilderbeck to suspect her husband was still lurking in the neighbourhood of the city. As she had a good stack of wood, she was probably planning to spend the winter in Cologne. In the following letters and years reports kept reaching Trumbull that the wife of Flavius was still living in the same city. Although she was once very poor, she lived on a grand scale. Throughout the following years reports on the whereabouts of Flavius varied from in the neighbourhood of Cologne, to Paris, Rome or even the Indies. At one time he even was reported dead¹⁶⁹.

¹⁶⁹ HMCD, v, 540 (letter 1140), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 10 July 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 544 (letter 1148), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 14 July 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 549 (letter 1160), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 21 July 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 565 (letter 1200), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 8

Van Once in the mean time was unable to find work in Antwerp for which the Jesuits were blamed. He now wanted to try his luck in England and Trumbull recommended him to the English royal printers. When in London, Trumbull wanted Van Once to visit Winwood. The English agent also asked if it would not be possible to give him a reward. Trumbull already had given him about £ 10. Winwood reported in his letter of November 1616 that he had arrived and had been offered employment¹⁷⁰.

Valentin De Meulder seems to have been a shifty personage. Professing to help Trumbull, the English agent was warned several times by Henry Bilderbeck that he was insincere in his dealings. Already in June 1616 the Dutch agent wrote Trumbull that de Meulder had not arrived, *from which it can be inferred that he has become either less honest or less discreet in this business*. According to Henry Taylor he was indiscreet, *all men must know what he had to do*; and two weeks later that Trumbull should not believe any word de Meulder spoke unless he was able to substantiate his claims, which was affirmed by Bilderbeck who had found him to be two-faced more than once. Trumbull finally affirmed to Taylor, *I have founde Valentin a false and trecherous fellowe*¹⁷¹.

While Van Once travelled to England and was employed there, Winwood was sure that Taylor could be of greater service if he remained in the Southern Low Countries. He was prepared to give Taylor an annual allowance of £ 20 and even more if his services justified it, on Trumbull's assurance of his honesty and trustworthiness. Trumbull felt the need to clarify his position. The English agent neither could nor would give any such warranty, *for him or any other of his profession, seeing that for the most parte they are fickel and unconstant and will promise much untill they gett monney, and performe little when they have it*. Trumbull informed Henry Taylor that he would receive an annual allowance of 200 florins and more if his services validated it. The English agent had also been able to obtain a pardon for which Taylor professed to be grateful. Winwood avouched what Trumbull had done and instructed him that he should *doe well to make mucche of him, for we both must make use of suche instrumentss as we can gett*.

While Taylor formerly had been used in the search for Van Once and the hunt for Flavius, Trumbull used his to get information on the booktrade. The main issue of his employment was the rumoured translation of *Corona Regia* into English. He promised buy up all the copies he could find. Winwood, on the other hand, wanted Trumbull to take another course of action. If Taylor did as promised he would be of little use in the future. When fully informed, Trumbull was to get a warrant from archduke Albert to get the translations burnt. Trumbull, however, had to send Winwood two or three copies, *because His Majesty will not believe that in the Archdukes countreyes any man dare be so*

August 1616 (n.s.); HMCd, v, 585 (letter 1253), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 8 September 1616 (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 1 (letter 4), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 15 September 1616 (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 18 (letter 49), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 6 October 1616 (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 187 (letter 425), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, [Cologne], 12 June 1617 (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 283 (letter 606), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Merchelbeck between Juliers and Maastricht, 12/22 September 1617; HMCd, vi, 335-336 (letter 722), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 11 December 1617 (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 337 (letter 726), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Spire, 3/13 December 1618.

¹⁷⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 204r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 October 1616.

¹⁷¹ HMCd, v, 508 (letter 1081), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 4 June 1616 (n.s.); HMCd, v, 559 (letter 1185), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 2 August 1616; HMCd, v, 571 (letter 1214), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 15 August [1616] (n.s.); HMCd, vi, 1 (letter 4), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 15 September 1616; HMCd, vi, 106 (letter 242), copy, Trumbull to Taylor, s.l., 3 February 1616.

*impudent to make and print that translation*¹⁷². Taylor kept Trumbull posted on the progress of the translation. A new press and letters were to be bought in Paris. Furthermore he had befriended several men who were not on good terms with the Jesuits: Dr. Matthew Kellison (1561-1642), president of the English College at Douai, Mr. Norton (alias Frogmorton; in fact this was the alias of Clement Throckmorton) and Mr. Clifford, amongst others¹⁷³. According to Taylor's information *Corona Regia* was being reprinted in Liège at the start of 1617 which was being paid by the Jesuits.

Winwood had also instructed Trumbull to buy all the copies he could lay his hands on of *Corona Regia* and send them to England. Trumbull already informed the secretary of state he knew where he could find fifty copies. Those copies were at Douai where Taylor was stationed. Meanwhile Taylor was also trying to acquire as many copies as possible. Arriving in Douai the man who had fifty offered him and his wife a room to stay in. In February 1617 the man was leaving for England and Taylor would try and reach a deal with his wife. Trumbull's informant also had knowledge of some copies being in the possession of two or three Irish gentlemen in their college. Trumbull instructed Taylor to buy the copies¹⁷⁴.

Besides *Corona Regia* and a possible translation of it, a new book was reported to be just as virulent. Taylor also mentioned that there was a book ready to be printed on the press of Kellums. Although Taylor was refused sight of it, he was promised the first copy. *What it is I knowe not, but it is Gybbens booke*. According to Trumbull this *Giblonien* book, perhaps the same as mentioned by Taylor, was titled *Jacobeados*, which he had already mentioned to Winwood at the start of January 1617: *Jacobeados; unde orginta. De expeditione Smr. Regis Magnae. Brittae. In Romanum Pontificem: proter quam ornatus est titulo regis regum, & Domini Dominatum &c. Sumptibus Authores 1616*¹⁷⁵. Trumbull was not exactly sure that this was the exact title, but he nevertheless was convinced that it covered the contents of the book. According to Trumbull it all came down to the slackness in the Southern Netherlands. If Edward Weston had been punished for his *Iuris Pontificii Sanctuarium*, *Corona Regia* would not have been written. If the culprits of *Corona Regia* had been punished, *this neue Cockatrice*, referring to vipers and serpents in the Old Testament books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, would not have been written¹⁷⁶. Trumbull requested Taylor to get three or four copies and if he could not get the book, then the title page would do¹⁷⁷.

Taylor as a key witness in *Corona Regia* had travelled to Brussels while Sir John Bennet was there. At his return in Douai people were interested what Bennet was doing in the Archducal Netherlands. Taylor claimed he did not know, but was told that they heard it

¹⁷² HMCD, vi, 47-48 (letter 118), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 14 November 1616.

¹⁷³ HMCD, vi, 20 (letter 55), Taylor to Trumbull, Douai, 8 October 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁷⁴ HMCD, vi, 104 (239), Taylor to Trumbull, Douai, 10 February 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 105-106 (letter 242), draft, Trumbull to Taylor, [Brussels], 3 February 1617.

¹⁷⁵ I have been unable to find any information about this book; according to CPE reg. 1277/225 the title was *Jacoberdos-De gloriosa Jacobi primi Angliae Francia et Hiba. Regis fidei defensoris. In Romam expeditione libri 28, Poema mysticum et prophetico spiritu reffectum ... 1616*; according to the same document Philippo Morne[z?] was the author.

¹⁷⁶ SP 77/12 f^o 249r-249v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 January 1617; Is. 11, 8; 14.29; 59, 5 and Jer. 8, 17.

¹⁷⁷ HMCD, vi, 104 (239), Taylor to Trumbull, Douai, 10 February 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 105-106 (letter 242), draft, Trumbull to Taylor, [Brussels], 3 February 1617.

was about *Corona Regia*. The English gentlemen divulged a great secret to him, namely the printing of *Jacobeados* adding, *pox of them, these Jesuits, make more stirre and do poore Catholiks more hurt then ever while the word stands will do good*. The Jesuits had sent a copy to the English college as a present, but Dr. Kellison, once he knew what it was, ordered a faggot to burn it. According to a friend of Taylor the book had been printed in Liège. Taylor would go to Liège to find out the identity of the culprit if Trumbull wished it. There were only 150 copies that were going to be printed, *the smallest impression that ever I see of such, for there are none of them to be sold for any money*¹⁷⁸.

Besides these books, Taylor also kept Trumbull informed of numerous others. In May 1616 he reported he had sent Trumbull three copies of Puteanus's *Epistles*. It were the last to be had. He also sent the book of Justus Rycquius (d. 1627) at that time¹⁷⁹. The following month he ordered two copies of Puteanus's latest work which was not quite finished yet¹⁸⁰. He reported that a book had been written against George Abbot was printed, but that he had not seen a copy yet¹⁸¹. Other books also got his attention: a book by the Roman Catholic bishop William Bishop on the lawfulness of murdering the king, which according to secretary Winwood was a fiction¹⁸². Edward Weston had a new book ready to be printed, Dr. Kellison was still writing his *A survey of the Catholicke Religion*. Taylor gave Trumbull an enumeration of the books he had already sent to the English agent by May 1617: *Dr. Campnes*¹⁸³, 5s.; *Gibbens*, 7s; *the first and 2 part of Doctor Westen*, 6s; *Fitzimon, A Catholicke Confutation*¹⁸⁴, 7s, *a litle booke of Doctor Westons*, 2s 6d; *Protestants Insurrections*, 4st.; *a lattin booke, called Brittonomachia*¹⁸⁵, 3s; *Doctor Bishop*, 10s; *against Doctor Sutcliffe*¹⁸⁶ bound, 3s 6d¹⁸⁷.

Henry Taylor also gave Trumbull other information. He revealed the name of the factor of the Jesuits in London. He was called William Atkins, and sometimes used the name Mr. Green. He had visited the house of Mr. Griffin in Drury Lane. He was a

¹⁷⁸ HMCD, vi, 187 (letter 424), Taylor to Trumbull, Douai, 11 June 1617 (n.s.).

¹⁷⁹ Possibly referring to *Justi Rycquii Gandensis Epistolarum selectarum centuria altera, nova. In qua mixtim quaesita & censurae*, which had been published by Flavius in 1615 in Louvain. For a copy see University Library of Louvain BTAB CaaA829 *.

¹⁸⁰ HMCD, v, 494 (letter 1044), Taylor to Trumbull, s.l., [6 May 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, v, 559 (letter 1185), Taylor to Trumbull, Malines, 2 August 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁸¹ HMCD, vi, 20 (letter 55), Taylor to Trumbull, Douai, 8 October 1616 (n.s.); I have been unable to identify this book. The only additional information given by Taylor is the size of the book, a quarto.

¹⁸² HMCD, vi, 78 (letter 184), Taylor to Robson, s.l., [c. 30 December 1616]; HMCD, vi, 104 (239), Taylor to Trumbull, s.l., 10 February 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 105-106 (letter 242), copy, Trumbull to Taylor, s.l., 3 February 1617; HMCD, vi, 112 (letter 258), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14/24 February 1617; HMCD, vi, 158 (letter 354), Winwood to Trumbull, St. Bartholemew, 5 April 1617.

¹⁸³ According to Anderson in HMCD, vi, 175, probably Anthony Champney's *Treatise of the Vocation of Bishops* (Douai, John Heigham, 1616), for a copy see BL 3935.bbb.8.

¹⁸⁴ Henry Fitzsimon, *A Catholicke Confutation of M; John Riders Clayme of Antiquitie* (Rouen, 1608), for a copy see 3936.bbb.32; the book was actually printed in Douai by two printers: Pierre Auroi and Charles Boscard.

¹⁸⁵ Henry Fitzsimon, *Britannomachia Ministrorum* (Douai, B. Belleri, 1614) for a copy see BL 4092.f.34 (1); Trumbull already sent this book to Winwood in August 1614 terming it *a virulent and malisious pasquil*. SP 77/11 f^o 130r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 10 August 1614; HMCD, iv, 503, Winwood to Trumbull, Grafton, 23 August 1614.

¹⁸⁶ Possibly: Matthew Kellison's *A Reply to Sotcliffes Answer to the Survey of the New Religion* (Rheims, Simon Foigny, 1608) for a copy see BL C.132.h.17.

¹⁸⁷ HMCD, vi, 174-175 (letter 396), Taylor to Trumbull, s.l., [3 May 1617 endorsed].

servant of Ambrose Rookwood (c. 1578-1606)¹⁸⁸, who had been executed after the Gunpowder Plot. The following years, until 1621, Taylor regularly sent letters and information keeping Trumbull up-to-date of books being printed¹⁸⁹. Trumbull, as is clear from his correspondence with Winwood, never trusted Taylor completely, but it was better to have him as intelligencer than to have none. Taylor's main use had been his deposition concerning *Corona Regia*. Of the books he mentioned at a later date, e.g. an English translation of *Corona Regia* and *Jacobeados* nothing ever came, the information he delivered Trumbull was faulty, to say the least.

For a short time in 1616 Trumbull corresponded with Louis de Medard, a canon in Louvain. The canon professed to be a humble subject of king James in all *salve religionis*. After having spoken to Puteanus in the streets of Louvain in March he promised to send Trumbull a report and as soon as possible a copy of a tract Puteanus had written to prove his innocence. De Medard was ready to help Trumbull more, but desired some title, of canon or councillor, from James VI/I in return, more for form than substance. This would be his security blanket if he became endangered because of his help. De Medard had also been informed that someone had offered the wife of Flavius gold in exchange for information, but she had remained unmoved. According to de Medard this should have been done by someone she knew, not by someone she had never seen. Trumbull requested *the lampoon* to Medard in April 1616, but he did not have it. Furthermore he did not think that it would be advisable that if he had it use would be made of it. There were only three people who knew of it, the president of the college where Thraso (Puteanus) was teaching, someone married to the sister of Flavius, and de Medard. It would be almost impossible not to associate de Medard with its procurement. In May 1616 Trumbull had asked him to make inquiries about a certain churchman. This led to Justus Rycquius. Rycquius, according to de Medard, was born in Ghent and parish priest in Tielt. While he was in Louvain he resided in the house of a widow called Opstal. De Medard was on friendly terms with him, but he was on more intimate terms with Puteanus. All he wrote, he sent to the Professor of Louvain. Currently he was busy with *Capitolio Romano*¹⁹⁰. For the few following months de Medard reported on Puteanus and the books he was writing tried to obtain copies. De Medard must have been aware that Trumbull was not pleased with the information he was receiving. If de Medard did not succeed in fulfilling Trumbull's expectations, *at least the great Theodosius [king James] will see that he has a faithful servant*. The last letter extant in the Trumbull papers dates only from a fortnight later. He requested the English agent a reply to his last letter. What happened is unclear¹⁹¹.

¹⁸⁸ Nicholls, 'Rookwood, Ambrose (c.1578–1606)'.

¹⁸⁹ Published until December 1618 in HMCD, for the manuscripts see, BL Add. 72311.

¹⁹⁰ Justus Rycquius, *De capitolio romano commentarius* (Ghent, Cornelium Marium, 1617), for a copy see University Library of Louvain BRES CaaB184.

¹⁹¹ HMCD, v, 467-468 (letter 988), De Medard to Trumbull, s.l. [6 April 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, v, 468 (letter 989), De Medard to Trumbull, s.l., [7 April 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, v, 502 (1064), De Medard to Trumbull, s.l., [19 May 1616 endorsed]; HMCD, v, 508 (letter 1079), De Medard to Trumbull, s.l., 3 June 1616 (n.s.).

Kidnapping Erycius Puteanus

After the failure of Bennet's embassy Trumbull was still looking for ways to proceed against Puteanus. With one of his friends he came to the conclusion that there were two possibilities. First, putting Puteanus in prison by the authority of the archdukes or induce them to banish Puteanus. If James would be pleased with one of these two and whether the archdukes would cooperate was highly uncertain. Secondly, kidnapping - two offers had been made in June 1617 to Trumbull. One offered to take Puteanus to the United Provinces and the other to the Palatinate. The first option was proposed by a subject of king James, who later appeared to be captain Hamilton of Binny, the second by a foreigner who wanted 20.000 Crowns. The foreigner also wanted £ 20 - £ 30 pounds in advance for his charges. The man was poor and would possibly only take the money. If a decision was taken to kidnap Puteanus to the Palatinate, then it was wise to let the man do it at his own expense. Afterwards he could be repaid and rewarded if his services justified it. If Winwood wanted to talk to either of them, Trumbull was sure that he could convince them to travel to England. If the requested reward was too high or the time for such a project was not convenient, Trumbull requested further instructions to what would be considered acceptable. If the foreigner wanted to do it, *the greatest hazard that can be borne; is but of 20 or 30 li sterling*, because the rest would not be paid until the conclusion of the affair. The foreigner was impatient, according to Trumbull, he wanted to perform his service within fifteen days or not at all. Winwood, in June and July 1617, was quite clear:

*Concerning a revenge to be taken of Puteanus for hys insolent and audacious malice, your judgement will tell you that noe courses are sutable to hys Majestys proceedings but suche which are conformable to justice and honor. And therefore, yt would yll become the greatnes of so mighty a monarch by pryvat and indirect course to wreke hys anger upon a so base and vile a creature as Puteanus ys*¹⁹².

Winwood professed that whoever tried to stain the reputation of the king, he was unsuccessful. Kidnapping Puteanus was beneath James and would demeane him in the eyes of the bystanders, according to Winwood. James, surprisingly, was scruples about such a project. Winwood reminded the English agent of the offers which had been made to Trumbull because *that nothing could be more pleasing unto him [the king] then to be possessed of the person of Puteanus*. All costs Trumbull would make would be reimbursed *magno cum favore*. Winwood knew that it was a difficult matter to kidnap Puteanus, but he thought Breda and Bergen-op-Zoom were the best options as destinations in the United Provinces. Captain Hamilton of Binny, who had served in Holland for seventeen or eighteen years, resided in Antwerp where Trumbull went to see him. He was willing to proceed, but only with the assistance of five others. He would choose them himself and

¹⁹² SP 77/12 f^o 357r-358r, Trumbull to Winwood, [Brussels], 14/24 June 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 364r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 18/28 June 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 368r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 June 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 383r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11/21 July 1617; HMCD, vi, 212 (letter 474), Winwood to Trumbull, St. Bartholemew, [28 June 1617]; SP 77/12 f^o 388v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 24 July 1617.

particularly mentioned John Meldrum (*b.* before 1584, *d.* 1645)¹⁹³, a Scotsman. According to Trumbull there were three conditions which would ensure success: *money, sixe good and tried hunting horses that may be able to runne forty or fifty myles without drawing their bittes, and opportunity.* Hamilton and Trumbull would provide the cash for the enterprise, on condition that king James instructed the Lord Treasurer to pay Trumbull the money that was due to him, some £ 600. As no suitable horses could be found in the Southern Netherlands, they would have to be sent over from England. Opportunity would have to present itself, when that happened they would take Puteanus on his way from or to his house and transport him to Bergen-Op-Zoom or Breda, as Winwood had suggested. The only difficulty along the way was Don Luis de Velasco and the cavalry that was quartered in Herentals. They would have to be circumvented by stratagem or under cover of darkness. At the start of October Winwood reminded Trumbull of king James's desire. Winwood would see to it that the Exchequer would pay Trumbull immediately. As for the horses, it was unnecessary to have them sent from England. Puteanus would have to be put in a coach otherwise there was no hope for secrecy. Winwood further left it to Trumbull to decide what would be the most effective measures¹⁹⁴.

In November 1617, after Winwood's death at the end of October, Trumbull wrote Buckingham that nothing was lacking except money and six horses to kidnap the presumed author of *Corona Regia*. Trumbull was unable to provide more money, because he had not been paid by the Exchequer. The arrears amounted to £ 600. That sum would give him the means to go forward with the plan. Further delays would jeopardize the success of the scheme. But at the end of November 1617 Buckingham had instructed the English agent to drop the design on command of king James¹⁹⁵. In March 1619 there was mention of such a plan again. It was especially the proposition of king James's subject, captain Hamilton of Binney, which was considered but was never executed. Trumbull's opinion was that Hamilton was a man well affected to king and country. Because of his want of means he was necessitated to offer his services to a foreign prince. Trumbull requested the king to intervene with the viscount Fenton to look for means to retain Hamilton *at yor. mats devotion*. Trumbull remained concerned with the plight of Hamilton, writing on several occasions in the following months to James Hay (c.1580–1636)¹⁹⁶, viscount Doncaster since 1618 and from 1622 the first earl of Carlisle. *I beseech yor. L: (a mains jointes) to be myndfull of Capne. Hamilton.* If he was obligated for his own sake to seek service in the Army of Flanders it would give that army *a valyent and sictreet a gentleman, and a Soldier, as any I knowe of or. nation.* Hamilton had been offered nothing less than the place of sergeant-major in a regiment of infantry or the command of a company of cavalry. Trumbull succeeded in convincing him to refuse all offers because

¹⁹³ Carlton, 'Meldrum, Sir John (*b.* before 1584?, *d.* 1645)'.

¹⁹⁴ HMCD, vi, 284 (letter 609), Winwood to Trumbull, Windsor, 12 September [1617]; HMCD, vi, 295 (letter 628), Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617. Much of the letter was in cipher; HMCD, vi, 302 (letter 642), Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 3 October [1617].

¹⁹⁵ HMCD, vi, 323-324 (letter 694), draft, Trumbull to Buckingham, Brussels, 9/19 November 1617; HMCD, vi, 335 (letter 721), [Trumbull] to [Buckingham], Brussels, [29 November 1617].

¹⁹⁶ Schreiber, 'Hay, James, first earl of Carlisle (c.1580–1636)'.

he would be a valuable man in the service of king James or his son-in-law, the elector Palatine¹⁹⁷. What happened remains unclear.

Trumbull in Purgatory

King James threatened to use *Corona Regia* as a *casus belli*. In June 1617 a copy of the report of Bennet was to be sent to Spain to inform the Spanish king of the reason why James VI/I intended to break the commercial relations with the archdukes¹⁹⁸. With the departure of Bennet, Trumbull's status as resident agent had been revoked, but the matter did not end there. The former English agent requested the permission of Albert and Isabella to remain for a little while, because he could not depart with his family at once. He added, *It would be a matter of personal regret to me to have to leave in these circumstances after representing the interests of His Majesty in your court for eight years.* Winwood was pleased that Trumbull had not left with Bennet. As this was a matter of great importance, nothing less than *the rupture of amity between hys Majesty and thouse Princes*, Winwood wished that the ambassador extraordinary had waited for further instructions before taking such a radical.

In the mean time Trumbull was asked to be patient *in the continuance of yor. charge there, for it would be unseasonable at this tyme to revoke yow because it is uncertaine what course his matie will take.* Although Bennet's original instructions were clear, Winwood seems to have been restrained when it came to revoking Trumbull. Both Winwood and Trumbull had known that this was a fight that had little chance of success. Winwood even confirmed what Trumbull had avouched to Carleton. Many in England were of the opinion *that it shalbe as honorable, and much more safe for his matie: to sitte downe by this iniury & wth silence to swallow it and digest it then by breaking amity wth the Archduke to seeme to ressent it or take revenge of it.* In Trumbull's opinion, if that were the case, Bennet should never have been sent. *And to speake with freedome,* Trumbull wrote in August, *to yor hor. if his matie does not calle me home; I conceive that the taking of my leave of these Princes, might well have ben forborne*¹⁹⁹. Trumbull was to remain in Brussels for the time being and in the mean time *find me [Winwood] owt some sufficient able and trusty man to advertyse me ypon all occasions of the occurrences of that place in Brussels, Louvain, Douai and St. Omer.* Trumbull promised to do what he could.

*But I can sooner fynde men to take monney, then to deserve it. And indeed (as I conceive) they can doe yor. hor. little good, unlesse they be of our owne nation; and those of our owne nation, are either so superstious as they will doe nothing, or commonly so falce, as they may not be trusted*²⁰⁰.

¹⁹⁷ SP 77/13, 192r-192v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 11 March 1619; SP 77/14 f^o 12r, Trumbull to Doncaster, Brussels, 22 January 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 47r-48r, Trumbull to Doncaster, Brussels, 27 February 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 71r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 31 March 1620.

¹⁹⁸ Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625)', vii, 825; CSPD James I 1611-1618, 472.

¹⁹⁹ SP 77/12 f^o 387r-387v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 24 July 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 396r-396v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8/18 August 1617.

²⁰⁰ SP 77/12 f^o 358r, Trumbull to Winwood, [Brussels], 14/24 June 1617, CSPD James I, 488.

Almost a month later Winwood reiterated his position. He promised to give Trumbull an answer on whether or not to stay in his next letter. *Your remove from thence being of so great importance, yt doth best sort with the nature of that business to march safely and lentis passibus.* In July 1617 nothing had changed as John More informed Trumbull nothing would be decided until the return of James from Scotland. Bennet, writing in August shortly before seeing the king described the situation of the English agent, *mee thinkes you hang in purgatorie or rather, as Erasmus (according to the Papistes imagination), betweene heaven and hell*²⁰¹. As no decision was taken on Trumbull's position at the end of September 1617 Trumbull voiced his opinion to Winwood. The Council of the elector Palatine had given him a commission to ensure the preservation of a Protestant church in Bad Breisig. Trumbull, however, did not know how to discharge it since he was but a private person in Brussels since the departure of Bennet. He added, *I should be restored to my former diplomatic status as Agent*²⁰².

In November 1617 Sir Thomas Lake, Trumbull's new official correspondent after Winwood's death, informed Trumbull that he would interpellate king James about the situation of the English agent in Brussels. If he wished it, Lake would press for Trumbull's return. If Trumbull agreed to stay he would get an increase of £ 100 per year. Lake had inquired that if Trumbull were to stay he would have to do so as a private person or if his title of agent would be revived by a new letter of credence to the archduke. Trumbull gathered that he was not going anywhere. After thirteen years of service in the Southern Low Countries, of which eight as agent, his duties were terminated with the departure of Bennet. When he requested to return, Trumbull was informed he had to stay until the matter *Corona Regia* had ended. Trumbull requested permission to return to England on leave to put his private affairs in order, which was granted. Archduke Albert was informed that Trumbull had received permission to return to England for a month to six weeks to attend to his private affairs²⁰³.

In October and November 1617 Charles de la Faille and Engelbert Maes were eager to show their diligence when it came to the printing of libels. At the end of October Trumbull met both men. Word had reached them of a book printed in the Southern Netherlands against king James. Trumbull supposed they were talking about *Jacobeados*. They wanted Trumbull's help. Trumbull referred to what had been done concerning the author and printer of *Corona Regia* and was unwilling to do anything because he was

²⁰¹ HMCD, vi, 194 (letter 428), draft, Trumbull to Albert/Trumbull to Isabella, s.l., [c. 3 June 1617]; HMCD, vi, 195 (letter 430), Winwood to Trumbull, Greenwich, 4 June 1617; HMCD, vi, 213 (letter 474), Winwood to Trumbull, St. Bartholemew, [28 June 1617]; HMCD, vi, 236 (letter 515), More to Trumbull, London, 22 July 1617; HMCD, vi, 240 (letter 522), Winwood to Trumbull, St. Bartholemew, 24 July 1617; HMCD, vi, 259 (letter 569), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 21 August 1617.

²⁰² HMCD, vi, 292 (letter 620), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 18 September 1617; HMCD, vi, 300 (letter 638), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 2/12 October 1617; HMCD, vi, 296 (letter 629), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 26 September 1617.

²⁰³ HMCD, vi, 333 (718), Lake to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 28 November 1617; HMCD, vi, 339 (letter 731), draft, Trumbull to James VI/I, s.l., 4 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 351 (letter 758), Lake to Trumbull, Whitehall, 22 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 352 (letter 761), More to Trumbull, London, 23 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 353 (letter 763), Bennet to Trumbull, London, 24 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 358 (letter 773), Lake to Trumbull, Charing Cross, 29 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 358 (letter 775), copy, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, [29] December 1617; BL Additional MSS 12485 f^o 8r, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 29 December 1617.

altogether discouraged, from meddling any further in business of lyke nature. Furthermore, Trumbull stated, he was only in Brussels as a private person, his legation as agent had ended with the departure of Bennet. He now only waited to be recalled, which was only delayed because James was in Scotland. Nevertheless, emphasized de la Faille, it would have been good to have advertised this new book to the archdukes and their councillors. At the request what the title was, the English agent only replied that everyone knew the title of the book. He was prepared to tell it on one condition, *that once for all, they would redresse these frequent wrongs donne to his matie in the lyke kynde; wch was both against the Common Amity.*

In the long conversation with both men Trumbull referred to Weston, the English fugitives which were received in the Archducal Netherlands, the erection of monasteries and colleges. Eventually Trumbull promised to deliver Maes a copy of *Jacobeados*. Investigations were made by the Privy Council against the printer of *Jacobeados* who they supposed to live in Louvain²⁰⁴. Trumbull was also prepared to deliver a new remonstrance, if that was the wish of king James, to which the monarch agreed according to Lake. Trumbull, if he had had more time, would have sent it to London for inspection before giving it to the archduke on 20 December. After the audience he also informed Maes, but on the whole Trumbull could not promise what the outcome would be this time. King James approved of the memorial *and wisheth you to pursue it to effect at least as farre as you can and to gett satisfaction therein*²⁰⁵.

Trumbull returned to England at the start of 1618. Albert commended him, *Et comme Il s'est icy tousrs. bien et demement comporté, Je ne puis laisser de vous tesmoigner la satisfaction que nous auons de sa personne et proceder, et qu'a son retour Il nous sera le bien venu.* Trumbull had safely arrived on his native soil on 13 January 1618. In stead of six weeks he stayed for about six months in England and was back in Brussels in July 1618. The embassy was not closed during his absence. John Wolley, Trumbull's secretary, remained behind in Brussels to manage the affairs until Trumbull returned once more as resident agent²⁰⁶.

Swan-song of Corona Regia

The archdukes had appointed Puteanus to the honorary position of governor of the castle of Louvain in October 1614. He entertained Albert and Isabella there in May 1618, the possibility of prosecuting Puteanus as possible author of *Corona Regia* had never been slimmer²⁰⁷. Before returning to Brussels in June Trumbull requested and received instructions on several matters, among other things the problem of

²⁰⁴ CPE reg. 1277/225.

²⁰⁵ SP 77/12 f^o 434r-435r, *Remonstrance*, Brussels, 12/22 December 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 443r-443v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 18/28 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 353-354 (letter 765), draft, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 25 December 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 445r-445v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 25 December 1617; PEA, 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 27 December 1617; HMCD, vi, 361 (letter 784), Lake to Trumbull, s.l., 1 January 1618.

²⁰⁶ HMCD, vi, 365-366 (letter 796), copy, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 8/18 January 1618; PEA reg. 1976, copy, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 18 January 1618 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 368 (letter 804), Chandler to Trumbull, s.l., [13 January 1618 endorsed]; HMCD, vi, 448 (letter 980), Trumbull to [Lake], s.l., [c. 18 July 1618].

²⁰⁷ HMCD, vi, 418 (letter 912), Wolley to Trumbull, Brussels, 23 May 1618 (n.s.); Roersch, 'Puteanus (Erycius)', 337.

licentious printing, which is, that both by some fugitives of this realme (whome their owne guiltines of diloyaltie towards us doth make malicious) and by strangers incensed by them, diverse pamphletts and libells have bene of late yeares printed within the Archdukes countries contayning scandalous matter to our honor and dignity. A thing though in it self is not to be weighed, because the honor of Princes cannot receive any wound from such base and unworthie scandals, yet in the same, coming into publique by print in those countries, doth give us just cause to require, and as one Prince oweth to another if there were no other bondes of amitie then the common regard of each others dignitie. And therefore doe require you to deale both with the Archduke and his ministers that some course of restraint may be taken against the publishing of such scandalous pamphletts, which both the rules of humanitie doe require and the Treatie of amitie betweene us and them doe oblige them unto²⁰⁸.

These instructions did not differ from anything Trumbull had received since becoming the king's agent in Brussels. Trumbull arrived at the Archducal court in Ghent on the same day as the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, to announce his return to the Archducal Netherlands as the resident agent of king James. He requested Gondomar's assistance in obtaining satisfaction in the matter of *Corona Regia*. Gondomar was amazed that king James *would nowe awake it, after it had slept so long*. He argued that the archduke could do nothing he had not already done. Furthermore it was Gondomar's opinion that to renew the case would give cause to the printing of new pamphlets against the king of England, which the Spanish king and Rome had tried to suppress. *And he said moreover, that out of love, & respect to his matie, he would humbly advise him to bury the offence of that lyell in oblivion*²⁰⁹. During the fall of 1618, despite insisting, Trumbull was not able to accomplish anything of note. He had requested the archduke that he would instruct de Steenhuyts to examine further witnesses proposed by Trumbull. By mid-December the English agent had been able to get a commission so that de Steenhuyts would interrogate the witnesses brought forward by Trumbull, but he was equally sure that because of the season and Christmas, nothing would be done for the time being²¹⁰.

Trumbull accompanied Guillaume de Steenhuyts and Francois De Groote (one of the clerks of the Privy Council and pensionary of Bruges) to Louvain and Antwerp to question the witnesses Trumbull suggested. In Louvain they questioned Vosman de Gember; Dr. Baecks, president of the Collegium Trilingue, Dr. Frenius, doctor in medicine; Dr. Sassenus, Dr. Sestich, Dr. Weymbs, Francois Habers, *libraire*; Jehan Sassenus, *libraire*; Dr. Zoesius and Valentin de Meulder who had 'helped' Trumbull in his

²⁰⁸ SP 77/13 f^o 7r-7v, *Certain points to bee represented to his maties consideration; before my retourne to Bruxelles*, March 1618; HMCD, vi, 433 (letter 939), *Instructions to William Trumbull*, signed by Lake, Whitehall, 16 June 1618; Trumbull's letter of credence: HMCD, vi, 438 (letter 947), James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 23 June 1618.

²⁰⁹ SP 77/13 f^o 28r, Trumbull to Lake, Ghent, 30 July 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 30v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 5 August 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 52v-53r, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 28 August 1618.

²¹⁰ SP 77/13 f^o 83r, copy, Trumbull to Albert, Brussels, 15 October 1618 (n.s.), together with a reply of the Privy Council and Trumbull reply on that of the Privy Council, for a copy or draft see, HMCD, vi, 535 (letter 1154), Trumbull to Albert, s.l. 15 October 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 91r-91v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 21/31 October 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 96r-96v, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 29 October 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 98r, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 5/15 November 1618; HMCD, vi, 587 (letter 1270), Naunton to Trumbull, Whitehall, 20 November 1618; SP 77/13 f^o 122r, Trumbull to Lake, Brussels, 14/24 December 1618.

search for Flavius. In Antwerp only Scholliers and his wife, related to Flavius, were questioned. Most of the witnesses in Louvain admitted they had seen or read *Corona Regia*. Some conceded that Puteanus or a Jesuit had given them a copy. For Trumbull this was proof enough that the book had been printed in Louvain and distributed by Puteanus and the Jesuits. Many of the witnesses, however, denied that Puteanus was the author, because according to them he could not write that well nor did he master what they referred to as the pure Latin style. Furthermore, he had never been in England so he simply did not have the information for the contents of *Corona Regia*. Although Trumbull was present at the examinations and witnesses therefore could speak freely no one accused Puteanus of writing or correcting the proofs of *Corona Regia*, *they being a people, that doe naturally abhorre to accuse one another*. Trumbull nevertheless remained convinced that Puteanus and Flavius servants of the English Jesuits in Louvain, were guilty²¹¹.

While Trumbull was in Louvain together with de Steenhuyts and de Groote, the former informed him that someone offered to discover the true author of *Corona Regia* for a substantial reward. Trumbull asked the commissioner to proceed and assured that he would see to a reward, within the limits of *reason and equity*. As ordered Trumbull had given the man some money. He wished Trumbull to write to James to disclose a mystery. The author of *Corona Regia* lived in the borderland with Germany where Flavius was printer. Puteanus had taken part in writing and correcting the libel. The man did not want to give more details until he got assurance from king James of his protection and an adequate reward. The man wrote under the name of Nicolas de Lacken/Laeken, but his real name, as appeared in a dispatch from Trumbull dated in May 1624, was John Periet of Dole in the county of Burgundy. Writing to James VI/I he promised to perform all possible duties he could. Besides protection he requested *deux mils pistolets*. Trumbull however thought that Periet would be pleased with less. *If he saye the truth, that intricate business will be at an end, and his matie discouuer such things as I dare not thinke, much lesse committ to paper*. By June 1619 Trumbull was sceptical of what the man would accomplish. Nicolas de Laeken, according to Trumbull, was *a common sollicitr. in this court; and I presume, a fellowe, that hath more craft then honesty*. He only wanted to reveal the name of the author and the whereabouts of the printer after receiving the money, *and perhappes, he would give us a shippe, and make us spende as much, in followinge him, as wee have done in huntinge after the other vagabonde*.

Periet had been in England in the summer of 1619 without Trumbull knowing it. He professed that had he been granted access to James he would have revealed the name of the author. Trumbull requested instructions from London,

*whether he [king James] shall thincke it fitter to bury that offence in obliuyon; wch hath nowe layen on sleepe aboute these 12. moneths; or to reuyve my pusuite by this occasion, and bringe it once again upon the Theater of the Archdukes slowe Justice*²¹².

²¹¹ SP 77/13 f^o 142v, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 5 January 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 149r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake], Brussels, 16/26 January 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 155r-156v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [presumably Lake], Antwerp, 23 January 1619; CPE 1277/230, copy, Albert to Magistrate of Antwerp, s.l., 28 January 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 196r, *Noms des personnes examinez a la request de l'Agent de sa Maté dela Grand Bretagne 1618/1619*.

²¹² SP 77/14 f^o 102r, Trumbull to [Calvert], Brussels, 20/30 May 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 148r-148v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 30 June 1620.

Trumbull in the end made a contract with Periet. One thousand pistolets were given into the hands of Charles Van Asche, an Brussels merchant. According to Periet the author was none other than don Pietro. It was Trumbull who informed him of the last name, Arlense. The principal witness Periet had was Norman who had been a servant of Arlense. Norman resided in London and was examined by Sir Henry Martin. Norman denied everything. Trumbull had some trouble getting his money back, but at least this was one litigation he won²¹³.

In January 1619 William Trumbull again launched a request to renew the prosecution of the author of the libel, emphasizing that it concerned *des livres fort offensives à l'honneur dud. Roy et au contraire des traites et concordats publiés*. The document reads *A la demande de l'agent du roi de Grande-Bretagne, nouvelles poursuites contre l'auteur du livre intitulé Corona Regia et ses complices à Anvers*. The one page document yields no results²¹⁴. In June 1620 Puteanus was still at large, Trumbull reported to secretary Naunton²¹⁵.

From the following entries it is clear that Trumbull pursued the matter in the following years. Trumbull refers to money of king James he received in January 1621. Trumbull promised to send the secretary of state a relation of all that he had done in the matter of *Corona Regia*, he could not do it at that time,

by reason of the cold, and flegmatick carriage of the Arcds. Privy Council, and their resy President; who will not goe forwarde; though I spurre him twiece euery day, by all the Acts of dilligence, entreaty, and prayer that can be imagined. I dare undertake, that in England yo. would have donne more, for the Archds. in 5 dayes; then they have donne here, for his matie in 5. Yeares. This month I have presented Remonstrance upon Remonstrance, to gett a commissary surrogated in the roome of the Counsellr. Steenhuyse (nowe absente wth Spinola in the Palatinate) and to procure certaine witnesses to be speedily examined in my presence. But to this very hower, woe what I can, I have not been able to obtayne an answer. Their Counsell are so circuler, and misterious, as I cannott tell what is donne; nor from whome, or when I may receive an absolute dispatche. From the Archd. (nowe unaccessible by the goute) I am posted to the Presidt., hee to the Confessor; the Confessor to the Spanishe Ambr. and the Ambr. consulteth the Jesuitts, and fugityves of or. nation; for such things as concerne his mats service²¹⁶.

Trumbull delivered his *large History* that same month. Although the document itself cannot be found in the State Papers, Trumbull gives his conclusion in the accompanying letter. He was convinced that *Corona Regia* had been hatched in the house of Remacle Roberti in Brussels, that the material came from the English Jesuits and their followers and that the form came from Puteanus, Maximilian Plouvier, Damseau and Cornelius

²¹³ SP 77/17 f^o 121r-122v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 6 May 1624.

²¹⁴ CPE reg. 1277/230.

²¹⁵ SP 77/13 f^o 155r-156v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [presumably Lake], Antwerp, 16/26 January 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 186r-186v, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 5/15 March 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 188r, de Laeken/Lacken to James VI/I, Brussels, 15 March 1619 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f^o 195r-195v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [presumably Lake], Brussels, 11/21 March 1619; SP 77/13 f^o 291v-292r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [presumably Naunton], Brussels, 26 June 1619; SP 77/14 f^o 148r, Trumbull to Naunton, Brussels, 30 June 1620.

²¹⁶ SP 77/14 f^o 262r-262v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 5/15 January 1621.

Breda (1588-1620)²¹⁷, one of Puteanus's students. Trumbull requested that his history would be kept secret because the names of the persons mentioned therein would cause them to be disgraced. Without their help, Trumbull would not be able to do anything more in the business²¹⁸. Meanwhile Trumbull had found another who was greedy enough to offer his assistance, De Heer from Liège. Trumbull promised him one hundred Philippos if he could discover the whereabouts of Flavius. In July 1621 Flavius was back in Liège, *haueinge shaken off all feare of farther prosecutions, or danger*. He not only walked about the streets in public but also *menaceth those, that first gave me notice of his beeing in that citty*²¹⁹. The English agent sent Wolley, who, by chance, met the man who delivered the libel to be printed and withdrew the leaves once they came from the press, Lambert Sauveur. Flavius at that time wrote to Roberti. If Roberti did not give him full satisfaction within eight days he would travel to Brussels, *and reveale the whole misery of Corona Regia*. After eight days Trumbull sent Sauveur and Wolley back to Liège with a safeconduct, £ 100 and an abolition *of his former crymes, in printinge the libell*. He would get this after *he should legally have made his depositions*. But Flavius had put himself into a sanctuary. Trumbull never gave up when it came to Flavius. In 1624 the English agent, finally, was able, through John Wolley and William Cool, to get hold of Flavius, who resided in Koblenz, *where they wth much industry founde the old foxe, that had escaped & mocked me so often before; and a Coups de Pistoles, gott his depositions, legally and judicialiter taken, before the Scultetus, and some other magistrates*²²⁰.

In May 1624 Trumbull sent king James a lengthy dispatch outlining all the occurrences concerning *Corona Regia*. It was an advocate, presumably he referred to Jean Thymon, who informed him,

that the libell was framed in Robertis house, in this Towne of Bruxelles; by a Jesuitt his brother, Puteanus, Cornelius Breda, and one Maximilian Pluvier, Secretary to the Comte Christopr. of Easte Freezland. And that Puteanus, for the preventinge of future perills; had wtdrawn from Bredas mother the Originall of the libell.

Trumbull revived his suit. De Boisshot, who had been assigned as commissioner to Trumbull in that matter, excused himself. It was de Steenhuyts who again became responsible. As he and his colleagues became aware that Trumbull was on the brink to *discouuer le pot aux roses*, he retracted his permission to assist at the examinations, after which the case lingered on. Cornelius Breda, according to Trumbull, was *stricken, wth a pannick terror, or bitten by the worme of his owne conscience, abandoned his Studdyes* and became a soldier serving in Bohemia. Either he was slain or died of a languishing disease. In September 1623 Puteanus wrote his former pupil Frederick de Marselaer (1584-1670)²²¹ a letter. In it he complained that few were interested in his scholarly activities. His life was filled with trouble and on top of that he had been accused of writing *Corona Regia*.

²¹⁷ Wauters, 'Breda (Corneille de)'.

²¹⁸ SP 77/14 f^o 199r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 24 August 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 206r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 7/17 September 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 221r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 28 September 1620; SP 77/14 f^o 262r-262v, 264v-265r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 5/15 January 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 280r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 17/27 February 1621.

²¹⁹ SP 77/14 f^o 402v-403r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 25 July 1621.

²²⁰ SP 77/17 f^o 125v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 6/16 May 1624.

²²¹ Wauters, 'Marselaer (Frédéric de)'.

Puteanus identified the author as one of his friends and former pupils. Not naming him, he gave de Marselaer a detailed description: belonging to a wealthy family, departed for Bohemia, probably serving Ferdinand II. For Tournoy these element point, *without a shadow of a doubt*, to Cornelius Breda, who was *Puteanus's favourite pupil and younger friend*²²².

Plouvier resigned his place as secretary and *tooke upon him, the charitable weede of a Carthusian Monck, to couur the brands of his wickednes*. He possibly lived in a monastery near Lyon. Roberti died in February 1624 *wth great torment in his body and very poore in his estate*. Damseau and Puteanus were the only two survivors of *those that forged, and managed this inhumaine, & barberous conspiracy against king James*. Trumbull hoped that Flavius, from this time forward, would be *at yor mats devotion*. Trumbull's dispatch does not proclaim Puteanus as innocent, but it becomes clear that *Corona Regia* probably had been the work of a few men, and not of a single author. Flavius confessed that Puteanus had corrected the proofs of the libel²²³. Trumbull sent king James in 1624 all the relevant documents, including Flavius's testimony of 1621²²⁴. Trumbull implored king James to forgive Flavius, for his only offence was printing *Corona Regia*,

*for wch cryme (though exorbitant) he hath through misery (I speake under all humble correction) ben well punished already: and his lyfe, peradventure, may be of more use to yor matie. in pusueinge the cheef Authors, then his death; wch would utterly ruyne his wyfe, and 4 poore innocent children*²²⁵.

Trumbull requested instructions and promised to do his utmost *for the removeinge of that rubbe, & settinge all things streight againe, for the finishinge of this great woorke, that nowe hath lasted almost as many yeares, as the Siege of Troy*²²⁶.

Sacred Sovereign. An ample plain & true relation (which with all humbleness I present to yr. Maj. Will, I hope, give yr. Maj. Satisfaction in some sort and sufficiently decare the restless endeavours done by me and through my means for the discovery & punishment of those souless villains that have sought by the instigation of the devil to blast yr. Maj.'s untainted reputation in a most false and pernicious libel under the forged title of Is. Casauboni Corona Regia. Every article of the said relation, I doubt not, may be justified either by authenticate writing in my possession or proved by the testimony of credible witnesses. The principal points thereof are confirmed by the annexed legal depositions of Flavius, those of Henry Taylor and Jan Van Once (though taken extrajudicialiter) because I could not have them any other way; Lambert Sauveur, Gilles Godde of Liege; from John Sauveur, canon of St. Bartholomew's in that city, whom I cannot get judicially examined by reason of the pope's nuncio's interdiction, I have matter enough under his own hand to supply that defect besides some original letters of Damseau unto Flavius to verify my accusations against them and convince them, if anything will do it, of the abominable crime wherewith they stand charged. Putidus Puteanus with his tergivisations, equivocations &

²²² Tournoy, 'Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon and the author of the *Corona Regia*', 387-388.

²²³ SP 77/17 f^o 120r-126v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 6/16 May 1624.

²²⁴ SP 77/17 f^o 161r-162v, *Examination of Chr. Flavius*, May 1624; SP 77/17 f^o 163r-185r, *Seven papers concerning Corona Regia*, May 1624.

²²⁵ SP 77/17 f^o 126r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 6/16 May 1624.

²²⁶ SP 77/16 f^o 126v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 6/16 May 1624.

*impudent denials cannot wash out his foul spot, that are more than enough manifested by Flavius, his depositions & testament sent by this bearer, John Woolley and those of Taylor, Van Once & Lambert Sauveur*²²⁷.

The depositions of Lambert Sauveur and Gilles Godde accused Roberti and Damseau of sheltering Flavius²²⁸.

Trumbull compared his efforts to get satisfaction for king James in the matter of *Corona Regia* to the battle of Hercules against Hydra and the Siege of Troy. Published in 1615 it took Trumbull over eight years to bring the case to an end. James died ten months later in March 1625.

²²⁷ SP 77/17 f^o 186r-186v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 7/17 May 1624.

²²⁸ SP 77/17 f^o 126v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussel, 6/26 May 1624.

Chapter 6 Agent for the *Rex Pacificus*

Rex Pacificus is one of the titles James VI/I enjoyed already in his own day and age. Smuts argues that James's *intellectual commitment to peace has been more often been taken for granted than closely examined*. For some contemporaries and later historians it was a sign of weakness. Others were more sympathetic, as already has been discussed in the introduction¹. Observe and report was the core duty of an ambassador or an agent at a foreign court. During the Eighty Years' War (1578-1648) there was a long interval of peace between the Catholic Southern Netherlands and the Protestant Northern Netherlands, the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621). During the tenure of William Trumbull as resident agent of James VI/I at the court of Albert and Isabella this truce came under immense stress. International relations were strained at the best of times, even before the start of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). The Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)² had all the ingredients to start a full blown European war and can be considered the prelude for the general European conflict which would ravage Europe for three decades, as is apparent in several studies, e.g. *Vorspiel zum Dreissigjährigen Krieg* and a chapter in Andersons recent book *On the verge of war*, 'The Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises and the Thirty Years' War'³. This was the ideal time for king James to achieve his aspirations as peacemaker in Europe and go down into history as the *Rex Pacificus*. An important job was laid aside for the diplomats of the king of peace.

The northwestern part of Germany was of strategic importance, argues Israel, for two reasons: religious and geographical. It was dominated by ecclesiastical territories (e.g. the electorate of Cologne and the prince-bishoprics of Münster, Osnabrück and Paderborn), which, according to the Peace of Augsburg (1555), had to remain Catholic. The urban population of this region, however, had Protestant sympathies⁴. As the most important secular territories in the region, Jülich, Kleve and their dependencies were equally appealing to both Protestants and Catholics. Besides its religious importance it was also strategically located at the border of the empire with the Catholic Southern Netherlands and the Protestant Northern Netherlands. In 1605 and 1606 Jülich and Kleve were instrumental in the attack of Spinola on the United Provinces (via Overijssel and Friesland). If the United Provinces controlled the disputed territories the direct link between the Southern Netherlands and the electorate of Cologne would be severed⁵. During the first half of the sixteenth century there had been religious tolerance in both duchies. The three eldest daughters of Wilhelm V (1516-1592), duke of Jülich and Kleve, were raised as Protestants and married Protestant princes. By 1600 the court of the duke was back in the Catholic camp but large Protestant groups lived throughout his territories. Because of the influx of Dutchmen the duchy of Kleve had become Calvinist

¹ Smuts, 'The making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI/I and the problem of peace in an age of religious war', 371-372.

² Recently Alison D. Anderson published a detailed account of the Jülich-Kleve crises which I used as reference for the source material. Unless otherwise stated this part is based on her work; *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*.

³ Ollmann-Kösling, *Der Erbfolgestreit um Jülich-Kleve. Ein Vorspiel zum Dreissigjährigen Krieg*.

⁴ Israel, *Conflicts of Empires. Spain, the Low Countries and the Struggle for World Supremacy 1585-1713*, 24.

⁵ Maland, *Europe at War 1600-1650*, 40-44.

and pro-Dutch. Berg and Mark were moderately Lutheran. Jülich, however, remained largely pro-Spanish and Catholic⁶.

It is small wonder that these strategically important duchies with their religious identities were a matter of international concern. A complete confessional war between Protestants and Catholics in Europe was one of the more dire possibilities. The question of succession for the duchies of Jülich, Kleve and Berg and the counties of Mark, Ravensberg and Ravenstein was already raised during the reign of Wilhelm V, although the real problems arose after the death of his son and successor, Johann Wilhelm (1562-1609). Emperor Charles V had given Wilhelm two privileges. The *Privilegium Unionis* stated that the duchies, which had been united since 1521, would continue as one single inheritance⁷. The *Privilegium Successionis* gave female descendants the right to inherit the duchies if the male line failed. Neither the reign of Wilhelm V nor that of his son Johann Wilhelm was considered strong due to the weak health of the first and the mental illness of the second⁸.

In 1618 the Thirty Years' War broke out which would ravage Europe in general and the Holy Roman Empire in particular. Bohemia offered the elector Palatine, Frederick V, the crown of Bohemia. Frederick asked James advice on the matter. This placed king James in a difficult position. A strong advocate of the divine right of kings he could hardly agree with such an election. According to James, Christ had come to earth to *teach Subjects obedience to the king*⁹. Frederick did not wait on the advice and accepted the crown. War broke out on two fronts, in Bohemia and in northwestern part of Germany. The elector and electress Palatine went to Bohemia at about the same time archduke Ferdinand, who had been the intended king of Bohemia, became emperor of the Holy Roman Empire¹⁰. James did not defend Frederick's Bohemian crown. The situation became more complicated when Spain invaded and occupied the elector's ancestral lands. James tried to secure a deal with the Habsburg occupiers to restitute Frederick's ancestral lands. While especially the second Jülich-Kleve succession crisis already had entailed some international diplomacy on behalf of James, this new conflict gave rise to several missions to the emperor, the exiled elector Palatine, the archdukes and the Spanish king. The second part of his solution was the Spanish Match, for which negotiations had been ongoing for years. The territory conquered by Spain could simply be considered part of the dowry of the Spanish infanta intended for prince Charles¹¹. Both schemes failed. While some historians tend to consider James's foreign policy as a complete failure, it is reasonable to assume that a specific set of circumstances led to the failure of his policy, which his idealism could not change.

⁶ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 20-21; Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 16-22.

⁷ This can be compared to the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles V in 1549 which concerned the inheritance of the XVII Provinces.

⁸ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 21-22.

⁹ Croft, *King James*, 106; Notestein, Relf, and Simpson, *Commons Debates 1621*, vi, 370.

¹⁰ Croft, *King James*, 106.

¹¹ Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match', 114; Add. MS. 4181 f^o 14-16; White, 'Suspension of arms: Anglo-Spanish mediation, 1621-1625', 132-300.

The First Jülich-Kleve Crisis

With the death of Johann Wilhelm in March 1609 there were several claimants to assume government of this strategically located region. Heinrich Van Nort reported to Trumbull from Neuburg,

que tout ce pays de Cleves et Juliers est alteré par le mort du ducq et entre aultres choses il y at eu partie de cavaliers du pays qui ont mis les armoiries du Prince d'Brandenbourg à la porte du palais et en une porte de la ville de Cleves, et en Juliers at eu aulcunes qui ont affigé aux portes de la ville les armoiries de cely de Ombourg et ainsi vont en differences etouldroit sortir quelque petite guere. De ce que Jentendroy vous advertiray. En Juliers se levent de soldats et en le pays de Berch, lesquels sont jointcs ensemble¹².

The two strongest claimants came through the female lines of the Protestant sisters of the deceased duke. The claims of the elector Johann Sigismund of Brandenburg passed through the eldest sister of Johan Wilhelm, Marie Eleonore. She had married the Albrecht Friedrich (1553-1618), duke of Prussia. As they had no sons, the claim passed to her eldest daughter, Anne, who had married the elector of Brandenburg. Other claimants disputed this line of reasoning, especially Philip Ludwig (1547-1614) of Neuburg, count Palatine, the husband of the second eldest sister of Johann Wilhelm, Anne. His argument was that the duchies were to pass to the eldest male from the female lines, which happened to be his son, Wolfgang Wilhelm (1578-1653)¹³. The *Privilegium Successionis* did not detail which which line of succession was the correct one. To complicate matters further the *Privilegium* had never been confirmed formally by an Imperial Diet nor by emperor Rudolf, which entailed that Rudolf could dispose of the duchies as he pleased according to the laws of the empire¹⁴.

In a confessionally split Holy Roman Empire it was impossible to find an impartial arbitrator who was acceptable to all sides. Neuburg was convinced of the superiority of his claim and was willing to seek support for it wherever he could get it: German or foreign, Catholic or Protestant. Brandenburg already had sued for support from the United Provinces¹⁵. In April 1605 Brandenburg, the United Provinces and the elector of Brandenburg signed a formal alliance which assured Brandenburg of assistance from the Dutch. By the start of June, margrave Ernst, representing Brandenburg, and Wolfgang Wilhelm had arrived in Dortmund. They reached an agreement, the Treaty of Dortmund, which entailed a joint administration by both of them until a definitive solution on the succession question had been reached. The claimants were to negotiate with each other because the Protestants were unwilling recognise the authority of the

¹² HMCD, ii, 89, Van Nort to Trumbull, Neuburg, 14 April 1609.

¹³ For a detailed account of the different claims see Appendix I, Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 249-251; Ritter, *Sachsen und der Jülicher Erbfolgestreit*; Gorissen e.a., *150 Jahre Landkreis Kleve*; Roggendorf, 'Die Politik der Pfalzgrafen van Neuburg um Jülich-Klevischen Erbfolgestreit'.

¹⁴ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 22-23; Lee, *James I & Henry IV. An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603-1610*, 146-147.

¹⁵ For the diplomatic relations between both see, Siccama, *Schets van de diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Brandenburg 1596-1678*.

Aulic Council of the Empire. If this failed a group of impartial princes would take a decision. All this was to be accomplished within a mere twelve months¹⁶.

During the first crisis (1609-1610) William Trumbull was kept informed by several correspondents: William Beecher (*bap.* 1580-1651)¹⁷ in Paris, Jean de Villiers Hotman in Düsseldorf and the encampment near Jülich, Henry Bilderbeck (born in Ghent¹⁸) in Cologne and Sir Ralph Winwood in The Hague. Sir Thomas Edmondes left Brussels in September 1609 and Trumbull remained behind as chargé d'affaires and was still on the payroll of Sir Thomas. He originally sent all his dispatches to Edmondes keeping him posted of several issues, including the military preparations that were being made in Jülich-Kleve¹⁹. Edmondes then passed his dispatches on to Salisbury. Trumbull was very succinct in those reports. The most important news in this phase was the visit of archduke Leopold to Albert and Isabella in October 1609. Trumbull's dispatch to Edmondes on the subject was short, but from the second half of November onwards Trumbull started corresponding directly with Salisbury. From that dispatch the international interest in Jülich and Kleve becomes clear.

Archduke Leopold complicated an already intricate business. Leopold, bishop of Passau, Strasbourg and nephew of emperor Rudolf, suggested decisive action in Northwestern Germany. Rudolf appointed him as administrator of Jülich-Kleve and all the dependencies which had fallen without a ruler until the succession issues would be resolved. The United Provinces were afraid that Habsburg rule by the emperor, Rudolf or Mathias, would eventually result in Spanish rule by Albert and Spinola²⁰. Archduke Leopold intended to drive Neuburg and Brandenburg out of the disputed territories. He arrived in July 1609 and the commander of the town and castle of Jülich, Johann von Rausenberg, willingly surrendered city and castle into the hands of the imperial administrator²¹.

During the fall of 1609 Leopold visited the archdukes seeking support. The visit to the court in Hainaut did not go down well. The Spanish ambassador, according to Trumbull, characterized Leopold as an imbecile. Leopold first was unwilling to appear before the infanta in his worldly clothes and not as a bishop; furthermore he could not speak any other language than his mother tongue and finally he had only one councillor, his confessor with him, who was a Jesuit. The councillor's advice was surely aimed at bringing about his own ideas and further the interests of his order, Trumbull feared. The French ambassador in Brussels informed his English counterpart of a conference he had had with Spinola. The representative of Henry IV of France²² had accused the archdukes

¹⁶ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 34-35; Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 19-20.

¹⁷ Baron, 'Becher, Sir William (*bap.* 1580, *d.* 1651)'.

¹⁸ HMCD, iv, 502, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 2 September 1614 (n.s.).

¹⁹ HMCD, ii, 122-123, draft, Trumbull to Edmondes, Brussels, 13 September 1609; HMCD, ii, 135-136, draft, Trumbull to Edmondes, Brussels 25 September 1609; HMCD, ii, 152-153, draft, Trumbull to Edmondes, Brussels, 12 October 1609; HMCD, ii, 159, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondes], Brussels, 18 October 1609; HMCD, ii, 164-165, draft, Trumbull to [Edmondes], Brussels, 25 October 1609.

²⁰ Maland, *Europe at war, 1600-1650*, 40-44; Lee, *James I & Henry IV*, 147.

²¹ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 39 and 48.

²² For more information on Henry IV and the Jülich-Kleve crises, besides Anderson, see especially, Dickerman, 'Henry IV and the Juliers-Clèves crisis: the Psychohistorical Aspects'.

of supplying money to Leopold to continue the war. The money Leopold had, he reasoned, had to come from them. The emperor only had his revenue of Bohemia which was scarcely enough to cover the costs of his own court. Leopold himself had only his rent from the bishopric, which did not amount to much. President Richardot protested to that argumentation. The treasury in the Southern Low Countries was depleted due to the only recently concluded conflict with the United Provinces. The little money there was, would be spent for the archdukes's own use. According to the French ambassador, however, the money for Leopold came from Spain. Trumbull concurred with Richardot on the lack of treasury money in the Archducal Netherlands on which he frequently reported²³.

Meanwhile Henry IV had supported the Treaty of Dortmund. He did not much care who got possession of the disputed territories, as long as it was not the Habsburg family. The Dortmund Treaty was welcomed in Paris, London and The Hague. France was mobilizing an army of 30.000 men for Jülich-Kleve and the Spanish Netherlands. Henry's displeasure with the archdukes also concerned a personal matter. As he wanted Charlotte de Montmorency as his mistress he had let her marry the young prince de Condé. That prince of the blood, however, refused to comply. Charlotte fled to Brussels and was followed by her husband at the end of 1609. Henry IV was convinced that the archdukes had known the couple's intentions, but does not seem to have been the case. Spinola wrote to Spain asking Philip III what had to be done. The Spanish monarch answered within the month that de Condé had to be protected.

At the same time de la Boderie, the French ambassador at the court of James, told James that Henry IV supported both possessionary princes and that he wanted to remove, peacefully or forcibly if necessary, Leopold from Jülich. The ambassador had been instructed to find out if England would join such an alliance. James, according to Lee, was unwilling to let the French act on their own and at the end of January 1610 it was decided that 4.000 men from England would join the expedition. James, however, hoped that Leopold could be frightened out of Jülich. The French-English negotiations were difficult. It was apparent during the spring of 1610 that Henry was levying more troops than he originally had given out and that Spinola was also preparing a major force to hinder the French king although this not necessarily meant that the French troops were levied for Jülich-Kleve or the Spanish Netherlands. Wotton reported rumours of a plot between France and Savoy²⁴.

Henry IV was murdered before he could attack which simplified the matter and saved the James VI/I *from an entirely unlooked-for and unwelcome involvement in a major war*, as Lee phrases it²⁵. The English agent did nothing more during this first crisis than report: preparations for war, consultations, a.s.o. Leopold's troops were defeated on several occasions. By mid-May 1610 he was suing for a conference to end the hostilities. He travelled to Brussels to bring it about. By the end of the month he announced his departure and intended to travel to his bishopric and afterwards to Prague. Archduke Albert gave him 26.000 Crowns and ammunition to be sent to Jülich.

²³ HMCD, ii, 477-480, draft, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 22 November 1609.

²⁴ Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, 157-158, 166.

²⁵ Maland, *Europe at war, 1600-1650*, 40-44; Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, 158-167.

Because of the murder of the French king Winwood was afraid that the plans would be changed²⁶. Preparations for war continued in the following months²⁷. Prince Maurice of Nassau and prince Christian of Anhalt-Bernburg (1568-1630) besieged Jülich which was still being defended by von Rauschenberg at the start of August. The commander hoped he would receive help from the archdukes. Albert seemed willing to send assistance as he ordered all troops to march towards Maastricht. Trumbull, however, did not believe they would undertake anything, stating that

In the mean time for the conserving of their Reputation, they will make this Spanish bravado to put you in fear, but as I am informed, not to hurt you; nevertheless it is not amiss that you should stand up your Guard to prevent the worst.

At the same time Albert and Isabella suggested to sequester Jülich into the hands of Philip William of Nassau (1554-1618)²⁸, who was the prince of Orange, or François de Bassompierre until the matter of the succession was resolved by the delegates of the emperor who were expected within the month in Cologne. A fortnight later Edmondes affirmed Trumbull's intuition that the archdukes would not intervene. They did not want to endanger the Truce and moreover they lacked the means. Rauschenberg capitulated at the start of September 1610²⁹. Peace was concluded within one week and the date by which all foreign troops had to leave the disputed territories was set at 27 September³⁰. By mid-September 1611 the armies of the anti-imperial allies had left Jülich and Kleve and international interest shifted away from the region. Internal difficulties in the joint-administration now became more apparent. Emperor Rudolf had not helped archduke Leopold and archdukes Albert and Isabella had not entered the fray, but Brandenburg and Neuburg were not reconciled with the emperor and his allies.

²⁶ HMCD, ii, 287-288, More ot Trumbull, London, 3 May 1610; HMCD, ii, 283, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, C[Ologne], 6 May 1610; HMCD, ii, 290-292, Winwood to Trumbull, The Hague, 9 May 1610; HMCD, ii, 292, Hotman to Trumbull, Düsseldorf, 9 May 1610; WM, iii, 172, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 May 1610; WM, iii, 176, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 28 May 1610; Sawyer (ed.), *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I*, from now on WM, iii, 179, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 June 1610; HMCD, ii, 305-306, Winwood to Trumbull, The Hague, 3 June 1610.

²⁷ HMCD, ii, 306, Hotman to Trumbull, Düsseldorf, 6 June 1610; HMCD, ii, 306-307, Hotman to Trumbull, Düsseldorf, 10 June 1610.

²⁸ Van der Aa, 'Filips Willem'.

²⁹ HMCD, ii, 329, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 5 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 329, Hotman to Trumbull, Düsseldorf, 5 August 1610; WM, iii, 203-204, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 340-341, Hotman to Trumbull, Düsseldorf, 11 August 1610; HMCD, ii 341-342, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 12 August 1610; WM, iii, 207-208, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 15 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 343-344, Hotman to Trumbull, Camp near Jülich, 18 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 350-351, Edmondes to Trumbull, Paris, 18 August 1610; HMCD, ii 344, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 19 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 346-347, Hotman to Trumbull, Hambach, 24 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 347-348, More to Trumbull, London, 16 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 348, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, s.l., 27 August 1610 (n.s.?): HMCD, ii, 349-350, Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris, 18 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 354; Beaulieu to Trumbull, Paris 25 August 1610; HMCD, ii, 351, Hotman to Trumbull, camp near Jülich, 1 September 1610; HMCD, ii, 352, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 2 September 1610; HMCD, ii, 355, Hotman to Trumbull, camp near Jülich, 4 September 1610.

³⁰ HMCD, ii, 357-358, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, [Cologne], 8 September 1610; Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 21.

Dissatisfied with his Protestant connections Neuburg looked for Catholic allies³¹. In 1612 he sought the support of the archdukes. To that end he sent a man twice or thrice in secret, according to Trumbull. Because of his own religion and the hatred of the archdukes against Protestantism this probably yielded no direct assurance unless Neuburg was prepared to hand over the fortifications of Mulheim and restore the magistracy of Aachen. A month later, in February 1613, Trumbull had more information on these visits. Albert and Isabella had given commission to the governor of Rheinberg to aid Neuburg with forces and to open the gates of the town if he was assailed or molested by Brandenburg³².

The Second Jülich-Kleve crisis

The second crisis started with the entrance of the troops of Maurice of Nassau in Jülich in May 1614 at the request of Brandenburg³³. By that time Ernest (1583-1613), margrave of Brandenburg, had died and had been succeeded by the elector of Brandenburg an adherent of Calvinism³⁴. Trumbull informed James VI/I of the surprise this had caused. Ways were being explored by which Neuburg could be assisted. In February 1613 a French Jesuit, Gontier, had been sent to Neuburg to try and convert Neuburg. In May Neuburg attended the mass of the Feast of the Holy Trinity in Düsseldorf³⁵. His marriage to the daughter of Maximilian (1573-1651), duke of Bavaria also gave rise to rumours of his conversion to Catholicism. Trumbull was only able to corroborate this in May 1614³⁶. Neuburg sent Sir Griffin Markham to confirm his obedience to the pope. Promptly, archdukes Albert and Isabella sent count Ottavio Visconti to congratulate him on his conversion and to promise him membership of the Order of the Golden Fleece and, more importantly, support from Spain. Although there were large preparations in the Southern Netherlands, Trumbull was sure that it would come to nothing, stating, *notwithstanding all these bravados, the wiser sorte of people do beleve, that the Archd. will not really engage himself in a warre for the Palat. of Newbourg.* Margrave Ernst, Brandenburg's regent, turned to Calvinism as early as 1610, the elector of Brandenburg, Johann Sigismund followed suit in 1613, and found support with his co-religionists in the United Provinces³⁷.

After the failure of a conference at Wesel in June 1614 new mobilisations of troops were undertaken. The mobilisation of new infantry and cavalry gave the archdukes an large army: 22.000 footmen and 2.000 cavaliers. The emperor would levy an army between 18.000 and 20.000 men under command of the count of Bucquoy. It was unclear what these new preparations meant. Was it to force France into an alliance with Spain?

³¹ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 132-133.

³² SP 77/10 f^o 249r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 30 December 1612; SP 77/10 f^o 260r-260v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 11 February 1613.

³³ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 163.

³⁴ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 29.

³⁵ SP 77/10 f^o 260r-260v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 11 February 1613.

³⁶ Anderson places his conversion in May 1613, but the archival material in the Trumbull correspondence suggest that this conversion was only effected a year later.

³⁷ Van Deursen, *Maurits van Nassau. De winnaar die faalde*, 247; Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 21.

Was it a preparation for the possible death of archduke Albert to affirm the control of Spain in the Southern Netherlands? Was it a preparation against England and the United Provinces if a good opportunity presented itself? Supporting Neuburg, according to Trumbull, was only a pretext.

Trumbull warned Albert in an audience in July 1614 not to use force against the United Provinces, direct or indirect. The fact that they had conquered some areas in Jülich and Kleve was not out of ambition to enlarge their own territory but to secure their own territories. Once peace was made between Brandenburg and Neuburg they would retreat. The English agent further assured Albert that James VI/I would support Neuburg in any just cause, despite his conversion. Trumbull emphasised that the only party that would gain anything in a conflict were the Turks, the common enemies of Christian Europe, who awaited the ideal moment to attack the house of Austria, *bulwarke of christendome*. Albert agreed with Trumbull on many issues. He could however not accept that the United Provinces would set themselves up as arbitrator between Brandenburg and Neuburg. It was after all an imperial matter. The reasons the United Provinces gave to justify their presence in Jülich equally applied to the Southern Netherlands, Albert alleged. King James was intending to send an ambassador, Sir Henry Wotton, to The Hague to convince the Republic to give Jülich in the hands of a neutral prince. If the ambassador was dispatched quickly war could be avoided, but Albert could not tolerate their presence in the disputed territories, *no una hora*.

Trumbull also visited the marquis of Spinola who professed gratitude towards king James for his honest drive towards peace and assured the agent that the king would further enhance that image if he could convince the Republic to give up Jülich³⁸. In August the Republic informed the archdukes in writing that they did not want to undertake anything to endanger the Truce. The mobilisations they were preparing were only to defend the elector of Brandenburg and the Palzgrave of Neuburg. They had no further interest in Jülich³⁹. While Wotton was treating with the Protestants in the North, the troops in the Southern Netherlands kept marching eastwards. In August Trumbull reported secret negotiations in Brussels. Participants were Schomberg and Efferne for Mainz, Vander Vele and Metternich for Treves and Aldenhove for Cologne. The English agent had been unable to ascertain what the purpose of the secret conference was. He was nevertheless convinced that two issues were being discussed: the support of the archdukes for Neuburg and the choice of the next *romanorum rex* to assure the continuation of the Habsburgs to the imperial crown⁴⁰.

Although Trumbull was kept apprised of what happened in London concerning the Jülich-Kleve crisis, he was also in close contact with Sir Henry Wotton, whom king James had sent as his ambassador extraordinary to The Hague and later to Xanten. The English agent was informed by the secretary of state of Wotton's mission mid-July. The principal aim was to try and persuade the States of the United Provinces to satisfy the demands of the archdukes and sequester the town and castle of Jülich to a neutral prince. Wotton had to suggest the names of Maurice, Landgrave of Hessen, Christian of Anhalt and the prince of Orange, brother of Maurice of Nassau, a subject of the archdukes residing in the

³⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 102r-108r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19 July 1614.

³⁹ SP 77 11 f^o 119r, copy, States General to Archdukes, 8 August 1614 (n.s.?).

⁴⁰ SP 77/11 f^o 121r-122v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels 3 August 1614.

Southern Netherlands⁴¹. On his way to The Hague Wotton asked Trumbull *to give him from thence where you are as much light as may be*⁴². Of the three names mentioned, Albert informed James that he preferred the prince of Orange. His ambassador in London treated with the king to limit the choice to that man. Winwood did write to Wotton informing him of this, but doubted the United Provinces would yield to the demand. Moreover the archducal diplomat in London requested the dismantlement of a part of the castle of Jülich, but the king held that *frivolous, if not ridiculous*, Winwood assured Trumbull⁴³.

Sir Henry sent Trumbull Francesco Biondi as a courier from The Hague with letters to the archdukes. Although Biondi was born in Venice, he migrated to England because of religion. He was a valuable man, *trained in great and secret affairs*. King James had given him an annuity of £ 100 for life. Trumbull was requested by Wotton to intercede with Albert and Isabella. According to Wotton, the States General of the Republic were prepared to resolve the situation peacefully. As he had been informed of the imminent departure of Spinola, Wotton requested the archduke to undertake nothing for the time being⁴⁴. Trumbull and Biondi visited Spinola who seemed to be prepared to give concessions. He assured both diplomats that the army had been assembled and was ready. To keep it in the field doing nothing cost too much. If the United Provinces left Jülich, then there was no more reason for concern. A few days later Spinola left for the field, but Trumbull did not know what his objective was: Jülich, Aachen or Mulheim. The rendez-vous for the army was Maastricht where Spinola had gathered a formidable force, 18.000 infantrymen and 3.000 cavalierists⁴⁵. Archduke Alber's discourse did not differ from that of Spinola. He promised to abide by the Twelve Years' Truce if the United Provinces did the same. He professed to be prepared to listen once they had relinquished Jülich to the possessionary princes or a neutral party. Albert guaranteed he would read through the letters of Wotton and give his answer through Louis Verreycken. The answer, however, remained the same: the United Provinces had to leave Jülich. Carrying letters for Wotton, Biondi departed for The Hague⁴⁶.

Wotton sent two couriers: one for England and one for Trumbull. Since his arrival in the United Provinces he had three audiences, and was now upon a fourth, but also had private conversations with Maurice of Nassau and Johan Oldenbarneveltdt. Trumbull was to inform Albert and Isabella that the United Provinces were resolved to accommodate the business of Jülich to satisfy the possessionary princes, the archdukes, and the monarchs of Great Britain and France. Wotton reiterated that the sovereigns of the Southern Low Countries would best keep their army stationary, otherwise any movement could be matched by the Republic⁴⁷. Trumbull had an audience with the archduke on 15 August. He followed Wotton's instructions and assured Albert that he was expecting further details within four or five days for the solution of the crisis in

⁴¹ HMCD, iv, 456-457, Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 13 July [1614].

⁴² HMCD, iv, 476, Wotton to Trumbull, Gravesend, 29 July 1614.

⁴³ HMCD, iv, 482, Winwood to Trumbull, Burleigh, 5 August 1614.

⁴⁴ HMCD, iv, 483, Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 6 August 1614; HMCD, iv, 483, copy, Wotton to Archdukes, The Hague, 6 August 1614.

⁴⁵ Maland, *Europe at war, 1600-1650*, 40-44.

⁴⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 128r-130r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 August 1614.

⁴⁷ HMCD, iv, 488-489, Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 12 August 1614.

Jülich-Kleve. Meanwhile, he requested Albert to discontinue the marching orders of his army to avoid that this would be seen as an act of hostility. Albert did not change his stance and informed the English agent

that this army, being in a readiness and the season of the year far advanced, he could not either with his honour or profit, stand idle and lose the present opportunity for words and promises, which would beget the writing of letters to the two kings, the sending of messengers, treaties and such like, whereof the issue was doubtful and uncertain.

Trumbull insisted on four or five days. Albert yielded and promised to look into it and follow the best course to give Wotton contentment. He promised to wait for the next courier, unless the United Provinces acted⁴⁸.

François d'Aerssens (1572-1641)⁴⁹, Lord of Sommelsdijk and Dutch ambassador in France until 1613 at which time he returned to the United Provinces, advised Maurice of Nassau in French matters⁵⁰. He confirmed that Maurice was awaiting Trumbull's reply, *as he values your advices above all others which reach him from the place where you reside*. Spinola, according to d'Aerssens, had taken advantage of the present negotiations aimed at the sequestration of Jülich. The attack and fall of Aachen was, d'Aerssens was sure, clear evidence that whatever the design of the Catholics was, it would be detrimental to the Protestants⁵¹.

Aachen had been the first objective of the marquis of Spinola. Between the first and second Jülich-Kleve crisis Aachen pops up in the correspondence as a matter of concern that would become entwined with the succession crises. Problems rose between the citizens and the magistrate of the city during the summer of 1611, just before the end of the first crisis. During the uprising the rector of the Jesuit College had been hurt and the Jesuits had been driven out of the college. Trumbull did not know exactly on what grounds the troubles had started which did not mean he did not have any information. The magistrate, at the instance of the Jesuits, had forbidden the Protestants, the majority in the city, to attend their sermons. Some were imprisoned because they violated the order. Subsequently the other Protestants took the town hall, freed the prisoners and demanded liberty of conscience⁵². The emperor sent delegates to inform himself of the problems, the archdukes sent the governor of Maastricht, de Wespen, and a Privy Councillor, Van Achelen (*d.* 1624). The population of the city was still displeased and watchmen had been placed at the entrance of the city to protect the delegates at their arrival⁵³. At the end of October Trumbull received information from the French ambassador. In exchange for liberty of conscience the people of Aachen were prepared to accept the magistrate and the Jesuits back into Aachen. The English agent, however, had also heard that the difficulties persisted and that a resolution would be taken at Nurnberg. Aachen was put under the imperial ban and the emperor gave a commission to archduke Albert and the elector of Cologne. Neuburg and Brandenburg reacted by stating that

⁴⁸ HMCD, iv, 492-493, draft, Trumbull to Wotton, Brussels, 15 August 1614.

⁴⁹ Van der Aa, 'Aerssens (François van)'.

⁵⁰ Van Deursen, *Maurits van Nassau. De winnaar die faalde*, 249.

⁵¹ HMCD, iv, 496, D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 29 August 1614 (n.s.).

⁵² SP 77/10 f^o 94v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 4 July 1611.

⁵³ SP 77/10 f^o 103r-103v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 24 July 1611.

they to were Protestants of Aachen. With the help of the French the Jesuits were able to reassert their position and the magistrate's appointment was confirmed⁵⁴.

By 15 August Trumbull reported that all the Protestants had left Aachen. The Catholics had called Baltazar de Robiano, the archduke's commissioner and Folkert Van Achelen, of the Privy Council. They would, with two commissioners of the elector of Cologne, execute the emperor's sentence against the town⁵⁵. Henry, earl of Southampton, informed Trumbull of the whereabouts of the Army of Flanders. An English gentleman from Aachen told him that Spinola had divided his army in two parts and marched towards Jülich. Both parts were lodged within a mile of the city. Although the soldiers of the Republic assumed they would lay siege to Jülich, one part went towards Cologne, the other towards Rheinberg. Near Rheinberg a bridge was constructed which made an attack of Wesel more likely⁵⁶. Spinola had only just begun his march and had taken Duren, Kaster, Bergheim, Grevenbroich without resistance. According to Bilderbeck, pledging to the possessionary princes HERNBERG had resisted, but the Dutch agent in Cologne did not know what the outcome had been. Bilderbeck feared other towns would suffer the same fate if the United Provinces did not intervene. Spinola was on his way to Wesel. If it surrendered, Spinola would have Kleve and Mark firmly in his grip. Henry Bilderbeck was equally convinced that Wotton's current presence at The Hague was ill-timed because it held the republic back⁵⁷.

James was appalled with the taking of Aachen by Spinola in August 1614. Trumbull had already indicated that Albert was furious with the city and wanted to remove the magistrate. The English agent added that *moste do believe, that the P. of Newbourg, and the reste of the Romishe leagues in Germany, do conspire with the Archd., in these counsells, and deseignes; to exterpate (as much as they can) the profesours of the true Relligion*. Spinola sent two delegates, de Robiano and Van Achelen who were joined by two men from the elector of Cologne, to deliver the *Sentence of Proscription* of the emperor. The population requested fifteen days to consider it. Spinola threatened to breach their walls after which they readily surrendered. Albert demanded 200.000 thalers, the removal of the magistrate and the subjection by Aachen on all matters to the empire and his *Espanolised Counsell*⁵⁸. Secretary Winwood instructed Trumbull to complain of the taking of Aachen *in moderate and modest terms* assuring them that any ill that came of this was only because of their own actions. The English king, at the request of Albert, had sent an ambassador extraordinary for the sequestration of Jülich and now Albert had moved against Aachen. Albert, according to Trumbull's dispatch, listened attentively to his discourse and seemed to be touched by James's discontent. He assured Trumbull that he only did what the emperor commanded him and stressed that the people of Aachen were nothing but

⁵⁴ SP 77/10 f^o 139v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 31 October 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 143r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels 14 November 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 145r-157r, copy, *Commission*, Prague, 1 October 1611 (n.s.); SP 77/10 f^o 148v-149r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 20 November 1611; SP 77/10 f^o 153r, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 5 December 1611; SP 77/11 f^o 159r-159v, Trumbull to Salisbury, Brussels, 19 December 1611.

⁵⁵ HMCD, iv, 493, draft, Trumbull to Wotton, Brussels, 15 August 1614.

⁵⁶ HMCD, iv, 499, Southampton to Trumbull, Spa?, [20 August 1614 endorsement].

⁵⁷ HMCD, iv, 500-501, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 31 August 1614.

⁵⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 128r-130r, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 134r-135v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels 18 August 1614.

rebels. If the English king had seen all the information, he was sure James would side with the emperor⁵⁹.

Wesel was next on Spinola's list because it was of strategic importance as the Lippe discharges itself in the Rhine. Winwood was clear that if Spinola approached Wesel, *actum est or rather conclamatum est*, James VI/I would go to war. Sir Henry Wotton had been instructed to ask the United Provinces to defend Wesel if it was besieged. Winwood only told Trumbull this to keep him up-to-date, and not so that he could make it public. At the same time Abbot confirmed the displeasure of James with the Albert's dealing with Aachen and confirmed his readiness to go to war if Wesel should be taken. Abbot however added, *I am only sure that our preparations for war are weak and whatsoever we say, we do nothing*⁶⁰.

Trumbull had a keen view on the importance of the city of Wesel. D'Aerssens informed the English agent that Maurice of Nassau had followed Trumbull's advice and had given *orders for securing the places you mentioned*. He again stressed that Wotton had made the Republic temporize and insisted that Spinola would do nothing during the negotiations. These negotiations had given the marquis the opportunity to overrun the disputed country. He now reaffirmed that thought. Although the Dutch army was in readiness, it was by the strong persuasion of Wotton that the United Provinces trusted that Spinola would undertake nothing. Maurice was on his way to Wesel, if he arrived in time, little harm would be done to the city. Despite being reinforced by 1,500 soldiers under the command of Ernst of Nassau Wesel fell into the hands of Spinola. Bilderbeck informed Trumbull that the siege had only taken three or four days. One thousand Spaniards and Italians would be stationed in the city. The exercise of the reformed religion, however, was still permitted. Bilderbeck could not understand why the United Provinces had not lent more assistance⁶¹.

Winwood informed Trumbull of the most likely course that would be taken in the United Provinces. The castle of Jülich would be dismantled and in the city a garrison would be placed which consisted of a company of French, English, Dutch for the Princes of the Protestant Union, and one for the States General; 100 men each. King James agreed with the proposal if the archduke dismissed his army and if Neuburg gave Brandenburg free entrance to Düsseldorf. Trumbull was instructed to inform Albert and remind him of the promises de Boisshot had made in London. If Albert refused, it was clear he had other intentions, either to attack the United Provinces or the Protestant Princes in Germany, which king James was bound, by treaty and reason of state, to protect and maintain⁶².

Trumbull was as peace loving as James himself. Receiving information that the United Provinces were prepared to deliver Jülich into the hands of an ambassador until Neuburg and Brandenburg had reached an agreement, he went to the French ambassador, de Preaux. Trumbull's counterpart did not want to undertake anything until

⁵⁹ HMCD, iv, 503, Winwood to Trumbull, Grafton, 23 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 144r-147r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 September 1614.

⁶⁰ HMCD, iv, 503, Winwood To Trumbull, Grafton, 23 August 1614; HMCD, iv, 514, Abbot to Trumbull, Croydon, 31 August 1614.

⁶¹ HMCD, iv, 504-505, D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 5 September 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 508-509, D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 7 September 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, iv, 509, Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 8 September 1614 (n.s.); SP 77/11 f^o 142v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 August 1614.

⁶² HMCD, iv, 507, Winwood to Trumbull, 26 August 1614.

the French ambassador to The Hague, Eustache Du Reffuge (c. 1564-1617), was returning to Paris. De Preaux was convinced that travelling to Albert and Isabella in Ghent would prove to be pointless. He expected that their answers would be vague. The French ambassador thought it a better course to inform Peckius and other members of the Privy Council. They, in their turn, could inform their masters in Ghent. Trumbull followed the advice of his colleague. As Peckius was absent, both ambassadors met with the Spanish ambassador, the Dominican confessor of Albert and a councillor of state. De Preaux did the talking and informed them of what had been accomplished in the United Provinces. Dumaurier and Wotton were ready to depart to Kleve and Düsseldorf, but were refrained from doing so when they heard the French court sent Du Reffuge as special ambassador to the United Provinces to resolve the case. De Preaux also referred to a decree passed in the United Provinces of 27 August for the sequestration of Jülich into the hands of the French and English ambassadors extraordinary. The councillors and advisers professed to be pleased with the news but informed the two diplomats that they had no authority to treat in the matter. After protesting Trumbull and de Preaux set their arguments down in writing which were sent to Ghent. It took ten days before Trumbull finally obtained an answer. He would have solicited for an answer sooner, but *subjected to the higher powers, I was forced to undergo those directions, and to sail by another man's compass*. Albert was at that time still at Ghent, but was pleased with the report De Preaux had made and would keep his promise once the Republic had sequestered Jülich, as the Spanish ambassador elaborated. The answer was only in general terms which was much to the disappointment of both diplomats. Du Reffuge arrived in Brussels on 3 September. Du Reffuge was instructed to join Wotton in The Hague and undertake nothing without him. The answer he got from Peckius after an audience with Albert was again only in general terms, which gave him little hope when he set forward to The Hague⁶³.

While the capture of places in Jülich-Kleve by Spinola and Maurice of Nassau continued, rumours circulated of possible negotiations to end the hostilities. By the 21 September there was even talk of a possible truce on the verge of being concluded or even already concluded. Spinola was speeding up the building of his fort in Wesel to be able to have his troops winter in Jülich. Neuburg had given the marquis the command of his troops⁶⁴. Spinola was expected to start campaigning in Jülich in the spring of 1615. The English agent feared that once Wesel had been conquered nothing could stop the marquis from occupy more land for Neuburg at the cost of Brandenburg. The recently converted Neuburg would be a dangerous neighbour of the United Provinces and the Palatinate. Trumbull voiced his own opinion writing to Winwood. He was convinced that the James VI/I should arm himself to bring the marquis of Spinola to reason⁶⁵.

The blame for the loss of Wesel was assigned to Sir Henry Wotton and to a lesser extent William Trumbull. This is evident from the letters of François d'Aerssens, Sir Edward Cecil and those of Wotton himself. François d'Aerssens had already indicated

⁶³ SP 77/11 f^o 142v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 August 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 144r-147r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9 September 1614.

⁶⁴ SP 77/11 f^o 150r-151v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 14 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 157r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels 21 September 1614

⁶⁵ HMCd, iv, 518, draft, Trumbull to Wotton, Brussels, 31 August 1616; SP 77/11 f^o 160v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 29 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 163r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 29 September 1614.

that it was only the insistence of Sir Henry that had stopped the United Provinces for intervening further in Jülich and Kleve. D'Aerssens had little hope for the future. The United Provinces were ready to redress what had happened in the duchy of Jülich and he was of the opinion that it was James VI/I's duty to assist. D'Aerssens did not expect anything from France except *lavish advice* and the Protestant princes of Germany were too slow and supine. As such the United Provinces, d'Aerssens confessed, were *too weak to crack the Spaniards everywhere*, but that was not because of lack of courage. Pierre Dathenes, secretary of the elector Palatine, shared d'Aerssens's opinion and blamed Wotton for Spinola's advance. Wotton reported as much in September 1614. Sir Henry Wotton informed Trumbull in October 1614 that they both were being blamed for the loss of Wesel *by intertayninge the States with assurance that the Archdukes promise to dessit from proceedings with their armie for some fowre of five dayes*. Trumbull had indeed passed on that information, but with no assurance if it was to be trusted. Peckius and Spinola, however, denied that the Albert had made any such promise. *I praie Sir out of your owne memory, tell me the thruthe of it*, Wotton asked Trumbull. Trumbull referred to his letter written mid-August 1614. Wotton later assured Trumbull that he did not have to trouble himself any more. What he had written in August was with sufficient caution, as well as what Wotton had related to the States General in The Hague. He considered that part of the blame for the loss of Wesel was to be assigned to the city itself for the inhabitants never requested the assistance from the United Provinces. They only wanted to preserve their neutrality. Colonel Schomberg had offered to help them by levying a regiment which he would have maintained for a month, at his own charge, but they refused⁶⁶.

Sir Edward Parham served in Spinola's troops during the second Jülich-Kleve succession crisis and reported to Trumbull from near Wesel after the city was taken. He assured Trumbull that

*in Wesell, all the towne being of the religion [Protestant] only accepting seven or nine lay peeple and four religious charterows monks and to dominikins all living retired in ther cloyster. This is all ther flock, the residew are of the religion, posese all the churches and enjoy ther religion in as absalut maner as they did befor withowt any impediment in the world*⁶⁷.

After the capture of Wesel Wotton wanted to know what Albert had undertaken since the protests of Trumbull. Although the situation was direr, the ambassador extraordinary still believed in a peaceful solution. The chancellor of the duke of Neuburg, Johannes Zeschlinn, arrived in The Hague with new proposals that had been approved by Spinola. The present situation was described as armed neutrality. Since Spinola had taken Wesel, Maurice possessed himself of Emerick.

Wotton wished that the armies would now remain inactive until the arrival of Du Reffuge in The Hague. Du Reffuge traveled very slowly, but Wotton hoped that this was

⁶⁶ HMCD, v, 2 (letter 5), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, 11 September 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 12 (letter 31), Dathenes to Trumbull, 9 September 1614; HMCD, v, 20 (letter 51), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 15 September 1614; HMCD, v, 23 (letter 59), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague 1614; HMCD, v, 34 (letter 85), Wotton to Trumbull, Xanten, 11 October 1614; HMCD, v, 44 (letter 108), Cecil to Trumbull, Rees, 27 October 1614; HMCD, v, 46-47, Wotton to Trumbull, [Xanten], 27 October 1614.

⁶⁷ HMCD, v, 14 (letter 37), Parham to Trumbull, 20 September 1614.

unintentional⁶⁸. Du Reffuge finally arrived on 13 September and suggested a general suspension of hostilities. D'Aerssens reported this to be a matter of some difficulty, as it was what the marquis of Spinola already had suggested. Maurice of Nassau only wanted a truce that would last until May 1615 and only apply to those places which had not yet been taken. What was more, he suggested a provisional partition between Neuburg and Brandenburg. They would change residence every four months, while justice and public affairs would be administered jointly. All that remained to be done was awaiting Spinola's answer⁶⁹. The marquis issued a declaration that he would regard the town of Soest as neutral if Maurice and Brandenburg did the same⁷⁰.

Count Ottavio Visconti arrived from Spain at the end of September with money. Trumbull had been informed of his departure in Spain with bills of exchange worth 600,000 ducats by Gabriel Colford, an English merchant who normally resided in Brussels. This was proof enough for Trumbull that Spain was not yet finished with Jülich-Kleve, which was further confirmed by the reinforcement of Wesel. Du Reffuge in The Hague instructed de Preaux to turn once more to the Albert, but his answer remained the same. He was only willing to give up the places which had been conquered if the United Provinces did the like. At the request of Du Reffuge Albert was willing to send diplomats, as France and England had done. He, however, was unwilling to dispatch them to the United Provinces. According to De Preaux there was no shame in following in the footsteps of James VI/I. Furthermore, it would be difficult to find another convenient place to gather seeing that the States General of the United Provinces consisted of many members. De Preaux was convinced that if Albert *really desired to compose the troubles of Julyers: he should strayne himself somewhat propte bonum pacis, et tranquillitatis pub. rather than drawn backward upon puntillos of forme, and ceremony*. Albert finally agreed and sent Peter Peckius to United Provinces⁷¹.

Trumbull and others feared that Wesel would not be surrendered easily if it would be surrendered at all. Immediately after the conquest of the city an archducal councillor had affirmed just that, the English agent reported to his sovereign, adding,

I presume to signifie so much unto yor matie, to the ende, there may be more caution used, that wee bee not hereafter circumvented by the fraudulent Treatyes; as wee were at Boubourg in the yeare 1588, and nowe in the present Conference at the Haghe, about Aquisgrane, Mulhem, and Wesell.

Parham confirmed this opinion describing the manner in which the forces of Spinola entrenched themselves. In December there was a rumour of sending a bishop to Wesel to sanctify the church of the town and of sending Jesuits and Capuchins to help the citizens with their religion⁷².

⁶⁸ HMCD, v, 5 (letter 11), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 2 September 1614.

⁶⁹ HMCD, v, 20 (letter 51), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 15 September 1614; HMCD, v, 23-24 (letter 59), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague.

⁷⁰ HMCD, v, 25 (letter 64), *Declaration*, near Wesel, 2 October 1614 (n.s.).

⁷¹ HMCD, v, 24 (letter 62), Colford to Trumbull, [Madrid?], 21 September 1613 [*recte* 1614]; SP 77/11 f^o 159r-160v, Trumbull to Somerset, Brussels, 29 September 1614.

⁷² HMCD, v, 14 (letter 37), Parham to Trumbull, *From ovr quarter by Weessell*, 20 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 150r-151v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 14 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 159r, Trumbull to

The Treaty of Xanten

By mid-September 1614 Spinola organised a conference in Bislick near Xanten where his delegates, Don Giron and count Henry van den Berg (1593-1638)⁷³, met those of Maurice, de Marquette and Starckenberg. The proposals formulated by Spain were laughed at by the delegates of the United Provinces. Spinola's men proposed a truce for four years and that the two armies should retire but that the towns would remain in their present condition. Bilderbeck hoped that the States General would not agree to a truce, which would only give the Spanish side time to strengthen its position⁷⁴.

It was soon clear that negotiations with any hope of success would have to be held in a neutral place. Spinola retreated his garrison lodged in Xanten on condition that if the negotiations proved fruitless it would be returned to him. Delegates from England, France, the United Provinces, Cologne, the archdukes (Peter Peckius⁷⁵), Brandenburg and Neuburg met in Xanten. They were eventually joined by delegates from the Protestant Union (count of Solms and Benjamin Buwinckhausen⁷⁶) and the emperor (count of Zollern⁷⁷). According to Du Reffuge 24 or 25 delegates attended the summit. To ensure success it was agreed that the English and French extraordinary ambassadors would treat with each side separately. The representative of the archdukes acted at Neuburg's spokesman while those of the Republic represented Brandenburg. The diplomat from Cologne acted as a mediator. Wotton informed Trumbull that one week passed in *propositions, replies, rejoinders, allees and veneus to the Princes of eache side whoe are eually distant, complementall intervisitations and preparatorie conferences*. The main problem was finding a partition which was equal. Jülich, Berg and Ravensberg had more fortresses than Kleve, Mark and Ravenstein⁷⁸. The best solution was a provisional divide of the territories between Brandenburg and Neuburg, but there were some knotty questions. Who would rule which part? What kind of control would they have over each others affairs? How would the foreign troops be evacuated? At the start of November the English and French ambassador presented the possessionary princes with a proposition and gave them four days to accept it⁷⁹.

William Trumbull does not elaborate much on what happened in Xanten. The information Trumbull got on the negotiations and their breakdown in Xanten came from Sir Henry Wotton and from several newsletters: one from Rees, which was sent by Sir John Throckmorton and one from Xanten which included two postscripts. The postscript of 22 November (n.s.) informed the reader that the treaty had been concluded⁸⁰. One of the knotty questions, the partition, was resolved by the end of

Somerset, Brussels, 29 September 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 209r-210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 December 1614.

⁷³ Gachard, 'Bergh, (Henri, Comte de)'.

⁷⁴ HMCD, v, 15 (letter 41), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 22 September 1614 (n.s.).

⁷⁵ HMCD, v, 73 (letter 173), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 3 December 1614.

⁷⁶ HMCD, v, 47 (letter 116), Maurice to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 29 October 1614; HMCD, v, 61 (letter 143), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Stuttgart, 17/27 November 1614.

⁷⁷ HMCD, v, 48 (letter 118), *News from Cologne*, Cologne, 10 November 1614 (n.s.).

⁷⁸ HMCD, v, 34 (letter 85), Wotton to Trumbull, Xanten, 11 October 1614.

⁷⁹ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 197.

⁸⁰ HMCD, v, 34 (letter 85), Wotton to Trumbull, Xanten, 11 October 1614; HMCD, v, 34-35 (letter 86), *News from Rees*, Rees, 21 October 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 37 (letter 93), Throckmorton to Trumbull,

October: one would get Kleve, Mark, Ravenstein and Ravensberg, the other Jülich and Berg. Who would get which part would be decided by fortune. The castle of Jülich and the fortification of Düsseldorf were to be dismantled, but if the latter was to be kept, the other party had permission to fortify Osroy. Brandenburg ratified the treaty on condition Neuburg would do the same. The negotiations were complicated by the count of Zollern who wanted that Wesel, Duisburg and Duren would be garrisoned with imperial troops until the succession issue had been entirely resolved⁸¹. Trumbull had a copy of the Treaty of Xanten in Spanish dated 12 November 1614⁸². The conclusion was confirmed from D'Aerssens in The Hague one day later. He furthermore stated that both armies would withdraw unconditionally⁸³. There was still some concern about Wesel. Was Spinola really going to abandon it? King James, according to Sir John Throckmorton, the governor of Flushing,

is confident that the towne of Weessell will be delivered back and doth laughe at all those that maintaine the contrarye; for the Spanish and Archduks Embassadors have directly asseured his Majesty that all places that have been taken , I meane in the provinces in question, shall be restored.

Throckmorton and others were less convinced⁸⁴.

At the start of November Trumbull thought that the Treaty of Xanten was almost concluded. At the same time the English agent informed London that archduke Albert sent emissaries to Madrid. Trumbull presumed that nothing would be decided until their return. Trumbull considered two possibilities. The first possibility was that the negotiations would be prolonged. The second possibility was that the negotiations would be terminated if the conflict between Savoy and Spain had been resolved. In the second case Spain would be free to attack the United Provinces and the Protestant Princes in Germany.

Wesel remained a major concern. Trumbull reported, as before, that there were many who thought Albert would not give it up. Several of his ministers were opposed to the idea and contacted the archduke on that point. The elector of Cologne sent two envoys to plead with Albert Brussels. What Albert's answer had been, Trumbull had not yet been able to ascertain. According to some Albert had been given a scolding by those who wanted to keep Wesel because he was prepared to give up Wesel voluntarily. He and Spinola had been prepared to keep their promise and restitute Wesel if the United Provinces yielded Jülich. Such a course was opposed by the marquis of Guadaleste and two senior Castilian officers, Don Luis de Velasco and Don Iñigo de Borja. De Borja was

Flushing, 16 October 1614; HMCD, 42-43 (letter 105), *News from Xanten*, Wesel, 26 October 1614, to this were attached two additions dated 22 November and 3 December (both n.s.).

⁸¹ HMCD, v, 47 (letter 112), Wotton to Trumbull, [Xanten], 27 October 1614; HMCD, v, 48-49 (letter 118), *News from Cologne*, Cologne, 10 November 1614 (n.s.).

⁸² HMCD, v, 55 (letter 133), *Treaty of Xanten*, [Xanten], 12 November 1614. The Treaty of Xanten has been printed in Dumont, *Corps Universel Diplomatique*, vi, ii, 259-261; for an English version which has been translated from French see, *Cal.S.P.Ven 1613-1615*, 256-259.

⁸³ HMCD, v, 55-56 (letter 134), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 13 November 1614; HMCD, v, 58 (letter 137), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 24 November 1614 (n.s.).

⁸⁴ HMCD, v, 57 (letter 136), Throckmorton to Trumbull, Flushing, 14 November 1614; HMCD, v, 62 (letter 147), Southampton to Trumbull, s.l., 21 November 1614.

even prepared to break the Truce with the Republic rather than give up the city. De Borja's opinion originally prevailed in the Spanish Council of State. Spinola got instructions from Spain to keep Wesel under his control unless he was going to deliver it into the hands of the emperor or one of his lieutenants. Trumbull could not confirm the report but it was generally believed among the common people and the courtiers to be true⁸⁵.

Secretary Winwood wrote Trumbull that London did not have any certainty yet on the conclusion of the Treaty. Wotton had sent London a module of the treaty signed by all the ambassadors. Since that time he had seen a copy of a letter of Neuburg to the States General that nothing was wanting in the Treaty except for the ratification by Brandenburg⁸⁶. Despite the prevailing optimism there was a hitch. Spinola introduced an obstacle at the end of November/the start of December which would delay and eventually postpone the implementation of the Treaty of Xanten indefinitely. Spinola requested an assurance from Maurice not to invade the disputed territories in the future. This assurance was to be in the form of a promise. The ambassadors left Xanten and Wotton was back in The Hague by 3 December⁸⁷. Du Reffuge returned via Brussels. Meeting with Albert he pleaded in favour of the Treaty of Xanten. Albert only made a dilatory answer and blamed the United Provinces for the delays because they refused to sign Spinola's promise. Trumbull disagreed with the Albert, it was rather the fault of Spain, *which do tend to a monarchy over all the kingdoms of Europe*. If peace was achieved it was because of the lack of means in Spain and not because they had no plans⁸⁸.

The promise

Anderson describes the Treaty of Xanten as the best provisional or even permanent solution to the problem, but it contained no provisions on its implementation. The main unsolved issue was that of the departure of the foreign troops. This was left up to the commanders, Maurice and Spinola, who would have to work out the details. The distrust between the Spanish and the Dutch was a major obstacle. Spinola suggested that he and Maurice of Nassau gave a written assurance not to interfere with Jülich and Kleve in the future. How to formulate such a promise was quite another matter. Why did Spinola insist on the promise? It was intended to retard the negotiations long enough to give the Spanish king time to consent to the Treaty of Xanten, according to Anderson. At the basis was a question of authority between Brussels and Spain⁸⁹. This move did not surprise the Protestant bystanders in Europe like Bilderbeck, Lingelsheim, Maurice, and others⁹⁰. The marquis of Guadaleste, Spanish ambassador in Brussels, had already pointed

⁸⁵ SP 77/11 f^o 205r-205v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 24 November 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 209r-210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 December 1614.

⁸⁶ HMCD, v, 65 (letter 153), Winwood to Trumbull, Whitehall, 24 November 1614.

⁸⁷ HMCD, v, 73 (letter 173), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 3 December 1614.

⁸⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 212r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 15 December 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 217r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 23 December 1614.

⁸⁹ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 197-201.

⁹⁰ HMCD, v, 71 (letter 168), [Bilderbeck] to Trumbull, Cologne, 11 December 1614 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 71 (letter 169), Lingelsheim to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 2 December 1614; HMCD, v, 72 (letter 170), Maurice

out to Trumbull and de Preaux in September that the archduke had nothing more to do with the matter of Jülich and Kleve. Spinola got his orders out of Spain. And the order was to continue without giving attention to treaties or mediation of others.

At the start of December Neuburg arrived in Brussels and would remain there until c. 20 January 1615. Trumbull suspected he was negotiating with the archdukes what places he would give them, as payment for the Spanish money in the previous campaign⁹¹. While Brandenburg, Neuburg and the States of Jülich and Kleve had approved the Treaty of Xanten, the promise requested by Spinola and the wish of Maurice to alter its wording had caused the negotiators to leave Xanten. As the French ambassador visited Neuburg, Trumbull did the same. The English agent emphasized that the actions of the United Provinces were done without the knowledge of king James. Neuburg hoped that he could count on king James to resolve the dispute between him and Brandenburg⁹².

For Albert and Spinola, Anderson argues, giving up Wesel had nothing to do with military strategy but with honour. Albert had assured the sovereigns of both France and England that his intervention in Jülich had nothing to do with personal gain and that he was prepared to return the captured towns if the United Provinces did the same. Spinola had given the conquered cities the same assurance. Throughout the correspondence it is clear Albert and Spinola were more inclined to peace than others, like the ambassador of the emperor, the count of Zollern, and Spain. Spinola, furthermore, was unwilling to launch a new campaign *sans bisquit*. Spain had to give him the funds to bring the entire conflict to a desired end. If Spain wanted peace it was only because of the lack of means, Trumbull was sure⁹³. After being fully informed by Albert and Spinola of the situation in Jülich and Kleve, the Spanish Council of State, in January 1615, agreed that the promises were to be honoured and the Spanish government was prepared to accept the Treaty of Xanten. When Trumbull reported this Spanish u-turn he nevertheless added that he was only going to believe it after the Spaniards had left Wesel. The English agent had conflicting evidence. On the one hand there were the encouraging reports out of Spain; on the other hand the actions of the Spaniards in Jülich-Kleve and credible information lead to different assumptions. The government of Wesel had been given to count Frederick Van den Bergh (1559-1618)⁹⁴ to give Don Luis de Velasco the opportunity to retreat from Wesel. Van den Bergh however refused. He did not want to be the one who had to give up the city⁹⁵.

to Trumbull, 2/12 December 1614; HMCD, v, 77 (letter 184), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 9/19 December 1614.

⁹¹ SP 77/11 f^o 207r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 1 December 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 209r-210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 December 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 219r-219v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 23 December 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 225r-225v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 5 January 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 243r, Trumbull to Somerset, Brussels, 20 January 1615.

⁹² SP 77/11 f^o 209r-210v, Trumbull to James VI/I, Brussels, 8 December 1614.

⁹³ SP 77/11 f^o 106v-108r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19 July 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 217v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 23 December 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 237r-239v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19 January 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 343r-343v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14 June 1615.

⁹⁴ 'Bergh (Frederik, Graaf van den)'.

⁹⁵ SP 77/11 f^o 188r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 8 November 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 190r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 11 November 1614; SP 77/11 f^o 229r-229v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 12 January 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 237r-241r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 19 January 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 247r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 February 1615.

The main issue which now remained was the promise which Spinola and Maurice were to sign. James's diplomatic offensive unfolded on two fronts in the Low Countries: the Protestant Republic and the Catholic archdukes. At the start of January Trumbull gave Albert the letter from James and was referred to secretary Philippe de Prats for an answer, which could not be given at that time because of the absence of Spinola. Spinola's wife had died and he temporarily retreated into a monastery. King James formulated a proposal concerning the promise, if Albert disagreed, it was up to him to come up with a new proposition. A letter was delivered to king James but Trumbull was not informed of the contents of the letter. Trumbull, however, did not give up and insisted until Peckius caved in and informed the English agent⁹⁶. Albert presented king James with his own proposal. As the English king was adamant to restoring peace, he sent Wotton a copy of the letter and the formula to assure the United Provinces that if they found the words *Venants lesdicts Pais a tomber en guerre ouverte* ambiguous, it was not the intent of the archdukes to forbid them to assist their friends and allies. James would press the States General to accept it. If they still refused to sign it, the king requested that Albert would agree to add the few words that would be presented by his agent in Brussels⁹⁷. By the start of March 1615 Trumbull compared these negotiations to the battle of Hercules against Hydra. Two issues clouded the entire negotiation. Firstly, should there be a reference to allies? Secondly, to whom should the promise be directed? The negotiations between Trumbull and the archdukes and their ministers took months. The matter was considered in London, Paris, Brussels and The Hague. By the end of February James assured the States General that the proposal did not bind them if it concerned the security of the possessionary princes and if the Treaty of Xanten had not been executed or if it had been violated. If the Protestant Union in Germany came under attack, then the United Provinces had free passage through Jülich-Kleve. Wotton made the proposal, but the United Provinces took their time evaluating it⁹⁸.

In Brussels Trumbull presented the additional line James VI/I wanted to see inserted and had to clarify it. Peckius interpreted that if the United Provinces were attacked by anyone they could send their troops to Jülich and Kleve and take towns and forts at will. Trumbull denied that this was the case and stressed that the only intent of the English king was to assure the United Provinces that they would be able to assist their friends and allies. To be able to do that, they needed free passage through the disputed territories. Albert was pleased but did not wish to make any further declarations on the matter until he received word from de Preaux and from the Republic. De Preaux eventually agreed with the formula presented by Albert. The archduke promised to get a ratification in Spain if the United Provinces agreed with his formula, because in the end he did not want to insert king James's clause concerning allies. He did agree with the retreat of the foreign troops out of the territories and an exchange of hostages⁹⁹.

⁹⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 229r-229v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 12 January 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 231r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels 25 January 1615 (n.s.).

⁹⁷ HMCD, v, 127-128 (letter 275), copy, James VI/I to Wotton, Newmarket, 3 February 1615; HMCD, v, 128-129, Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 4 February [1615]; HMCD, v, 129 (letter 277), copy, James VI/I to Albert, s.l., [4 February 1615].

⁹⁸ HMCD, v, 145-146 (letter 313), Wotton to Trumbull, s.l., 25 February 1615.

⁹⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 261r-265v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 March 1615.

To whom the promise should be directed was the second knotty affair. On the one hand it was natural for the United Provinces that it would be directed to the kings of France and England, as they had been the main mediators in ending the hostilities. For the archdukes it had to be directed to the emperor under whose authority the disputed territories fell. After negotiating three weeks in March the archdukes wished to keep the preamble with the emperor in it, which was unacceptable to Trumbull and de Preaux¹⁰⁰. Trumbull delivered a remonstrance to Albert requesting the full implementation of the Treaty of Xanten and the restitution by 25 March. If that did not happen James would be forced to take some measures to remedy the situation. At the same time he presented a remonstrance for the Protestant Union. With all the military preparations in Wesel, Jülich, Kleve, Italy and Lorraine, they requested Albert's assurance that he did not intend to attack the Protestant Union, which was given¹⁰¹. During that same month Albert expressed that he was pleased with the efforts of king James to establish peace in Jülich and Kleve. He promised to look through the document Trumbull brought at that time and to deliver his answer via Peckius. The archduke asked Trumbull if he had compared the document and if so if there were essential differences. The English agent had indeed made a comparison and found three major differences. Firstly, in the preamble of the Treaty itself mention was made of the emperor while the promise was formulated *indefinitely*, without reference to the English or the French king. Secondly, the United Provinces, as the promise was now formulated, were refused the possibility to assist their allies. Thirdly, the clause presented by James was still absent. Albert assured the English agent that his intention never had been to use his troops in an offensive war against the Protestant Princes of the Empire. Peckius delivered an answer which was less than forthcoming; the promise could not be changed. Besides the arguments already given, some points were elaborated. To address to promise to the two kings was considered an affront to the emperor. The clause James wanted to insert was superfluous as the promise did not forbid the United Provinces to help their allies. Albert and Spinola were thus free to help the elector of Cologne or the duke of Bavaria, and the United Provinces were equally free to help their allies, e.g. the elector Palatine, the duke of Württemberg. Trumbull riposted that if the clause was so unimportant, what was the harm in including it? According to Peckius the promise, as it had been formulated, had already been approved by the imperial ambassador, changing it again would be badly received. Trumbull again turned to his French colleague for assistance. De Preaux was prepared to lend a hand, but doubted it would change the outcome. He wanted to send the promise to Wotton and that the States General would then ask the archdukes for the changes. Nevertheless, the French ambassador was almost convinced that only war would and could bring a solution, but professed he was willing to do what he could to prevent further military conflict¹⁰².

By the end of March the States General had formulated the same objections as Trumbull had done. Again it was Peter Peckius who delivered an answer. Mentioning the emperor in the preamble was only a formality. The reference to the Treaty of

¹⁰⁰ SP 77/11 f° 261r-265v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 3 March 1615.

¹⁰¹ HMCD, v, 156 (letter 332), Trumbull to Albert, s.l., 7/17 March 1615; HMCD, v, 156 (letter 333), Copies, *Remonstrance to Albert*, 7/17 March 1615; *Reply seen by Peckius and signed by Prats*, s.l. [endorsed 23 March 1615].

¹⁰² SP 77/11 f° 279r-182r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14 March 1615.

Cologne made clear that the possessionary princes were subjected to the emperor. The archdukes, furthermore, got news from their ambassador in London, Ferdinand de Boisshot, that James not only agreed with this, but would promote it in the United Provinces. Trumbull again replied that the main mediators leading up to the Treaty of Xanten had been the French and English king, both should also be mentioned in that capacity. As it was formulated it seemed that the United Provinces were dependent of the emperor. While no one doubted that Brandenburg and Neuburg were *dominus foedi*, referring to the Treaty of Cologne was unjust as it had been imperfect and no one felt bound by it. What de Boisshot had effected in England, Trumbull could confirm nor deny it.

King James, however, was willing to accept a promise made to the archdukes and the United Provinces, if the United Provinces agreed. As Trumbull was getting nowhere with Peckius he turned to the commander of the army, Spinola, whose answer did not vary. Spinola did not lend a willing ear to Trumbull's proposition that the emperor could be mentioned in a separate article¹⁰³. Albert informed king James in April 1615 he was willing to have the promise without a reference altogether. If the States General disagreed with this their intentions were clear, according to Albert¹⁰⁴. In the mean time the States General had also sent a formula they found acceptable to England. Winwood discussed it with de Boisshot. The archdukes's ambassador objected to the clause *Invasion faite sur noz Amys et Alliez dehors ou dedans le Pais de Cleves et Julyers etc.* He could agree with *guerre ouverte* or *invasion manifeste*. In no circumstances could he agree with references to friends and allies¹⁰⁵.

Mid-April new instructions arrived in Brussels together with a copy of a letter from the States General. The United Provinces asked how they could help their allies if necessary. Trumbull also informed Albert that Ferdinand de Boisshot had agreed to *guerre ouverte* or *invasion manifeste*. Albert himself had not heard of de Boisshot but gave his word he would read the papers and let de Prats deliver his answer. As the archdukes left for Scherpenheuvel and afterwards Mariemont, Trumbull did not receive a reply. In the mean time Trumbull turned to Spinola and Peckius who informed the English agent that Albert did not have to write anything more than he had not already done. Referring to assisting allies had never been suggested by any party during the negotiations in Xanten. Proposing new sentences or new words, according to both, would only lead to further delays¹⁰⁶.

De Boisshot kept negotiating in London and Winwood informed Trumbull of the outcome of those negotiations in May. He agreed to leave out the emperor if no reference was made to the French or the English king. The United Provinces were also ready to concede that point. There would be no explicit clause referring to assisting allies¹⁰⁷. The English agent received a letter from the archduke to James but again Trumbull did not receive a copy. Albert assured James that there was no doubt that allies

¹⁰³ SP 77/11 f^o 289r-291v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 March 1615.

¹⁰⁴ SP 77/11 f^o 305r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 15 April 1616 (n.s.).

¹⁰⁵ SP 77/11 f^o 301r-301v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, s.l., 4 April 1615.

¹⁰⁶ SP 77/11 f^o 311r-313r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 April 1615.

¹⁰⁷ SP 77/11 f^o 329r, draft, [Winwood] to Trumbull, Greenwich, 20 May 1615; HMCD, v, 219 (letter 460), Winwood to Trumbull, [Greenwich], 20 May 1615.

could be assisted. The archduke now professed to be entirely content¹⁰⁸. News from the United Provinces was anything but hopeful. De Preaux, who received his information from his colleague in The Hague Aubery Dumaerier, informed Trumbull and Spinola that some members of of the States General objected to the formula. Albert in the following weeks seemed to be conceding point after point, according to Trumbull. Now it was up to the United Provinces. A decision could only be taken in a plenary meeting which was scheduled on 1 July (n.s.). Winwood informed Trumbull that Wotton was instructed to push it through¹⁰⁹. The States General, however, failed to reach a decision. Furthermore, according to Winwood, Dumaerier did not receive instructions from Paris concerning the deleting of the name of the French king, which was confirmed by Sir Henry Wotton. As the States General were resolutely opposed to the proposal, Dumaerier did not want to push any more. Trumbull turned to Spinola who guaranteed he would inform Albert who then could write to the French king to obtain new instructions for Dumaerier. At the end of August it became clear that the French king would not be swayed one way or the other on this matter¹¹⁰.

After the news from the Protestant North had been so discouraging the archduke convened the Council of War. Governors, captains and soldiers were put into readiness. This could be for Jülich-Kleve but also to anticipate troubles in France, according to the English agent in August 1615¹¹¹. Albert, after having convened the Council of State, a rarity according to Trumbull, dispatched Don Iñigo de Borja to Spain to inform Philip III of the state of affairs of the Southern Netherlands. Trumbull got his information on the meeting of the Council of State of someone important, but the English agent does not divulge the identity of the informant. One of the matters on the council table was whether Wesel and other places should be surrendered or not. Decisions were put off until news arrived from Madrid¹¹².

In March 1616 De Preaux approached Trumbull. He had been instructed by the French king to inform the archdukes that the United Provinces had decided to accept the formula, *about wch there hath ben much adue*. They were willing to pull back their garrisons from Jülich and Kleve if the Spaniards did the same, *and the two kings oblige them selves by a counterassurance, for the true perfourmance of the said promise*. De Preaux wanted to know if Trumbull had received the same instructions from London. The English agent assured that he had received nothing of the like from Winwood in London nor from Edmondes in Paris. If there were negotiations he requested secretary Winwood to keep him informed and to supply further instructions. Winwood, writing a fortnight later informed the English agent that

it is longe since that his maty hath declared that in case the ffrench king would ioyne wth him, he would become caution to the States that if they would accept the Archduks formularie the

¹⁰⁸ SP 77/11 f^o 333r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 June 1615 (n.s.).

¹⁰⁹ SP 77/11 f^o 356r-356v, [Winwood] to Trumbull, Greenwich, 21 June 1615.

¹¹⁰ SP 77/11 f^o 366r-366v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615; SP 77/11 f^o 383v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 23 August 1615.

¹¹¹ SP 77/11 f^o 376v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels 4 August 1615.

¹¹² SP 77/11 f^o 389r-389v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13 September 1615.

*Treaty of Zanten should be observed whereof whensoever occasion shalbe offered yow take notice to the Archuks and their officers*¹¹³.

While the negotiations were ongoing, both sides started to make warlike preparations and both armies kept taking places in Jülich and Kleve. Count Henry Van den Bergh took Syberg in March 1615. He informed Spinola of his motivation: the threat posed by the United Provinces and Brandenburg. Spinola had already summoned Trumbull and de Preaux to inform them of the capture of Syberg, which, he assured, had only been done to prevent the United Provinces from taking it first. Spinola asked Trumbull to write Wotton and inform him. Trumbull was displeased and replied that the taking of Syberg at that time was particularly inconvenient and could possibly be the proverbial last drop. The marquis was prepared to consider the place neutral if the United Provinces did the same. A letter was sent to the States General concerning Syberg but Trumbull wondered if it would be accepted or if it would start the same journey as the promise¹¹⁴. In April rumours circulated in the Southern Low Countries that prince Maurice was planning to besiege Wesel, but Spinola would at such a time relieve the city effectively breaking the Truce concluded in 1609¹¹⁵. It did not come to that but the United Provinces did not stand by idly and took other places. They took several places in Mark, surprised the castle of Willenstein near Aachen, their cavalry together with that of Brandenburg in the electorate of Cologne and assembling troops in Jülich. These actions engendered the idea in the Archducal Netherlands that peace never had been on their agenda. Rumours circulated that Van den Bergh was instructed to take some of the neutral places in Mark to stop the progress of the United Provinces. Spinola complained to Trumbull about the recent actions of the United Provinces and asked the English agent to write his counterpart in The Hague to request their retreat. Trumbull emphasised that the recent military actions were only a consequence of the taking of Syberg, but nonetheless promised to write to Wotton¹¹⁶.

In January 1616 Trumbull reported the mobilisation of new troops in the Southern Low Countries. Added to the existing force in the Southern Netherlands the archdukes wished to help archduke Leopold to gain the electorate of Cologne and to do wonders in Jülich and Kleve. The main purpose would be to avenge the help lent to Brunswick by the United Provinces. In February 1616 Winwood accurately described what it would take for the archdukes and for the United Provinces to render all they had taken in the disputed countries, *whensoever they render the places they nowe possesse in Cleves, and Juliers, it must bee for theyr owne good, and not for respect they bear to theyr neyghbours*. The preparations continued throughout the spring. Trumbull wondered *if they seeke no other advantage but by their owne weapons, to keepe those of their neighbors in the scabberts: wherefore doe they nowe reenforce the weakest companyes in their Army both of horse and foote?* Why were

¹¹³ SP 77/12 f° 28v-29r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 4 March 1616; SP 77/12 f° 37r-37v, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, [Whitehall], [17 March 1616].

¹¹⁴ SP 77/11 f° 281v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 14 March 1615; SP 77/11 f° 286, copy, Van den Bergh to Spinola, Syberg, 27 March 1615 (n.s.).

¹¹⁵ SP 77/11 f° 292r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels 31 March 1615.

¹¹⁶ SP 77/11 f° 366r-366v, 367r-368v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 22 July 1615.

ammunition and victuals sent to Wesel? Why were the companies of the regiments of Walloons reinforced up to 9.000 men¹¹⁷?

At the start of April 1616 the Dutch agent in Colonge, Henry Bilderbeck, informed Trumbull that the Spanish army assembled near Düsseldorf had crossed the Rhine at Berck. In total it consisted of 4.000 or 5.000 infantry soldiers. Van den Bergh took Soest and Lipstat despite the assurance of Spinola, Maurice and Neuburg to keep the Soest neutral, as abovementioned. Both towns were disputed by the United Provinces and the Spaniards who each had a delegation in the city. But now the question was resolved forcibly. According to Buwinckhausen he also captured Dortmund, but according to Bilderbeck they only had demanded to install a garrison in the city. The magistracy had agreed to accommodate 400 men. Van den Bergh garrisoned his troops. Soest had a garrison of 200 men who met opposition once Van den Bergh had departed. Fourteen were killed and they were forced to take 300 soldiers more. Moreover, rumours circulated that archduke Maximilian would travel to Düsseldorf to govern Jülich and Kleve in the name of the emperor. During April Trumbull kept reporting of rumours of preparations but was unable to substantiate the claims. He also was unsure what the possible objective would be, but it was likely that something was going to be undertaken in Jülich and Kleve. Van den Bergh wrote to Neuburg explaining that what he had done had been effected in the name of the emperor and assured Neuburg that both towns had pledged their allegiance to him¹¹⁸.

Meanwhile, Sir Henry Wotton was recalled by king James in August 1615 and was replaced by Sir Dudley Carleton¹¹⁹. With the departure of Wotton negotiations did not end. Carleton, instructed by king James, pressed the States General to accept the latest formula proposed by the archdukes. He was glad the matter was revived because the recent military feats, in his opinion, were the consequence of neglect. There was no reference in the formula to the Treaty of Xanten nor to the kings of England and France. Carleton informed Trumbull of the proceedings in the States General,

they doe very mannerly excuse uppon suspition of your indirect dealing on that side; wherof they alleage many arguments, and amongst others of oder date your new surprises of Zoest and Lipstadt contrarie to formal and authentical acts of neutralitie granted on both sides, which makes them here conjecture that per fas et nefas you are resolved (yf you can) to possesse your selfs of the whole cuntry of Cleves and Juliers, and therefore they here resolve you shall win it by blowes rather then attaine your ends by practise.

¹¹⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 15r-15v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, [31 January] 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 20r, draft, Winwood to Trumbull, Newmarket, 10 February 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 44v-45r, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussels, 22 March 1616.

¹¹⁸ HMCD, v, 462-463 (letter 975), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 11 April 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 465 (letter 981), Buwinckhausen to Trumbull, Stuttgart, 4 April 1616; HMCD, v, 469 (letter 991), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 18 April 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 68v-69r, Trumbull to [Carleton], s.l., 8 April 1616; HMCD, vi, 476 (letter 1001), draft, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 13/23 April 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 77r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 17/27 April 1616; HMCD, v, 480 (letter 1008), *News from Cleves, Kleve*, 19/29 April 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 70r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 22 April 1616; HMCD, v, 492 (letter 1039), Paul to Trumbull, 2 May 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 82v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 May 1616.

¹¹⁹ HMCD, v, 317 (letter 640), Wotton to Trumbull, The Hague, 19 August 1615.

Carleton, the recently appointed resident ambassador in The Hague, was unsure how king James would react to that answer, but the English ambassador was confident that the monarch had more faith in the intentions of the archdukes than he had been able to instil in the United Provinces¹²⁰.

Bilderbeck informed Trumbull that the military leaders had been summoned to Brussels in May 1616 to receive orders from the archdukes. Trumbull reported in his dispatches that the Council of War and the Council of State met in Brussels. Trumbull was told that everything was put into readiness as if there was a decision to fight. The English agent did not know if this was reality or rather a manoeuvre to intimidate the United Province. Hope existed in the Southern Netherlands to get the Republic out of Jülich and Kleve by the mere threat of war. Trumbull was secure that if nothing was undertaken this summer, it surely would happen the following year. He promised to keep Carleton informed¹²¹. A few days later, writing to Winwood and Carleton, Trumbull was much less sure that the entire operation was a bluff. Trumbull had been informed that it was likely the archdukes would put their army in the field in August, *when they may fynde fourrage abroad to feed their horses; and come in the barnes at home; to nourische their footemen*. In addition, ammunition was being transported and the banners of the trumpeters of Spinola were renewed. Everything was done with the utmost secrecy. This lead Trumbull to believe that the decision to remove the United Provinces and Brandenburg forcibly from Jülich and Kleve had been taken. If so, they wished to incorporate those countries with the territories of Austria or the Spanish king. In his letter to Carleton, Trumbull was clear what he thought was going to happen with this information he had sent to England:

so much I have written into England: though perhaps they will but laugh at me for my labor.: the truth being (as yor. L: truly wryteth) that by some strange artifice, or fatall influence; they have instilled an opinyon into the king our Souveraigne, of their reall intencions to restore the Townes they holde in the litigious Provinces of Juliers, and Cleves, so the States of yor. Countryes will doe the lyke. I dare not to be so staunc?, as to beleeve, that his maty would engage his mediation upon sleight grounds: neither, in truth, were it requisite to use violence, where difference may be composed by faire meanes. But I may notwithstanding reason woonder, that so wise, & prudent a Prince as his maty, who professeth a Relligion so contrary to that of the Spanyard, the only favor. and supporter of his Rebels, fugityves, and malcontents; should be carryed away so easily, wth the spetious and fayned promises of his opposits¹²².

Despite persistent rumours Trumbull did not mention any military activity during the summer of 1616. Although *the vulgar bruit* in July was that war would break out in Jülich and Kleve, Trumbull's opinion was that before such a war would start the troubles in Italy would have to be accommodated. What did happen during those months were negotiations between the archdukes and Spain. Bucquoy had been in Spain in June, the

¹²⁰ HMCD, v, 478 (letter 1004), Carleton to Trumbull, 17/27 April 1616; HMCD, v, 495 (letter 1048), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 8/18 May 1616.

¹²¹ HMCD, v, 493-494 (letter 1042), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 16 May 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 89r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 7/17 May 1616.

¹²² sP 77/12 f^o 97r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 9/19 May 1616; SP 77/12, 103r-103v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 12 May 1616.

archduke sent his confessor in August. The first military fact was the taking of two castles: Loo by Brandenburg and one in Kleve by Swartzenbourg in November 1616. According to Jean Libigny, secretary of the Council of the marquis of Brandenburg, it was a matter of justice after a sentence given by the councillors of both possessionary princes in Düsseldorf¹²³.

A new proposition to resolve the matter was proposed by Sir Dudley Carleton in December 1616 (n.s.). Instructed by king James he addressed the States General. The Spanish ambassador, the future conde of Gondomar, acting on instructions from the Spanish king, had lately approached king James. He informed the English king that

there is nothing that his master would favour more than that the towns and places in Cleves and Juliers, now occupied by the Archdukes and your Lordships, should be restored to the Princes Possessioners and the Treaty of Xanten, as a result put into execution.

Sarmiento also wanted that a date would be set for the restitution, which James set at the last day of February 1617. The Spanish ambassador asked James, in case the United Provinces refused to do this, not to take it ill that Philip III would take full possession of the disputed countries¹²⁴. According to Trumbull much now depended on the answer of the United Provinces. D'Aerssens did not think the States General would approve the Spanish proposal. Trumbull asked Carleton to send him copies of all the documents concerning the new proposal as the English agent in Brussels had already all the pieces related to the crises in Jülich-Kleve. The States General was content to maintain their hold on Jülich and Kleve as the Spanish. Carleton was sure that if there was no decision to execute the Treaty of Xanten than this matter would linger until the expiration of the Twelve Years' Truce¹²⁵.

The proposal formulated by Carleton was disavowed by the Spanish ambassadors in Brussels and Paris and, Carleton wrote, *the fault cast ether uppon the Spanish Ambassador in England as to officious, or me as inexpert*. Pointedly he further added

Thay you may have somewhat to say to your Dons there as a prooffe of my experience though a nouveau venu in these parts ... I observe it a common practise in the Spaniards to amuse the world with treaties at the shutting up of the old yeare to the end there should be no preparation made against the new; and then theyr publique ministers in one place alwayes to differ from those

¹²³ SP 77/12 f^o 114r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 27 May 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 115r-115v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 31 May 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 123r-123v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 17/27 June 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 132v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 12/22 July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 147r-147v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, July 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 149r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 August 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 215r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 29 November 1616; SP 77/12 f^o 218r-218v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, end of November/start of December, 1616; HMCD, vi, 87 (letter 205), Libigny to Trumbull, Kleve, 20 January 1617 (n.s.).

¹²⁴ HMCD, vi, 53-54 (letter 132), copy, *Sir Dudley Carleton's address to the States General*, s.l., 3 December 1616 (n.s.).

¹²⁵ HMCD, vi, 67 (letter 160), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 25 December 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 223r-223v, Trumbull to Carleton, Brussel, 17/27 December 1616; HMCD, vi, 75-76 (letter 178), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 4 January 1617 (n.s.).

*in an other, yf not disavow them, that they may take consilium ex eventis and follow that which may be most for theyr advantage*¹²⁶.

Spinola informed the French ambassador that he had seen the new proposal. He agreed that the implementation of the Treaty of Xanten was the best way to end the troubled in the litigious territories. In the new proposal there was no mention of mutual promises between the archdukes, who were not mentioned in the Treaty, and the United Provinces. Although it was not mentioned explicitly, Spinola was sure that it was implied. He showed Trumbull a copy of his letter. The conference between Trumbull and Spinola ended with the English agent assuring the marquis *that this proceeding was nothing; but principia petere; and to comme in a circle*. All this had already been subject of much debate. Furthermore, the English agent had at that time no commission to proceed in the matter. Despite what had happened James instructed Carleton to press the States General to approve the proposition. The new date now set for the restitution was 31 March. The proposals were discussed in the States of the different provinces of the Republic but Carleton remained sceptical on the outcome, considering the intrigue that now surrounded the affair. A month later Trumbull acquired a copy of the letter of Spinola which he sent to Carleton and Winwood. The English agent requested his counterpart in the United Provinces not to spread any copies because that would be detrimental to those who procured it for Trumbull¹²⁷.

In May 1617 Spinola travelled to the disputed provinces and to Friesland to inspect the army and reinforce the frontier towns, which would also be done in Flanders. This gave the impression that there was a grand Spanish plan. According to some this was a wish, but if the matters in Italy settled down it would no longer be a wish but a decision. Trumbull was sure that Spinola's excursion had roused the suspicion of the United Provinces¹²⁸.

The aftermath

While the negotiations were ongoing Trumbull got letters from Henry Sticke, the ambassador of Brandenburg in The Hague, and from François d'Aerssens, writing for Maurice of Nassau, to intervene with the archdukes in favour of the citizens of Aachen who had been imprisoned by the commissioners of emperor Mathias¹²⁹. De Preaux had also received such a request. Trumbull approached Albert on the matter during an

¹²⁶ HMCD, vi, 94 (letter 218), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 16 January 1617 (n.s.).

¹²⁷ SP 77/12 f^o 245r-245v, copy, Spinola to de Perigord, Brussels, 11 January 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 247r-247v, copy, Spinola to de Perigord, Brussels, 11 January 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 82 (letter 192); copy, Spinola to de Perigord, s.l. 11 January 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 254v-255v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 26 January 1617; HMCD, vi, 96 (letter 223), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 29 January 1617 (n.s.); HMCD, vi, 108 (248), Carleton to Trumbull, The Hague, 8 February 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 262v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 8 February 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 269v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussel, 12/23 February 1617; HMCD, vi, 176 (letter 401), Libigny to Trumbull, s.l., 8/18 May 1617.

¹²⁸ SP 77/12 f^o 314r-314v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 21 May 1617 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f^o 320r-320v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 1617; SP 77/12 f^o 321r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 1 June 1617 (n.s.).

¹²⁹ HMCD, v, 442 (letter 925), D'Aerssens to Trumbull, The Hague, 22 March 1616 (n.s.); HMCD, v, 443 (letter 928), Sticke to Trumbull, The Hague, 23 March 1616.

audience in March 1616 and delivered a written memorial. The English agent requested him to use his authority and prevent further violence against the Protestants in Aachen, especially against Schantinelle. Albert only responded in general terms despite Trumbull's insistence to get better satisfaction at his hands. When the time was ripe and out of respect towards king James Albert would not refuse *to moderate the rigor of any proceedings wch might be used againste the said inhabitants*. As he refused to really commit himself, Trumbull was convinced that all would be in vain unless James would second him with letters¹³⁰. But by then the matter of *Corona Regia* was in full rigour, and James VI/I seemed uninterested in the plight of Aachen.

King James only took a further interest when it concerned certain fiefs in Jülich which belonged to his son-in-law, Frederick V, the elector Palatine. James first mentioned the fiefs on 22 June. James had launched a similar request in the United Provinces. Trumbull, orally and in writing, presented the case to the archduke but despite soliciting regularly for a reply he only received an answer by 20 July. The English agent had little hope for justice. Albert and his ministers did not fear James. In their minds his adherence to pacifism would make sure that he would never undertake any military action. Trumbull was

*farr from wishing any broyles betweene the Crowne of Gr. Brettane, & lament to see the benignity of or. Souveraigne tramped under the feete of his neighbors, and the honor., & reputation of my cuntry to much contended*¹³¹.

Over two months later Trumbull was able to report that James VI/I could expect a letter. In it Albert professed to be willing to assist James but that it did not depend on him but on the emperor and other princes¹³². The elector Palatine already thanked Trumbull for his efforts. The English agent confessed in September 1616 that he had hoped that the authority and recommendation of James would have advanced his cause. He begged Frederick to take into account that he had to work with people who were hostile to Protestants¹³³.

In September 1616 the delegates from the archdukes and the elector of Cologne were in the Aachen. They were seeking out all that facilitated the changing of the magistrates during the interregnum of the empire and the vicariate of the elector Palatine. Councillor Van Achelen, who was murdered in 1624, had been chosen by the archdukes. Trumbull described him as a superstitious man and a great confidant of the Jesuits. More than fifty Protestants had been imprisoned. Another 170 had been summoned to appear within thirty days, numbers which Trumbull received from the Dutch agent in Cologne, Bilderbeck. Trumbull was pessimistic about what might follow, *Men doe expect; that this*

¹³⁰ HMCD, v, 448 (letter 938), copy, Trumbull to Albert, s.l., 18/28 March 1616; SP 77/12 f° 40r-40v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 21 March 1616; SP 77/12 f° 44r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 22 March 1616.

¹³¹ SP 77/12 f° 120r, copy, James VI/I to Albert, Greenwich, 22 June 1616; SP 77/12 f° 137r-137v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 20/30 July 1616

¹³² SP 77/12 f° 163r, 165r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 2 September 1616; SP 77/12 f° 171r, Albert to James VI/I, Tervuren, 14 September 1616 (n.s.).

¹³³ HMCD, v, 585 (letter 1251), Frederick V to Trumbull, Heidelberg, 29 August 1616; HMCD, vi, 10 (letter 32), draft, Trumbull to Frederick V, s.l., 14/24 September 1616.

inquisition should be followed wth a bloody execution, of those poore people, that are fallen into the hands of these persecutors. The interrogation of prisoners continued throughout September. Finally the English king took an interest and wrote Albert. The archduke, however, assured the English king that he only acted on instructions from Mathias. James had to turn to the emperor to relieve the people of Aachen. In January 1619 Trumbull renewed his request for an answer concerning Aachen. The excuse this time was that Albert had written his co-commissioner, the elector of Cologne, but had not yet received a response. Albert promised three months later that he would take the matter to heart, *as it should be dispatched one way, or other wthall convenyent speed*¹³⁴.

In effect the Treaty of Xanten was never put into execution. Brandenburg and Neuburg together with their allies were in an uncomfortable stalemate. At the end of 1617 Trumbull reported a conflict between the officers of the possessionary princes concerning some villages in Mark. Trumbull added *Howe glorious an action would it be for his matie. by his Royall intervention & aucthority, for the preventing of these, and such lyke dysorders, to procure the Treaty of Zanten to be putt in execution*¹³⁵. Anderson concludes that after 1614 the military strategies were made in Spain and the United Provinces with little respect to the interests of Brandenburg and Neuburg. In 1621, after the end of the Twelve Years Truce, and the renewal of the Spanish-Dutch conflict, Jülich and Kleve became a new theatre of war. While Spinola and Maurice had never clashed during the Jülich-Kleve crisis, it had been a race to occupy as many places as possible. The armies of North and South clashed again after 1621. The duchies were sometimes a main field of operation, e.g. 1621, and sometimes a diversionary tactic, e.g. 1622 and 1624. In 1621 the Spanish army besieged the United Provinces in the fort of Jülich, which fell in 1622. Most of the duchy now came under control of Neuburg. Spinola secured Berg afterwards.

A Provisional Accord was signed in 1624 which was clearly to the advantage of Neuburg. Neuburg received Jülich, Berg, Ravenstein and a part of Kleve. Brandenburg got Mark, Ravensberg and the other part of Kleve. But, as in 1614, the presence of the foreign troops and the lack of an acceptable exit strategy entailed that the Provisional Accord was never put into execution. In May 1625 Neuburg arrived in Brussels after a visit to Madrid. He was defrayed by the infanta, his great councillor, Trumbull stated. As other ambassadors and agents visited him, Trumbull did the same. Neuburg showed the English agent of Charles I, James VI/I died in March 1625, a dispatch of the Spanish king to the infanta to ratify the agreement between him and Brandenburg. Once peace was proclaimed in the disputed territories, the troops of the Spanish king would relinquish the cities and fortifications they held. Neuburg also presented Trumbull a letter from the French king instructing Brandenburg to agree. The French ambassador in London, De Fiat, had been instructed to request king Charles's assistance to persuade Brandenburg and the United Provinces. Neuburg asked Trumbull to recommend the matter to Sir

¹³⁴ HMCD, vi, 1 (letter 4), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 15 September 1616; SP 77/12 f° 183r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 17/27 September 1616; HMCD, vi, 18 (letter 49), Bilderbeck to Trumbull, Cologne, 6 October 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/12 f° 197v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 24 October 1616; SP 77/12 f° 203v, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 31 October 1616; SP 77/12 f° 205r, Trumbull to Winwood, Brussels, 7/17 November 1616; SP 77/12 f° 202r, Albert to James VI/I, s.l., 9 November 1616 (n.s.); SP 77/13 f° 145r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake?], Brussels, 5 January 1619; SP 77/13 f° 181v, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Brussels], 18/28 February 1619; SP 77/12 f° 184r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake?], Brussels, 5/15 March 1619.

¹³⁵ SP 77/12 f° 446r, Trumbull to Secretary of State [Lake?], Brussels, 25 December 1617.

Dudley Carleton. Trumbull did not await instructions from London and wrote Carleton, later excusing himself in a letter to secretary Conway,

*If my wryting to his mats. Ambr. I haue exceeded, I am sorry for it; but my hoope therein, beeing no other, then to gratify that Prince, and to conserue his mats. intelligence & friendshippe wth him; I presumed I shall soone obtaine pardon*¹³⁶.

This attempt, as the others, ended in failure. A new Provisional accord was reached in March 1629 between Georg Wilhelm (Brandenburg) and Wolfgang Wilhelm (Neuburg), this time favouring Brandenburg. Jülich, Berg and Ravenstein went to Wolfgang Wilhelm and Kleve and Mark were restored to Brandenburg. Ravensberg was to be administered jointly. The United Provinces succeeded in driving the Spanish forces out of Wesel in August 1629. Jülich-Kleve remained a theatre of war for years to come. Generally, however, Brandenburg and his allies kept control over Kleve and Mark and Neuburg over Jülich and Berg. In 1640 Georg Wilhelm of Brandenburg was succeeded by his son Friedrich Wilhelm, the Great elector, who was much more forceful than his father, according to Anderson. A new Provisional Accord was concluded in 1647, another failure. Brandenburg invaded Berg in the summer of 1651 but was forced to retreat. It took another two decades before the matter was settled in September 1666. All the original claimants were dead and their heirs, Friedrich Wilhelm (Brandenburg) and Philip Wilhelm (Neuburg) agreed on a partition of the duchies as a permanent solution until the extinction of one of the houses. That treaty was confirmed by emperor Leopold I twelve years later. A new conflict broke out with the death of the last descendant of the house of Neuburg, mid-eighteenth century. In 1815, during the Congress of Vienna, the entire inheritance passed to the house of Brandenburg-Prussia¹³⁷.

The Palatine war and the start of the Thirty Years War

The start of the Thirty Years' War in 1618 did not change the relations between the courts in Brussels and London. Trumbull's main duty at that time was reporting all he observed: consultations, preparations for war, numbers of soldiers in the army, commanders of the army, a.s.o. His dispatches from 1618 onwards contain valuable information on what was happening in Europe. A more active part was reserved for Trumbull when it concerned the conflict in the Lower Palatinate, the patrimonial land of Frederick V, son-in-law to king James. Frederick had accepted the Bohemian crown in 1619 but had to relinquish it after the Battle of White Mountain (8 November 1620). During the reign of James VI/I this was the heyday of his diplomacy. James was sending ambassadors extraordinary to Brussels and the Empire, while still treating to conclude the Spanish Match. In May 1619 James Hay (c. 1580-1636), viscount of Doncaster and later earl of Carlisle, was sent on a mission to the Imperial court and various German Princes including the Princes of the Union. On his way Doncaster visited the archdukes,

¹³⁶ SP 77/18 f^o 113r-113v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 6/16 May 1625.

¹³⁷ Anderson, *On the Verge of War: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)*, 205-206 and 243-250.

Trumbull reported on his arrival¹³⁸. On his return journey at the end of 1619 he passed in The Hague. Sir Richard Weston (later first earl of Portland) and Sir Edward Conway (later viscount Conway) were sent to Germany mid-1620. They visited various German states and also stopped in the Archducal Netherlands and the United Provinces before reporting back to king James in March 1621¹³⁹. Between February and April 1621 Sir John Digby was appointed ambassador extraordinary and travelled to the court of the archdukes to negotiate a ceasefire in the Lower Palatinate. During that time he sent William Trumbull to Mainz to negotiate an agreement. Digby, later the same year, was sent to the Palatinate and also visited the emperor. On his way back in October he visited the archdukes once more. In 1622 Sir Richard Weston was again dispatched to the court of the infanta, Albert by that time had died¹⁴⁰.

Two ambassadors were sent directly to the Southern Netherlands: Sir John Digby in 1621 and Sir Richard Weston in 1622. The Spanish troops under command of the marquis of Spinola invaded the Lower Palatinate in the autumn of 1620¹⁴¹. Frederick V not only lost his recently acquired Bohemian crown but also his patrimonial lands. This made James VI/I formulate a declaration in his Privy Council that he would restore his son-in-law to his hereditary lands. Asking for a benevolence to financially support action in the Palatinate James was disappointed with the mere £ 30,000 it brought in¹⁴². In 1621 James assembled Parliament for the first time since 1614 but dissolved it that same year when a dispute arose on royal prerogative. This, according to Cogswell, was the fundamental flaw in James's foreign policy and diplomatic efforts for the Palatinate. The threat of military intervention, which was impossible without parliamentary funding, was necessary to facilitate a diplomatic solution for the restoration of the Palatinate and a general peace in the empire. Cogswell describes the situation accurately when writing *the nosiest sabre the impoverished king could rattle was a bellicose Parliament*¹⁴³. At the same time king James was trying to negotiate a settlement. The first step towards a general settlement was a suspension of arms in the Empire. Frederick V, such was the royal aspiration, would give up his claim to the Bohemian throne and get his patrimonial lands in return. But Frederick V was obstinate and refused to relinquish it¹⁴⁴. James sent Sir John Digby to the archdukes in spring 1621 to facilitate a general settlement¹⁴⁵. He was

¹³⁸ PEA reg. 1976 Trumbull to [de la Faille], Antwerp, 27 May 1619 (n.s.); PEA reg. 1976 Trumbull to [de la Faille], Antwerp, 30 May 1619.

¹³⁹ White, 'Suspension of Arms', 116-130.

¹⁴⁰ These are only the ambassadors and agents sent by King James who visited the archducal court in Brussels; Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives*, 143, 266-267; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*, 25; Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625*, 236-237.

¹⁴¹ Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*, 21; for a detailed account of the Palatine war see, Du Cornet, *Histoire Générale des Guerres de Savoie, de Bohême, du Palatinat & des Pays-Bas 1616-1627*, ii, 1-128; Maland, *Europe at war 1600-1650*, 75-78.

¹⁴² Croft, *King James*, 109-110.

¹⁴³ Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish match', 114-115; for the parliamentary debates on the Palatinate and the disagreement with James VI/I see Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', 139-171; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*, 27-38; Houston, *James I*, 77-84.

¹⁴⁴ Parker, *The Thirty Years' War*, 57.

¹⁴⁵ PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 22 February 1621; PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Isabella, Westminster, 22 February 1621 (is wrongly classified under 1620).

handsomely received in the Archducal Netherlands where he arrived on 7 March. He was lodged and defrayed at the costs of the archdukes, an honour which never had been given an ambassador from England since the ratifying of the Treaty of London in 1605 by the earl of Hertford, nor had any ambassador of the archdukes been received in that manner in England. Digby resided in the palace of the prince of Orange. Trumbull was clearly impressed writing, *I cannot ymagin what greater demonstration their A.A. could have made of their affection to his matie, then they have in this occasion shewed towards his extraordinary ambassador that representeth his person.* The English agent nevertheless cherished little hope that the mission would yield the desired result¹⁴⁶.

Digby found the archdukes ready to give king James all the satisfaction he wanted in the affairs of the elector Palatine. The Ambassador Extraordinary was convinced of their sincerity and their readiness to join with James to move Ferdinand and Philip III to grant a suspension of arms in the Palatinate. They gave Digby a letter for Spinola and Digby dispatched Trumbull with that letter and one from king James to the marquis. Trumbull's voyage was uneasy as he was robbed along the way. According to Digby the beleaguered agent had only been robbed of his money. No further harm had been done. He had been assured that Trumbull continued his voyage¹⁴⁷. In the mean time, Albert informed Philip III, the news of his death had not yet reached Brussels, of Digby's mission and the wish of king James that the Palatinate would be restored to Frederick V¹⁴⁸. Digby returned to England in April 1621 armed with letters from archduke Albert and infanta Isabella. King James promised *au nom de nostre Gendre qu'il ne sera rien fait ny attenté par luy contre les forces de l'Empereur commandées par led. Marquis [Spinola], ny contre les places qu'il occupe maintenant aud. Palatinat durant le temps de lad. prolongation*¹⁴⁹. Spinola, in Mainz, agreed to a suspension of arms until 30 June (n.s.)¹⁵⁰. One of the conditions was that the Union of Protestant Princes had to be disbanded, which happened. The English agent was back at his post in Brussels by the end of May. James VI/I again turned to the archduke. He wanted Albert and Spinola to use their authority to lengthen the suspension of arms¹⁵¹. Meanwhile the English king sent Sir John Digby as ambassador to Germany. A prolongation would give his ambassador extraordinary more time. While he was negotiating in Brussels Trumbull informed Carleton that the rumours of levies by the king of Denmark damaged his negotiating position, achieving anything of note would be difficult¹⁵². Trumbull's aim was a suspension of six weeks, two months or while the

¹⁴⁶ PEA reg. 1976, copy, Isabella to James VI/I, s.l., 3 April 1621; PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 15 April 1621; PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Isabella, Westminster 15 April 1621.

¹⁴⁷ SP 77/14 f^o 307r-307v, Digby to [Carleton], Brussels, 23 March 1621; SP 77/14, f^o 317r, Digby to [Carleton], Antwerp, 29 March/8 April 1621.

¹⁴⁸ SP 77/14 f^o 311r, copy, Albert to Philip III, Brussels, 3 April 1622 (n.s.).

¹⁴⁹ PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 2 May 1621.

¹⁵⁰ SP 77/14 f^o 313r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 3 April 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 314r, Isabella to James VI/I, Brussels, 3 April 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 329r, Spinola to James VI/I, s.l., 14/24 May 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 330r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 25 May 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 333r, Trumbull to [Carleton], [Brussels], 28 May 1621 (n.s.); Du Cornet, *Histoire Générale des Guerres de Savoie, de Bohême, du Palatinat & des Pays-Bas 1616-1627*, ii, 25; Maland, *Europe at war 1600-1650*, 78.

¹⁵¹ SP 77/14 f^o 337, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 6/16 June 1621.

¹⁵² PEA reg. 1976, James VI/I to Albert, Westminster, 27 May 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 339r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 6-16 June 1621.

talks lasted. Trumbull did not only treat with archduke Albert but also with the Spanish ambassador and Albert's confessor. Trumbull describes his last audience with Albert:

This good Prince, doth daily, and sensebly decay in his strength, and nowe is becume so feeble; and his voice so hollowe and fainte as those that negotiate wth him continually can hardly understand what he saith. When I was laste wth him (although I approached his mouth wth myne eare, as neere as good manners would permitt me) yet I did rather by conjecture, then certainty collect his answer¹⁵³.

Albert only agreed to lengthen the suspension until 15 July (n.s.)¹⁵⁴. Trumbull hoped that the archdukes would in the mean time hear from the emperor or from Digby, but if that failed he was sure that Albert would agree to a further prolongation, if James VI/I requested it. The advice of Trumbull was heeded in London and the English agent again treated with the archdukes, the Spanish ambassador, Spinola and the Albert's confessor. The suspension of arms was extended for another fifteen days in July 1621 at the request of king James according to Albert's letter of 10 July¹⁵⁵. Around noon on 3/13 July 1621

his soule was seperated from his body, to the great greef of the Infanta, his desolate lady, and the sorrowe of his servants and subiects by whome he is infinitely lamented. As he was pious, & exemplary in the Relligion hee did professe; so was his sicknes borne wth much patience, and his death with a Christian resolution¹⁵⁶.

After four days his corps was put in a leaden coffin which was laid in the underground chapel. In March 1622 he received a great state funeral¹⁵⁷. The English king dispatched Sir George Chaworth on an embassy of condolence to Brussels. Although that was apparently the prime reason of sending the ambassador extraordinary, Chaworth's main business was the situation in the Palatinate¹⁵⁸. During the first audience Trumbull again functioned as interpreter. Presumably Trumbull was also present during the second audience, although Chaworth does not mention him explicitly. Chaworth recommended Trumbull to Buckingham: *I assure yor Lop [Lordship] he ys an excellent servant, worthie his master, and worthie yor Lops [Lordship's] making him ye subject of yor favor and benefitt¹⁵⁹*. Chaworth's mission ended in failure¹⁶⁰.

¹⁵³ SP 77/14 f^o 345v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 14/24 June 1621.

¹⁵⁴ SP 77/14 f^o 341r, Albert to James VI/I, Bussels, 20 Juin 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 344r, Spinola to James VI/I, Brussels, 22 June 1622 (n.s.).

¹⁵⁵ SP 77/14 f^o 286r-287r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 6 March 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 292r, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 8/18 March 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 294r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 8/18 March 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 301r-301v, Trumbull to Secretary of State, Brussels, 14/24 March 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 345r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 14/24 June 1621; PEA reg. 1976, copy, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 July 1621 (n.s.), SP 77/14 f^o 360r, Albert to James VI/I, Brussels, 10 July 1621 (n.s.); SP 77/14 f^o 361r, Spinola to James VI/I, Brussels, 11 July 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 362r-364r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels 2/12 July 1621.

¹⁵⁶ SP 77/14 f^o 366r, Trumull to Calvert, Brussels, 3/13 July 1621.

¹⁵⁷ For the state funeral see, *Pompe funèbre du très-pieux et très-puissant prince Albert, archiduc d'Autriche, duc de Bourgogne, de Brabant, représentée au naturel, en tailles douces, dessinées par Jacques Franquart et gravées par Corneil Galle, avec une dissertation historique et morale d'Eryce Puteanus, conseiller et historiographe du roi.*

¹⁵⁸ Kempe (ed.), *The Losely Manuscripts*, 438-439, 440-442, 444-446, 452 and 464.

¹⁵⁹ Kempe (ed.), *The Losely Manuscripts*, 446

The Spanish ambassador, Cardinal de la Cueva, conde de Bedmar, after the deceasing of Albert, *presented a commission to the Infanta for the Gouuernment of these Countries in the name of the King his mr. wth authority to dispose of his army.* Infanta Isabella made difficulty and only wanted to accept it if she could surrender it at her own pleasure¹⁶¹. In reality the authority of the Spanish ambassador superseded that the Council of State. Two juntas in the Southern Netherlands, one of Spaniards and one of locals, were under Bedmar's authority. He was held accountable by the Junta de Flandes in Spain¹⁶². Despite that, Trumbull did not know to whom he now had to turn. Those that were in the Southern Netherlands had no power to get a further prolongation of the truce in the Palatinate¹⁶³. While the infanta was in mourning he turned to Spinola and by chance met the Spanish ambassador. Both were displeased with the reports on the military actions of Enest (1580-1626), count of Mansfeld, in Bohemia. Trumbull, as that information was not yet confirmed, asked both *not to credit those informations too lightly.* But as the information came from the elector of Mainz and the duke of Bavaria, they were sure enough. All Trumbull's arguments lead to nothing and Spinola refused to assist the English agent to obtain a prolongation of the Truce. Trumbull afterwards went again to the Spanish ambassador and the late archduke's confessor, but got the same answer. The Spanish ambassador, however, told Trumbull that although there would be no formal prolongation *que no se avia tan presto de disparar la Artilleria, wch beeing an oraculous, & equivocall speech; I doe in all humility referre to his interpretation*¹⁶⁴. Trumbull, writing at the end of July (n.s.), feared that his next letter to London would contain *dolefull newes of some conflict in the Lower Palatinate: and in tyme (If God prevent it not) wee shall see the losse of that Province*¹⁶⁵. After the expiration of the truce Spinola laid siege to one of the most important fortresses of the Lower Palatinate, Frankenthal.

On 14 September Trumbull received a dispatch from Sir John Digby with a letter from the emperor to the infanta and letters from Digby to the infanta, the Spanish ambassador, the marquis of Spinola, the late archduke's confessor and secretary Pedro St. John. The emperor was inclined to grant a suspension of arms in the Lower Palatinate, *for an indifirent time.* Charles de la Faille, who remained secretary of state after the death of Albert, gave the answer of the infanta,

*qu'elle le fera. Mais qu'en prealable elle desire de sçauoir s'il ya a quelque suspension d'Armes au Palatinat Superieur, & outre ce de demander en cet affaire l'aduis du Marq. Spinola, comme General de l'Armee de Sa Maté, estant au Palatinat Inferieur, pour ce fait y prendre resolution avec tant plus de fondement*¹⁶⁶.

Trumbull pleaded for a general truce in Germany for six months, but if that proved to be impossible to grant at least a suspension of arms in the Lower Palatinate for fifteen to twenty days. This would give Trumbull the time to inform London. He further hoped

¹⁶⁰ Kempe (ed.), *The Losely Manuscripts*, 464-466.

¹⁶¹ SP 77/14 f^o 376r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels 5/15 July 1621.

¹⁶² Maland, *Europa at war 1600-1650*, 86.

¹⁶³ SP 77/14 f^o 376v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 5/15 July 1621.

¹⁶⁴ SP 77/14 f^o 395r-397r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 21/31 July 1621.

¹⁶⁵ SP 77/14 f^o 397v, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 21/31 July 1621.

¹⁶⁶ SP 77/14 f^o 473r, de la faille to Trumbull, s.l., 30 September 1621.

Sir John Digby would be back in Brussels by that time. De la Faille replied that as Digby was treating for a general suspension of arms in Vienna nothing could be undertaken until those negotiations came to a conclusion¹⁶⁷. In the fall of 1621 the duke of Bavaria took large parts of the Upper Palatinate and the Spaniards had encountered no resistance in the Lower Palatinate¹⁶⁸. The Catholic forces expelled the Protestant clergy and sequestered all secularized church property. They wanted to recatholize the region by importing Catholic priests¹⁶⁹. Maximilian of Bavaria was, in the words of Croft, *the strong man of the Catholic League*. Emperor Ferdinand was increasingly dependent on Maximilian. To ensure his future assistance Ferdinand offered him the electorship and the Upper Palatinate¹⁷⁰. Count Henry Van den Bergh besieged the Dutch garrison in Jülich. In January 1622 they surrendered their position, which had been theirs since the start of the second Jülich-Kleve crisis to surrender the city. Infanta Isabella appointed Don Diego de Salcedos as governor of the city. This made any help from the United Provinces or England to the Palatinate virtually impossible¹⁷¹.

Frederick V was finally prepared to negotiate. He had lost the Bohemian crown and his patrimonial lands had been overrun by Spinola and the duke of Bavaria. The elector Palatine and his wife lived in exile in The Hague. The emperor's reliance on Maximilian of Bavaria was cause for concern for the allies of the Austrian Habsburgs. This could entail new possibilities for peace. James wrote the widowed Isabella in late November 1621 proposing a conference. The idea gained the support of Ferdinand and Philip IV, who had succeeded his deceased father in Spain. The conference convened in Brussels between May and September 1622. It aimed for a truce which eventually would result in a general suspension of arms. In the mean time Jean 't Serclaes (1559-1632), count of Tilly, conquered Heidelberg and Mannheim for Maximilian of Bavaria which effectively ended the Brussels Conference. Mannheim was captured despite the request of Philip IV to the Catholic League not to besiege the two remaining garrisons in Frankenthal and Mannheim¹⁷². Frankenthal was the last city which remained in Protestant hands due to the end of the war season. The situation of Frankenthal changed the following year. The Habsburgs got hold of it without using military force. Ferdinand de Boischot was sent to England and Trumbull negotiated in Brussels. An agreement was reached in London on 19/29 March 1623. Frankenthal was sequestered into the hands of infanta Isabella for a period of eighteen months. It was also agreed that the Protestants would retain their churches and schools. King James ordered the mainly English garrison of the fortress to surrender the city to the officers of the infanta. Isabella appointed Don Guillermo

¹⁶⁷ PEA reg. 2065, Trumbull to Isabella, s.l. 2 October 1621; PEA reg. 2065, de la Faille to Trumbull, s.l., 4 October 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 474r, Trumbull to Isabella, s.l., 2 October 1621; SP 77/14 f^o 475r, de la Faille to Trumbull, 4 October 1621.

¹⁶⁸ SP 77/14 f^o 482r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 28 September/8 October 1621; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*, 25.

¹⁶⁹ Parker, *Empire, War and Faith in Early Modern England*, 236; Egler, *Die Spanier in der linkrheinischen Pfalz, 1620-1632: Invasion, Verwaltung und Rekatholisierung*, 134, 149; Maier, *Die bayerische Unterpfalz im dreissigjährigen Krieg: Besetzung, Verwaltung und Rekatholisierung*, 142ff, 289ff.

¹⁷⁰ Croft, *King James*, 109.

¹⁷¹ Parker, *The Thirty Years' War*, 57-58; Israel, *Conflict of Empires*, 36.

¹⁷² Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*, 56-57; Patterson, *James VI and I and the reunion of Christendom*, 311; White, 'Suspension of arms' 292-293.

Verdugo¹⁷³. The five years between 1623 and 1628 were the height of Spanish power in northwestern Germany¹⁷⁴.

When the date for the restitution of Frankenthal approached, Trumbull reminded the infanta of the agreement. The English agent delivered a letter from James VI/I requesting the restitution. She was asked to relinquish the fortress into the hands of someone appointed by king James, to recall her governor and troops out of the city, as had been stipulated in London¹⁷⁵. Trumbull not only informed the infanta during an audience but furthermore delivered a written memorial of his argument, which was customary in a *formall court*, as he described the archducal court in Brussels. He had not received such instructions from James VI/I and asked pardon if he had exceeded his mandate. He, however, defended himself

But myne owne feeble judgement tells me it is the beste and safest course and I have continued it for many yeares together : because thereby an answere is drawen likewise in writing, and those that are made by word of mouth are subject to forgettfullnes mistakings, equivocations, or misinterpretations¹⁷⁶.

The answer of the infanta was positive, but according to Trumbull there was too little time to get everything arranged. He suggested that the sequestration would be prolonged or that Frankenthal would get the status of neutrality. He, however, feared that the town would be taken by archduke Leopold, the Catholic League or the duke of Bavaria. Furthermore, rumours circulated that once Frankenthal was in the hands of king James Tilly would besiege it. Remaining in the hands of the infanta was *a fate only imperceptibly better than falling* in the hands of the duke of Bavaria, according to Redworth¹⁷⁷. The Spaniards, however, never had the intention of surrendering their strongholds in the Palatinate. In the mean time Buckingham and Charles had travelled to Spain to conclude the Spanish Match but returned empty handed. King James was still convinced that the Spanish could be trusted and it took some time for him to recall Digby, by that time earl of Bristol, to England. This definitely ended the hopes for a Spanish Match. The only alternative, honourable course, according to Buckingham and Charles, was war. James asked Charles at that time, with tears in his eyes, according to Johan van Rusdorf, ambassador of Frederick, *Do you want me to go to war, in my twilight*

¹⁷³ SP 77/16 f° 85r-XXX, *Articles of sequestration of Frankenthal*, loco, 19 March [1623]; SP 77/16 f° 99r, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 5 April 1623 (n.s.); SP 77/17SP 77/16 f° 103r-103v, Infanta – *commission to receive Frankenthal*, s.l., 29 March/8 April 1623; SP 77/16 f° 101r-101v, Trumbull to [Carleton], Brussels, 8 April 1623 (n.s.); SP 77/16 f° 106r-107v, 108r, Trumbull to Calvert, Brussels, 31 March 1623; Maland, *Europe at war 1600-1650*, 94; Israel, *Conflict of Empires*, 34.

¹⁷⁴ Israel, *Conflict of Empires*, 37; Croft, *King James*, 115-116.

¹⁷⁵ SP 77/17 f° 344r-345r, copy, Trumbull to Isabella, Brussels 30 September 1624 (n.s.).

¹⁷⁶ SP 77/17 f° 359r-359v, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 3/13 October 1624.

¹⁷⁷ SP 77/17 f° 359r-360r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 3/13 October 1624; SP 77/17 f° 373r, Trumbull to Conway, Brussels, 9/19 October 1624; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics and the Spanish Match*, 73; Kessel, *Spanien und die geistlichen Kurstaaten am Rhein während der Regierungszeit der Infantin Isabella (1621-1633)*, 104; Weiss, *Die Unterstützung Friedrichs V. von der Pfalz durch Jakob I. und Karl I. von England im Dreissigjährigen Krieg (1618-1648)*, 57-58.

*years, and force me to break with Spain?*¹⁷⁸ A new parliament assembled in 1624, but it was only after the death of James VI/I that war broke out between England and Spain. Frankenthal would remain in Spanish hands until three years after the conclusion of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648)¹⁷⁹. In 1648 one of the sons of Frederick V and Elizabeth, Charles I Louis (1617-1680), got the Lower Palatinate and the electoral title back. The Upper Palatinate and the senior electoral title remained in the hands of the duke of Bavaria. The duke of Bavaria as the count Palatine were electors of the Holy Roman Empire after 1648.

¹⁷⁸ Stewart, *The Cradle King. A Life of James VI & I*, 330; Rusdorf, *Mémoires*, i, 147; the translation is that of Stewart.

¹⁷⁹ Parker, *The Thirty Years' War*, 169; Maland, *Europe at War 1600-1650*, 189.

Conclusion

Arriving back on English soil in the fall of 1625 Trumbull was able to look back on a diplomatic career which spanned two decades, almost the entire reign of the first Stuart on the English throne. Not especially noted for his ambition he succeeded Sir Thomas Edmondson in 1609 as representative of king James and became the resident agent at the court of archdukes Albert and Isabella. If ambition was not the driving force behind his actions in Brussels, his sense of duty had to be. Often foreign policy of the early modern age has been looked at through the spectrum of the king and his ministers and favourites. What this thesis aimed at was looking at foreign policy from a completely different angle, the lowest ranking man on the so-called chain of command, the individual ambassador, in the case of Trumbull nothing more than an agent. The second approach suggested in this thesis concerns the relationship between England and the Southern Low Countries, at times overlooked in historiography and at other times almost completely reduced to its religious dimensions.

While looking at those two different matters a picture of a Jacobean diplomat in the early seventeenth century becomes evident. The tasks at hand were considerable for a diplomat in that day and age. Since the origins of resident diplomacy in Italy observing and reporting had been the core business of the diplomat. Trumbull provides an excellent example of the Cecilian system of diplomacy, a system which remained in place after the death of Sir Robert Cecil, first earl of Salisbury, in 1612. Trumbull not only reported back to London on a weekly basis, writing sometimes long and tedious reports, he also corresponded with his fellow diplomats all over Europe. Besides the English agents and ambassadors he frequently had contacts with representatives of Protestant powers, e.g. Henry Bilderbeck, Dutch agent in Cologne. A diplomat also had to intervene actively to defend the interests of his king and countrymen. Trumbull, instructed by London or of his own accord, took that part of his job seriously and tried to secure his clients and king James satisfaction. Success was, despite his insistence and hard work, rare. The cases of Albery and Boyd, respectively a merchant and armyman, are the clearest examples of individuals who sued for Trumbull's assistance in Brussels, without success. Jean Thymon, a Brussels advocate, was employed by the English agent to further those and other cases. Litigation in the Southern Low Countries took years, especially when money was involved. Proceeding for years did not change the outcome for men like Albery and Boyd. Research into these individual cases has been neglected in historiographical research. It is clear that a diplomat at a foreign court could be a rally point for his countrymen seeking justice, an aspect of early seventeenth century diplomacy that needs further attention.

Looking at Trumbull's career, at his successes as well as his failures, it becomes clear that the diplomat at his post was able to do little to affect the course of history or to influence foreign policy. How a diplomat operated and to which success he conducted his business depended on several factors, e.g. the principal secretary of state and foreign policy goals. The post of principal secretary of state was pivotal. After the accession of James VI/I Sir Robert Cecil remained in control of the diplomatic corps. All foreign correspondence passed through his hands. Trumbull's dealings with Salisbury were few. Only at one time did the secretary of state trouble the Brussels agent, when William

Seymour escaped prison in England and fled to the Southern Low Countries in June 1611. Edmondson, in the years before, equally had little success in procuring satisfaction for king James with the Flight of the earls, Tyrone and Tyrconnell. Nothing changed. James had tried to separate Seymour from Arabella Stuart, but they had married nevertheless. By fleeing to the Southern Low Countries, Seymour, in fact, was out of harms way. Trumbull succeeded by his constant questioning at all levels of government in the Archducal Netherlands to keep Seymour on the road. Interest in London diminished as it became clear that the main objective, keeping the illicit couple separated, had been achieved if Seymour remained in the Southern Netherlands. After the death of Arabella Stuart in 1615, Seymour was able to return to England. Unintentionally, therefore, Trumbull did manage to keep the trust of the principal secretary and James, although his interventions failed.

Not only dynastic concerns motivated London to pursue individuals. The interest of Sir Thomas Lake in Lord Ros, especially after his death, was far more personal. It concerned his own daughter, Lady Ros and the will Lord Ross presumably left behind when he died in exile in Italy. Sir Thomas Lake was disgraced in 1618 because he used his office for personal ends. Ros never was an official concern of the English government. Seymour had stirred some trouble, but in the end proved to be harmless. Others who fled to the continent represented no danger at all, although they were embarrassments to king James, e.g. Benjamin Carier, his chaplain, and John Bull, his organist. Carier indeed left England to be able to practice the Catholic religion freely, but died soon after his departure out of England in France. John Bull, who fled England to escape the Court of High Commission, was a much more fanciful personage. English musicians were no rarity at the archducal court, and John Bull was originally employed by Albert and Isabella. This did not last long because of Trumbull's intervention. Bull ended his days playing the organ in the cathedral of Antwerp.

Observe and report not always implied a matter brought to the attention of the king received the reception the English agent thought it deserved. The possible banishment of English cloth is the most obvious example. Trumbull reported in 1611 that such a course was being contemplated in the Archducal Netherlands, but no instructions came from England. Unsure what to do he turned to his old master for advice. Edmondson was quite cynical in his answer lamenting the lack of action taken in England on many issues, until it was too late. Instead of preventing London often had to remedy. Edmondson nevertheless told Trumbull to take action in Brussels and remind the archdukes of the treaties between England and the Low Countries. On the other hand it is clear that the English cloth trade largely focused on the Northern Low Countries. At that time Trumbull was not only in contact with the government in London but also with the Company of the Merchant Adventurers. The implications of the Cokayne project had little influence on the interaction between England and the Archducal Netherlands. More research has to be done on the impact of the Southern Low Countries on the English cloth trade and on the policies concerning cloth in the Archducal Netherlands, to be able to appreciate Trumbull's point of view on this matter.

The death of Salisbury in 1612 was a heavy blow for diplomats all over Europe. King James did not appoint another principal secretary of state for two years. He managed all foreign correspondence with his favourite, Rochester. Salisbury's death not only caused a change in the way government was run. While the Elizabethan diplomatic compensation

had largely continued on a regular basis during Salisbury life, this changed after his death. The English court was in constant need of money. This naturally had immense implications on policy, foreign as well as domestic. James VI/I was unwilling to call parliament to provide the necessary funds. Naturally he had to seek other sources of income, e.g. benevolences, taxes and the sale of the cautionary towns. Nevertheless, the Exchequer was unable to pay the Jacobean diplomats on a regular basis. Trumbull's dispatches regularly mention the irregular payment of his fees and the lack of a compensation for his extraordinary expenses. Addressing himself to Rochester Trumbull was finally able to procure a clerkship of the Privy Council, a function he would only be able to exercise after his return in 1625. Rochester, however, proved to be an untrustworthy patron. In 1614, preparing for the convening of parliament, James appointed Sir Ralph Winwood, a staunch Protestant and experienced diplomat, who turned out to be William Trumbull's main patron. In 1617 a long standing grievance was addressed by Winwood. Trumbull was promised an allowance for his extraordinary expenses. In 1618, after the death of Winwood in October 1617, Trumbull returned to the Southern Low Countries after spending half a year in England with his ordinary entertainment doubled. Payment however was as slack as before. When Trumbull finally returned to England in 1625 the Exchequer owed him thousands of pounds.

Focus in older historiography is almost exclusively on the British and Irish men and women who sought refuge in the Southern Low Countries from persecution in England, as William Seymour. William Trumbull formulated many complaints when it came to those individuals and especially about their monasteries and colleges which were often financially supported by Albert and Isabella. However, he was equally sure that those foundations could only survive because of the money that was smuggled out of England. Trumbull's two main correspondents who were interested in the refugees were George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, and Sir Ralph Winwood. Although there were some high profile refugees that commanded Trumbull's attention between 1605 and 1625 it was only in the period 1614-1617, Winwood's tenure, that there was a special interest. Winwood wanted four men who resided in the Southern Low Countries to return to England: Sir Thomas Leedes, Sir Edward Parham, Sir Ralph Babthorpe and William Roper. It was the only time the English government, for a short while, was truly interested in individual recusants residing in the Southern Low Countries.

Catholic historiography of the end of the nineteenth and the start of the twentieth century is largely apologetic when it comes to English refugees. Authors as Guilday, Willaert and Proost denounce the vile Protestant persecutions of heroic Catholics. Looking at the protests and actions of Edmondes and Trumbull they concluded that there was a large persecution of those poor men and women who, according to them, were forced to flee their homes to be able practise their religion freely. Recent historiography, however, is much more nuanced. Questier points out that James made a distinction between moderates and radicals in religion. This distinction was communicated by Salisbury to Edmondes after the Gunpowder Plot. Persecution of Catholics was never high on the agenda, unless at some specific moments in the reign of the first Stuart on the English throne, e.g. the Gunpowder Plot. The last dozen years of James VI/I's reign were marked by a relative tranquillity for the Catholics in England.

Questier's article provides an excellent starting point for the study of the subject¹. Hugh Owen and William Baldwin were the two main culprits sought after 1605 in the Southern Netherlands. Although this was still under Edmond's tenure in Brussels, a certain pattern can be discerned which repeated itself time and again in the following years. When requesting that Albert sent such men to England the archduke always hid behind the argument of jurisdiction. Or they were servants of the Spanish king, or they were members of the clergy, anyway, they escaped his jurisdiction. The only thing that eventually happened was the banishment of the men out of the Southern Low Countries, which was better than nothing. That Baldwin spent some years in the Tower of London had more to do with luck than anything else. Banished from the Archducal Netherlands he was discovered passing through the Palatinate. Owen, on the other hand, made it to Rome, where he presumably spent his remaining years. The men presumably involved in the Gunpowder Plot were the only men that were actively persecuted. Why would Albert help the English king with capturing Catholics? He was unable to accomplish anything of note on the British Isles and Ireland to alleviate their plight. Receiving them, even at the displeasure of the English king, was, surely in his own mind, the least he could do.

Although it is clear from the correspondence that Trumbull belonged to the staunchly Protestant camp, with Abbot and Winwood at its centre, he did not always agree with his chief patron. During Winwood's tenure attention for the Irish regiment and individual recusants in the Southern Low Countries peaked. Of the four men secretary Winwood wanted to see back in England Sir Thomas Leedes and Sir Edward Parham proved to be the most interesting cases. Trumbull had already named Parham as the possible leader of the archducal English regiment in 1614, but it was only in 1625 that Parham got that function. Sir Thomas Leedes, one of those who frequented Catholic masses according to Winwood, had an extensive correspondence with Trumbull. The true nature of their relationship remains elusive, but it is clear from what Trumbull told Winwood, that part of that relationship was pragmatic. Leedes had good contacts, even as an exile, with members of the English court. On the other hand, the English agent professed that his close association with Leedes was only for show. Creating a false sense of friendship was Trumbull's way to make use of Leedes's contacts in England.

Interest in the English refugees further waned after the death of Winwood in October 1617. It was Abbot who most clearly motivated the non-policy towards the refugees. One of the main objectives of James VI/I was securing dynastically important marriages. His daughter, Elizabeth, was married to the Protestant elector Palatine, Frederick V, and James wanted to secure an equally important marriage with a Catholic family. The quest for the Spanish Match would therefore colour all decisions on foreign policy in the last latter part of James's reign. Abbot assured Trumbull of his sadness that nothing could be done when it concerned the English Catholic refugees, but, he went on, that was motivated because of the negotiations for the Spanish match. It was only in 1624 that it became clear that the match was a fiction, by that time James had little time left.

The English, often Catholic, merchant community never was targeted by the London government. Trumbull's contacts with some of them were extensive, e.g. Lionel Wake, John Corham and John Chandler. It would have been impossible for Trumbull to

¹ Questier, 'English Catholicism after the reformation'.

function in the Southern Low Countries if he was not pragmatic towards Catholics. Firmly convinced of his own beliefs, e.g. the lengths Trumbull went through to baptise his children who were born on foreign soil, he nevertheless had good contacts with Catholics in the Archducal Netherlands. While Winwood was secretary of state the English agent apparently felt the need to justify himself, which was evident when it came to Sir Thomas Leedes. Correspondence with these men stopped once Trumbull returned to England in 1625, long lasting friendships certainly were not the result of his career in Brussels.

Books and pamphlets provided Trumbull with much more trouble than the British refugees and their monasteries and colleges, because in that case king James took a personal interest. Historiographical interest in scurrilous books and pamphlets has been sporadic. The focus has been mainly on the war of pamphlets in which James actively took part. What is clear however from Trumbull's correspondence is the importance of some tracts that were written and published in the Southern Netherlands and were offensive to the king of England. Several books were opposed by Trumbull at the archducal court. It was *Corona Regia*, published in 1615 under a false name and false printer, that crowned them all. *Corona Regia* was truly Trumbull's largest burden, financially and time-consuming. Although to the modern day reader it remains baffling to what lengths James VI/I was prepared to go and even went, it substantiates how deeply honour mattered to the king. Although the interest in the matter peaked in 1616-1617, William Trumbull was still collecting information from 1618 onwards. Finally, in 1624, Trumbull was able to produce his key witness, the printer Flavius, but by that time London was consumed by other matters, such as the Thirty Years' War. The case of *Corona Regia* provides a clear insight in how Trumbull went about his business and who his informants were. Henry Taylor and Valentin de Meulder were two of those assistants, but both were equally untrustworthy according to Trumbull. Confessing as much about Taylor to Winwood, the secretary of state, wizened as a diplomat, Trumbull thought it better to have use of such men, then of none.

The importance of honour is also apparent when looking at some high profile refugees. Although William Seymour was a potential danger to the English crown of James, the likes of Benjamin Carier and John Bull were not. The fact that the one had been a chaplain of king James and the other his organist, was much more an embarrassment to the king than a dangerous turn of events. Besides the refugees, regular recusants, monasteries, colleges and some high profile individuals, another group came into focus after 1604: the English, Irish and Scottish regiments serving Albert and Isabella in the Army of Flanders. The Somerset House Treaty of 1604 opened the way for official levies on the British Isles and Ireland. Sir William Stanley already had defected to Spanish service in the 1580s, but after 1604 contracts were made to mobilise troops. The English and Scottish regiments which were founded after 1604 failed to recruit enough mercenaries to keep the regiments. The English regiment, according to Edmond Trumbull, was dangerous because of the English Jesuits who used all their influence to push their agenda. An individual as Sir Thomas Studer caused Trumbull a lot of trouble, but, in the end, was unable to do the English agent much harm. After 1609 the need for a standing army diminished because of the Twelve Years' Truce. The English and Scottish regiments disappeared and were reduced to companies. The Irish regiment, on the other hand, remained a constant concern for Trumbull, with over one thousand

men. Trumbull disagreed with the official policy. Winwood and others were convinced that it was better that those Irishmen remained on the Continent, where they could do little harm, than having them in Ireland. The English agent, however, was constantly seeking to weaken the regiment. On the one hand he was afraid that the Irish regiment could be instrumental in future broils, on the other hand he attached little credibility to reports of Spain preparing to invade England or Ireland. Spain simply lacked the funds to do so, Trumbull alleged.

The English agent, instigated by Winwood, watched the Irish regiment closely and acquired some informants, e.g. Fergus Donnell, who talked of plots being hatched. While the English regiment had been closely related to the English Jesuits, the Irish regiment turned to the Irish Franciscans of Louvain. That is clearly one of the reasons why those two religious orders got more attention from Trumbull. It stands to reason that the British and Irish mercenaries were employed by the commander of the army, Spinola, in the second Jülich-Kleve succession crisis and in the Palatine War at the start of the Thirty Years' War. The Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621) meant the end of direct hostilities between Spain and the Southern Netherlands on the one hand and the Republic of the United Provinces on the other. By no means did this entail peace and prosperity in the region. Strategically located duchies such as Jülich and Kleve were of interest to all parties. Although both Spinola and Maurice of Nassau started conquering towns and forts in the disputed territories, they never faced each other in the field. The Truce was safe, but the problems surrounding the succession in Jülich and Kleve would be left unresolved for years to come.

The traditional focus on Bohemia at the start of the Thirty Years' War has to be complemented with the Palatine war. When Frederick, the elector Palatine, decided to accept the Bohemian crown, without even waiting for the advice of his father-in-law, James VI/I, he dragged his patrimonial lands into the conflict. James was still convinced he could restore peace and quiet in Christendom relying on diplomacy and the Spanish match. A significant number of ambassadors extraordinary were sent to the continent to talk to the warring parties. Naturally the attention of Trumbull shifted in those final years to the international crisis.

The part the English agent had to play concerned the Palatinate. James VI/I never supported the claim of Frederick V to the Bohemian throne, but was adamant that the Palatinate, which had been overrun by Spinola and Maximilian of Bavaria, would be restored to Frederick V and Elizabeth, who had sought refuge in The Hague. James's diplomatic offensive was not a particularly great success. His diplomats such as Sir John Digby and William Trumbull succeeded in negotiating a temporary ceasefire in 1621. Rather than to some brilliant diplomatic strategy this success has to be attributed to the circumstances at the time. Historiography on the Thirty Years' War is affirmative that during these years the Spanish hold on the Palatinate was at its height. The final effort to safeguard a city of importance, Frankenthal, was by sequestering it into the hands of infanta Isabella. It was also a last recourse. Trumbull had little to do with negotiations on this issue which were the result of Ferdinand de Boisshot in London. After eighteen months the city was to be returned to James, but, not surprisingly, this did not happen. Trumbull was sure however that this was still better than let the city be conquered by Maximilian of Bavaria.

Corona Regia and the Jülich-Kleve succession crises are a few examples that demonstrate a central flaw in James's foreign policy. When all was said and done, he remained a strong opponent of war and was prepared to make enormous concessions to maintain peace. The promise Spinola requested of Maurice of Nassau in the wake of the Treaty of Xanten provides the clearest example. Despite strong speeches of going to war, James eventually was prepared to accept the promise as formulated by the archdukes and to promote it in the United Provinces. Trumbull was instructed with the departure of Sir John Bennet in 1617 to return with him. *Corona Regia*, on the other hand, seemed to sever the diplomatic relations between Brussels and London completely. The archdukes and their ministers, however, did not think Trumbull would really be called back to London. Winwood was glad Trumbull had not left with Bennet, as it was a matter of great concern. In the end Trumbull returned to England, but only for six months. The embassy remained open in Brussels under the supervision of John Wolley.

Toby Osborne, in his recent study, describes diplomacy during the first half of the seventeenth century as,

*as much about the dead-end negotiations, deliberate smokescreens and unfulfilled pipedreams of the competing powers and players, as about negotiations they undertook and treaties they concluded*².

Although he focussed on abbot Scaglia and Savoy, this generalisation seems applicable to Trumbull's career in Brussels. Dead-end negotiations, deliberate smokescreens and unfulfilled pipedreams were manifold in the two decades Trumbull was a diplomat. Despite the shortcomings in, the lack of continuity between one secretary of state to the other and the propensity of James to prefer peace before everything else, Trumbull functioned as agent in Brussels for twenty years. Although it was difficult for him to achieve anything of note, it has to be remembered that the main function of a diplomat was to observe and report. This, Trumbull did with full conviction. He followed instructions he received out of London meticulously even if he was sure that it would lead to nothing, or that interest in London would wane and disappear. Trumbull, in short, was a civil servant *avant-la-lettre*, serving king and country, sometimes despite their policies.

² Osborne, *Dynasty and diplomacy in the court of Savoy. Political Culture and the Thirty Years' War*, 278.

Bibliography of Sources and Works Cited

Archival material

Brussels, Archives générales du royaume

- Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience, reg. 365.
- Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience, reg. 405/3.
- Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience, reg. 1976.
- Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience, reg. 2065.
- Conseil Privé Espagnol, reg. 1276/162; 164; 349.
- Conseil Privé Espagnol, reg. 1277/47; 224; 225; 230.

London, The National Archives

- State Papers Flanders 77/8-18.

London, The British Library

- Add. MS 4181
- Add. MS 72314
- Add. MS 72387

Published Sources

- *Pompe funèbre du très-pieux et très-puissant prince Albert, archiduc d'Autriche, duc de Bourgogne, de Brabant, représentée au naturel, en tailles douces, dessinées par Jacques Franquart et gravées par Corneil Galle, avec une dissertation historique et morale d'Eryce Puteanus, conseiller et historiographe du roi* (Brussels, 1729).
- Ermolao Barbaro, *Tractatus "De coelibatu" et "De officio legati"* (Firenze, 1696).
- Geoffrey R. Berridge (ed.), *Diplomatic Classics. Selected Texts from Commynes to Vattel* (Basingstoke and New York, 2004).
- John Blackfan, *Annales Collegii S. Albani in Oppido Valesoleti, auctore Patre Joannes Blackfan ex typis, J.-H. Pollen (ed.)* (Manresa, 1899).
- Victor Brants, *Règne d'Albert et d'Isabella 1597-1621* (Recueil de ordonnances des Pays-Bas. Recueil des anciennes ordonnances de la Belgique) (2 vols., Brussels, 1909-1912).
- Rawdon L. Browns, *Calendar of state papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy* (38 vols., London, 1864-1940).
- John Bruce (ed.), *Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1861).
- J.R. Dasent et. al. (eds.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England 1542-1628* (46 vols., London, 1890-1964).
- Jean Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens; contenant un recueil des traitez d'alliance, de paix, etc. faits en Europe depuis le regne de Charlemagne jusques à present, etc.* (8 vols, Amsterdam, 1726-1731).

- G. Dyfnallt Owen (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder September 1614-August 1616* (vol. v of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Downshire formerly preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire*) (London, 1988).
- G. Dyfnallt Owen and Sonia P. Anderson (eds.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder September 1616-December 1618* (vol. vi of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Downshire formerly preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire*) (London, 1995).
- Alberico Gentili, *De Legationibus Libri Tres* (2 vols., London, Toronto, Melbourne and Bombay, 1924; repr. Buffalo and New York, 1995).
- John Gerard and John Morris (ed.), *The Condition of Catholics under James I. Father Gerards Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot* (London, 1871).
- M.S. Giuseppi et al. (eds.), *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury* (24 vols., London, 1888-1976).
- Louis de Haynin, *Histoire Générale des Guerres de Savoie, de Bohême, du Palatinat & des Pays-Bas 1616-1627* (2 vols., Brussels, 1868-1869).
- Allen B. Hinds (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder January 1613-August 1614* (vol. iv of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1940).
- Allen B. Hinds (ed.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder 1611-1612* (vol. iii of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1938).
- Jean Hotman de Villiers, *The Ambassador* (London, 1603).
- Vladimir E. Hrabar, *De Legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* (Dorpat, 1906).
- James VI/I, *A Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer written by the King's Majestie for the benefit of all his subjects, especially of such as follow the court* (London, 1619).
- Alfred J. Kempe, *The Loseley Manuscripts. Manuscripts and other rare documents, illustrative of some of the more minute particulars of English History, Biography, and Manners of the reign of Henry VIII to that of James I. Preserved in the muniment room of James More Molyneux, Esq. at Loseley House, in Surrey* (London, 1835).
- Robert Lemon and Mary A.E. Green (eds.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1571-1625) preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. (1547-159) Edited by R. Lemon. (1591-1603), with addenda 1547-1579, By M.A.E. Green* (12 vols., London, 1856-1872).
- Norman E. McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1939).
- Luis Munoz, *Vida y Virtudas de la venerable Virgen Donna Luisa de Carvajal de Mendoça, su jornada a Inglaterra, y sucessos en aquel reyno* (Madrid, 1632).
- Edward K. Purnell en Allen B. Hinds (eds.), *Papers of William Trumbull the elder 1605-1610* (vol. ii of *Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire preserved at Easthampstead Park Berks*) (London, 1936).
- Johan von Rusdorf and Ern. Guill. Cuhn (ed.), *Mémoires et negociations secrètes de Mr. de Rvsdorf* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1739).
- Thomas Rymer and Robert Sanderson, *Foedera, conventiones, literae, et cujuscunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliae, et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes, vel communitates, ab ineunte saeculo duodecimo ... ad nostra usque tempora, habita aut tractata* (10 vols., The Hague, 1739-1745).
- Edmund Sawyer (ed.), *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (chiefly) from the Original Papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood, Kt. Sometimes one of the Principal Secretaries of State. Comprehending likewise the Negotiations of Sir Henry Neville, Sir Charles Cornwallis, Sir Dudley Carleton, Sir Thomas Edmondes, Mr. Trumbull,*

Mr. Cottington and others, *At the Courts of France and Spain, and in Holland, Venice, &c. Wherein the Transactions of those Times Are faithfully related, and the Policies and Intrigues of those Courts are discovered* (3 vols., London, 1725).

- Constant P. Serrure (ed.), *Vaderlandsch museum voor Nederduitsche letterkunde, oudheid en geschiedenis*, (5 vols., Ghent, 1855-1863).
- Frederik Van Marselaer, *Khpykeion, sive Legationum insigne; in duos libros distributum* (Antwerp, 1618).
- Frederik Van Marselaer, *Legatus libri duo, ad Philippum Hispaniarum regem* (Antwerp 1626).
- Juan-Antonio de Vera y Figueroa y Zuniga, *Le Parfait Ambassadeur* (2 vols., Leiden, 1709).
- Johann P. Sommerville (ed.), *King James VI and I. Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1994).
- John Wheeler, *A treatise of commerce, wherein are shewed the commodities [sic] arising by a well ordered ... Trade ... such as that of Merchant Adventurers is proven to bee, etc.* (Middelburgh, 1601).

Literature

- *Historie der erfopvolginge in de landen van Gulik, Berg, Kleef, Ravensberg en Ravenstein, vertoonende het gewigt van dezen landen, de eisschen der verscheide erfgenamen, de inzichten* (Amsterdam, 1739).
- Simon Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Foreign Policy', in: Howard Tomlison (ed.) *Before the English Civil War* (Basingstoke and London, 1985), 79-101.
- Simon L. Adams, 'Foreign policy and the parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in: Kevin M. Sharpe, ed. *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History* (Oxford, 1978) 139-172.
- Simon Adams, Alan Bryson, and Mitchell Leimon, 'Walsingham, Sir Francis (c.1532–1590)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28624>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Vivienne Aldous, 'Cokayne, Sir William (1559/60–1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5824>, accessed 17 Sept 2006].
- Gavin Alexander, 'Dickenson, John (c.1570-1635/6)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7601>, accessed 27 April 2005].
- Paul C. Allen, *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica. The Failure of a Grand Strategy, 1598-1621* (New Haven and London, 2000).
- Alison D. Anderson, *On the verge of war: International Relations and the Jülich-Kleve Succession Crises (1609-1614)* (Boston, 1999).
- Peter J. Anderson (ed.), *Records of the Scots colleges at Douai, Rome, Madrid, Valladolid and Ratisbon. Vol. 1. : registers of students* (Aberdeen, 1906).
- Sonia P. Anderson, 'The Elder William Trumbull: a Biographical Sketch', *The British Library Journal*, 19 (1993) 115-132.
- Sonia P. Anderson, 'Trumbull, William (1576x80?-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27775>, accessed 4 Jan 2005].
- L. Antheunis, 'Een weldoener van het St. Monicaklooster te Leuven : Thomas Worthington, 1553-1619' [A benefactor of St. Monica's Convent, Louvain]. *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis Bijzonderlijk van het Oud Hertogdom Brabant*, 3rd ser., 5 (1953) 38-46.
- Paul Arblaster, 'Blackwell, George (1547–1613)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2541>, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- Paul Arblaster, 'The Infanta and the English Benedictine nuns: Mary Percy's memories in 1634', *Recusant History*, 23 (1996) 508-527.

- Paul Arblaster, 'The monastery of our lady of the Assumption in Brussels (1599-1794)', *English Benedictine History Symposium*, 17(1999) 54-77.
- Paul Arblaster, 'Verstegan [Rowlands], Richard (1548x50–1640)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24217>, accessed 16 Sept 2006].
- W. A. J. Archbold, 'Hoskins, Anthony (1568/9?–1615)', rev. Peter Milward, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13836>, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Robert Ashton, 'Pindar, Sir Paul (1565/6–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22291>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Roland Baetens, *De nazomer van Antwerpens welvaart: de diaspora en het handelshuis De Groote tijdens de eerste helft der 17de eeuw* (2 vols., Brussels, 1976).
- J. H. Baker, 'Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley (1540–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8594>, accessed 28 July 2006].
- S. A. Baron, 'Becher, Sir William (bap. 1580, d. 1651)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/58323>, accessed 24 Oct 2006].
- James H. Baxter, 'The Scots college at Douai'. *Scottish Historical Review*, 24 (1927) 251-7.
- Gary M. Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation: Its Nature and Variety', *Journal of British Studies*, 20 (1981) 1-25.
- Gary M. Bell, 'Gilpin, George (d. 1602)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10758>, accessed 10 May 2006].
- Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688* (London, 1990).
- Alastair Bellany, 'Carr, Robert, earl of Somerset (1585/6?–1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4754>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Alastair Bellany, 'Cecil, Anne, Lady Ros (1599x1601–1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70622>, accessed 17 July 2006].
- Alastair Bellany, 'Cecil, William, sixteenth Baron Ros (1590–1618)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70619>, accessed 17 July 2006].
- Alastair Bellany, 'Elwes, Sir Gervase (bap. 1561, d. 1615)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12879>, accessed 18 July 2006].
- Alastair Bellany, 'Monson, Sir Thomas, first baronet (1563/4–1641)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18990>, accessed 3 July 2006].
- Alastair James Bellany, *The politics of court scandal in early modern England: news culture and the Overbury affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Barrett L. Beer, 'Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset (c.1500–1552)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25159>, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Thomas Birch (ed.), *The Court and Times of James the First* (London, 1849).

- Thomas Birch, *An Historical View fo the Negotiations Between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, From the Year 1592 to 1617. Extracted chiefly from the MS. State-Papers of Sir Thomas Edmondes, Knt. Ambassador in France, and at Brussels, and the Treasurer of the Houshold of King James I. and Charles I. and of Anthony Bacon, Esq; Brother to the Lord Chancellor Bacon. To which is added, A Relation of the State of France, with the Characters of Henry IV. and the principal Persons of that Court, drawn up by Sir George Carew, upon his Return from his Embassy there in 1609, and addressed to King James I. Never before printed* (London, 1749).
- Thomas A. Birrell, 'The Reconstruction of the Library of Isaac Casaubon', in: Anthony R. A. Croiset van Uchelen and Ernst Braches (eds.), *Hellinga Festschrift* (Amsterdam, 1980) 59-68.
- Douglas R. Bisson, *The merchant adventurers of England : the company and the crown, 1474-1564*. (Newark, 1993).
- Jeremy Black, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy 1688-1800* (Exeter, 2001).
- F. Blom, 'English and Irish books and convents in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: the link with the Low Countries', *Dutch Crossing*, 26 (2002) 169-182.
- Marc Boone, 'Les toiles de lin des Pays-Bas bourguignons sur le marché anglais (fin XIVE-XVIIe siècles)', in: Jean-Marie Cauchies (ed.), *L'Angleterre et les pays bourguignons : relations et comparaisons (XVe-XVIIe s.) Publication du Centre Europeen d'Etudes Bourguignonnes (XIVE-XVIIe s.) No. 35 - 1995. Rencontres d'Oxford (22 au 25 septembre 1994)* (Neuchâtel, 1995) 61-81.
- René Bouvier, *Comédie Royale: le mariage manqué du Prince des Galles Charles avec l'Infante Maria* (Paris, 1949).
- Caroline M. K. Bowden, 'Percy, Lady Mary (c.1570–1642)', Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66980>, accessed 17 July 2006].
- Peter J. Bowden, 'The regulation of English internal wool trade', *Wool knowledge*, 4 (1957) 4-9, 14-19, 20-23.
- Peter J. Bowden, *The wool trade in Tudor and Stuart England* (London and New York, 1962).
- Alexander Boyle, 'The flight of the earls', *Studies: and Irish quarterly review*, 44 (1955) 496-478.
- Patrick Boyle, *The Irish college in Paris from 1578 to 1901. With a brief account of the other Irish colleges in France : viz., Bordeaux, Toulouse, Nantes, Poitiers, Douai and Lille; and a short notice of the Scotch and English colleges in Paris* (London and New York, 1901).
- Allen D. Boyer, 'Coke, Sir Edward (1552–1634)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5826>, accessed 22 Oct 2006].
- Victor Brants, *Albert et Isabelle. Etudes d'Histoire Politique et Sociale* (Louvain and Paris, 1910).
- Victor Brants, 'Peck (Pierre)', *Biographie nationale*, 16 (1901) 784-792.
- Victor Brants, 'Prats (Philippe de)', *Biographie nationale*, 28 (1905) 202-203.
- Victor Brants, 'Richardot (Jean)', *Biographie nationale*, 19 (1907) 274-280.
- Victor Brants, 'Spinola (Ambroise)', *Biographie nationale*, 23 (1921-1924) 405-422.
- Louis Bril, 'Steenhuys (Guillaume de)', *Biographie nationale*, 23 (1921-1924) 756-758.
- J. Britz, 'Boischot (Jean-Baptiste de)', *Biographie nationale*, 2, (1868) 624-626.
- Alan Brown, 'Bull, John (1559x63–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3905>, accessed 8 June 2006].
- Jennifer M. Brown, 'Scottish Politics 1567-1625', in: Allen G.R. Smith (ed.), *The Reign of James I and VI* (London and Basingstoke, 1973) 22-39.
- John Callow, 'Campbell, Archibald, seventh earl of Argyll (1575/6–1638)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4471>, accessed 1 June 2006].

- John Callow, 'Campbell, Archibald, seventh earl of Argyll (1575/6–1638)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4471>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Nicholas P. Canny, 'The flight of the earls, 1607', *Irish Historical Studies*, 17 (1971) 380-399
- Nicholas P. Canny, 'O'Neill, Hugh, second earl of Tyrone (c.1550–1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20775>, accessed 26 May 2006].
- Philip Caraman, *John Gerard: the Autobiography of an Elizabethan* (London, 1951).
- Charles Carlton, 'Meldrum, Sir John (b. before 1584?, d. 1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18525>, accessed 16 Aug 2006].
- Charles H. Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625* (London and New York, 1964).
- James Carty (ed.), *Ireland, from the Flight of the Earls to Grattan's Parliament, 1607-1782; a documentary record* (Dublin 1951).
- Jerrold I. Casway, 'Henry O'Neill and the formation of the Irish regiment in the Netherlands, 1605', *Irish Historical Studies*, 18 (1973) 481-488.
- Jerrold I. Casway, 'O'Neill, Owen Roe (c.1583–1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20783>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- W.O. Cavanagh, 'The Irish Franciscan College at Louvain, Belgium', *Journal of the Society of Antiquaries*, 38 (1908) 175-178.
- Hubert Chadwick, 'The Scots College, Douai, 1580-1613'. *English Historical Review*, 56:224 (1941) 571-85.
- Thomas Clancy, 'English Catholics and the Papal Deposing Power, 1570-1640', *Recusant History*, 6 (1960-1961) 114-140, 205-227; 7 (1963-1964) 2-10.
- Terry Clavin, 'Conry, Florence (d. 1629)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6099>, accessed 17 July 2006].
- Roderick Clayton, 'Finet, Sir John (1570/71–1641)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9456>, accessed 1 Aug 2006].
- John T. Cliffe, 'Babthorpe family (per. c.1501–1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/71868>, accessed 3 July 2006].
- Thomas Cogswell, *The blessed revolution: English politics and the coming of war, 1621-1624* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Thomas Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match', in: Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds. *Conflict in early Stuart England: studies in religion and politics, 1603-1642* (1989) 107-133.
- Patrick Conlan, 'Irish Franciscan studies in the 17th century', *Donegal Annual*, 48 (1996) 110-122.
- Patrick Conlan, *St. Anthony' College of the Irish Franciscans Louvain, 1927-1977, 1607-1977* (Dublin, 1977).
- John Considine, 'Casaubon, Isaac (1559–1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4851>, accessed 7 Aug 2006].

- John Considine, 'Overbury, Sir Thomas (*bap.* 1581, *d.* 1613)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20966>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- August Corbet, 'Musical relations between England and Flanders', *Music and Letters*, 21 (1940) 259-265.
- Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age. England 1603-1714* (2nd edn., London and New York, 1994).
- Jan Craeybeckx, 'Les industries d'exportation dans les villes flamandes au XVIIe Siecle, particulierement a Gand et a Bruges', in: Amintore Fanfani, *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani: nel venticinquennio di cattedra universitaria* (Milan, 1962), iv,
- Anselm Cramer, 'Preston, Roland (1567-1647)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29356>, accessed 7 Aug 2006].
- Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, 'Bancroft, Richard (*bap.* 1544, *d.* 1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1272>, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- Pauline Croft, 'Cecil, Robert, first earl of Salisbury (1563-1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4980>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Pauline Croft, 'Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton (1540-1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13906>, accessed 28 July 2006].
- Pauline Croft, 'Howard, Thomas, first earl of Suffolk (1561-1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13942>, accessed 25 July 2006].
- Pauline Croft, *King James* (Basingstoke, 2003).
- Pauline Croft, 'Somerset, Edward, fourth earl of Worcester (*c.*1550-1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26005>, accessed 28 July 2006].
- Bernadette Cunningham, 'The culture and ideology of Irish Franciscan historians at Louvain, 1607-1650', in: Ciarán Brady (ed.), *Ideology and the historians* (Dublin, 1991) 11-30 and 221-22.
- Emile De Borchgrave, 'Gryspere (Guillaume de)', *Biographie nationale*, 8 (1884-1885) 390-391.
- Jules Delecourt, 'Boisshot (Ferdinand de)', *Biographie nationale*, 2 (1868) 621-624.
- Alfred De Ridder, 'Robiano (Balthazar De)', *Biographie nationale*, 19 (1907) 533.
- Hugo De Schepper, 'Richardot (eigenlijk Grusset), Jan', *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 1 (1964) 762-775.
- Pierre Deyon, 'La concurrence internationale des manufactures lainières aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles', *Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 27 (1971) 1 and 20-32.
- Peter H. Ditchfield and William Page (ed.), *A History of the County of Berkshire* (5 vols., London, 1906-1927).
- Edmund H. Dickerman, 'Henry IV and the Juliers-Clèves crisis: the Psychohistorical Aspects', *French Historical Review*, 8 (1974) 626-653.
- Alfred H. Dodd, 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', *The English Historical Review*, 53 (1938) 627-650.
- Gordon Donaldson, 'The Scottish Church 1567-1625', in Allen G.R. Smith (ed.), *The Reign of James I and VI* (London and Basingstoke, 1973), 40-56.
- Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland James V-James VII* (vol. 3 of *The Edinburgh History of Scotland*) (Edinburgh, 1965).

- Emile Dony, 'Verreycken (Louis)', *Biographie nationale*, 26 (1936-1938) 682-685.
- Susan Doran, 'Loving and Affectionate Cousins? The Relationship between Elizabeth I and James VI of Scotland 1586-1603', in: Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its neighbours* (Basingstoke, 2005) 203-234.
- Susan Doran, 'Seymour, Edward, first earl of Hertford (1539?-1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25161, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its neighbours* (Basingstoke, 2005).
- Susan Doran and Jonathan Woolfson, 'Wilson, Thomas (1523/4-1581)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29688, accessed 17 July 2006].
- Eamon Duffy, 'Allen, William (1532-1594)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/391, accessed 22 Oct 2006].
- Jean Dumont, *Corps Universel Diplomatique* (12 vols., Amsterdam, 1726-1731).
- Michael Earls, 'The flight of the earls', *Catholic World*, 104 (1917) 651-652.
- Francis Edwards, 'The Attempt of 1608 on Hugh Owen Intelligencer for the Archdukes in Flanders', *Recusant History*, 17 (1984) 140-157.
- Francis Edwards, 'The First Earl of Salisbury's pursuit of Hugh Owen', *Recusant History*, 26 (2002) 2-38.
- Francis Edwards, 'Reformation and Excommunication', *Contemporary Review*, (1983) 133-136.
- A. Egler, *Die Spanier in der linkrheinischen Pfalz, 1620-1632: Invasion, Verwaltung und Rekatholisierung* (Mainz, 1971).
- Frédéric Fabre, 'Le collège anglais de Douai: son histoire héroïque', *Revue de littérature comparée* 10 (1930) 201-221.
- Frédéric Fabre, *The settling of the English Benedictines at Douai. As seen chiefly through unpublished documents of the Vatican archives, 1607-1611* (s.l., 1934).
- Charlotte Fell-Smith, 'Sandford, John (c.1565-1629)', rev. Elizabeth Haresnape, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24639, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Ignatius Fennessy, 'Guardians and staff of St. Anthony's College, Louvain, 1607-1999', *Collectanea Hibernica*, 42 (2000) 215-41.
- Hugh Fenning, 'Irish Dominicans at Louvain before 1700: a biographical register', *Collectanea Hibernica*, 43 (2001) 112-160.
- Kenneth Finsham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985) 170-206.
- Philip J. Finkelpearl, 'Chamberlain, John (1553-1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5046, accessed 12 Sept 2006].
- Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (7 vols., London, 1875-1883).
- Vittorio Frajese, 'Una teoria della censura: Bellarmino e il potere indiretto dei papi', *Studi Storici*, 25 (1984) 153-168.
- Georgiana Fullerton, *The Life of Luisa de Carvajal* (London, 1873).
- Louis-Prosper Gachard 'Ambassade extraordinaire envoyée par Jacques Ier ... à l'Archiduc Albert', *Bulletins de l'Académie royale des sciences et belles-lettres de Bruxelles*, 6 (1839) 138-141.
- Louis-Prosper Gachard, 'Bergh, (Henri, Comte de)', *Biographie nationale*, 2 (1868) 189-205.

- Louis-Prospér Gachard, 'Le cardinal Bentivoglio. Sa nonciature à Bruxelles (1607-1614)', in: Louis-Prospér Gachard, *Etudes et notices historiques concernant l'histoire des Pays-Bas* (vol. 3, Brussels, 1874) 95-168.
- Ian Gadd, 'Norton, John (1556/7–1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20347>, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642* (10 vols., London, 1883-1884)
- Artemis Gause-Stamboulpoulou, 'Gentili, Alberico (1552–1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10522>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Cathaldus Giblin, 'The Irish colleges on the continent', in: L. Swords (ed.), *The Irish-French connection, 1578-1978* (Paris, 1978).
- Joseph Gillow, *A literary and biographical history, or bibliographical dictionary of the English catholics : from the breach with Rome, in 1534, to the present time* (5 vols., New York, 1885-1902).
- Friedrich Gorissen, Franz Matenaar and Herbert Gräf, *150 Jahre Landkreis Kleve: Beiträge zu der geschitliche Entwicklung* (Kleve, 1966).
- J.D. Gould, 'The Trade Depression of the Early 1620s', *Economic History Review*, 7 (1954-1955) 81-90.
- Mark Greengrass, 'Edmondes, Sir Thomas (d. 1639)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8486>].
- Mark Greengrass, 'Neville, Sir Henry (1561/2–1615)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19940>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- Mark Greengrass, 'Unton, Sir Henry (c.1558–1596)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28001>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Mark Greengrass, 'Winwood, Sir Ralph (1562/3–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29783>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795. Vol. 2: The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795* (London, New York, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras 1914).
- Alexandra Halasz, 'Lodge, Thomas (1558–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16923>, accessed 25 July 2006]
- Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorn, *The Practise of Diplomacy: its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (London, 1995).
- Paul E.J. Hammer, 'The Crucible of War: English Foreign Policy, 1589-1603', in: Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its Neighbours* (Basingstoke and New York, 2005) 235-266.
- Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Smith, Sir Thomas (c.1556–1609)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25907>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Ernest T. Hamy, 'Conférence pour la paix entre l'Angleterre et l'Espagne tenue à Boulogne en 1600. Etude Historique. Suivie d'un choix de lettres relatives à cet évènement', *Bulletin de la Société Academique de Boulogne-sur-mer*, 7 (1906) 434-460.

- Vanessa Harding, 'Cross-channel Trade and Cultural Contacts: London and the Low Countries in the Later Fourteenth Century', in: Caroline Barron and Nigel Saul (eds.), *England and the Low Countries in the Late Middle Ages* (Bodmin, 1998) 153-168.
- F.W. Harris, 'The state of the realm: English military, political, and diplomatic responses to the flight of the earls, autumn 1607 to spring 1608', *Irish Sword*, XIV (1980-1981) 47-64.
- Simon Healy, 'Ingram, Sir Arthur (b. before 1571, d. 1642)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14414>, accessed 17 Sept 2006].
- A. J. Hegarty, 'Prideaux, John (1578–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22785>, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- Christian E. Henneke, 'The art of diplomacy under the early Stuarts, 1603-1642', PhD diss. (University of Virginia, 1999).
- Gráinne Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621* (Dublin, 1992).
- Gráinne Henry, 'Women "wild geese", 1585-1625: Irish women and migration to European armies in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries', in Patrick O'Sullivan (ed.), *Irish women and Irish migration (The Irish world wide, IV)* (London en New York, 1995) 23-40.
- Michael Hicks, 'Stanhope, John, first Baron Stanhope (c.1540–1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26249>, accessed 28 July 2006].
- Robert Hill, 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain. The parallel careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton, 1609-1625', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 15 (2003) 211-228.
- Robert Hill and Richard Lockyer, "'Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office" Revisited", *History*, 88 (2003) 17-31.
- Robert Hill, 'Works of Art as Commodities. Art and patronage; the career of Sir Dudley Carleton 1610-1625', PhD thesis (Nottingham Trent University, 1999).
- Peter Holmes, 'Bishop, William (c.1554–1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2474>, accessed 16 Aug 2006]
- G. Holt, 'Free places at the English College of St. Omer and Bruges and at the Liège Academy'. *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 52 (1983) 115-26.
- Park Honan, 'Wriothesley, Henry, third earl of Southampton (1573–1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30073>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- Harry R. Hoppe, 'Dr. Caesar Clement, chaplain to Archduke Albert', *Recusant History*, 7 (1963) 263.
- Harry R. Hoppe, 'John Bull in the archduke's service', *Music and Letters*, 35 (1954) 114-115.
- Andrew J. Hopper, 'Arundell, Thomas, first Baron Arundell of Wardour (c.1560–1639)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/726>, accessed 26 May 2006].
- Andrew J. Hopper, 'Conyers, Sir John (c.1587–1664)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66579>, accessed 22 Oct 2006].
- Ralph Houlbrooke, 'Dun , Sir Daniel (1544/5–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7817>, accessed 17 Sept 2006].

- S.J. Houston, *James I* (London, 1995).
- Victor Houlston, 'Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21474>, accessed 22 Sept 2006].
- David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle* (New Haven and London, 1985).
- David Howarth, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel* (Oxford, 1985).
- David Howarth, 'William Trumbull and art collecting in Jacobean England', *British Library Journal*, 20 (1994) 140-162.
- W.M. Hunnybun, 'Registers of the English Poor Clares at Gravelines, including those who founded filiations at Aire, Dunkirk, and Rouen, 1608-1837.!', in: J. Gillow (ed.) *Miscellanea*, 9 (Catholic Record Soc., Publications, 14) (1914).
- Jonathan I. Israel, *Conflict of Empires. Spain, the Low Countries and the Struggle for World Supremacy 1585-1713* (London and Rio Grande, 1997).
- Sybil M. Jack, 'Wolsey, Thomas (1470/71–1530)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29854>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Christine Jackson, 'Kendrick, John (bap. 1574, d. 1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66534>, accessed 10 May 2006].
- Christine Jackson, 'The Kendrick bequests: an experiment in municipal enterprise in the woollen industry in Reading and Newbury in the early seventeenth century', *Southern History*, 16 (1994) 44–66
- Brendan Jennings, 'The career of Hugh, son of Rory O'Donnell, earl of Tyrconnell, in the Low Countries, 1607-1642', *Studies: an Irish Quarterly Review*, 30 (1941) 219-234.
- Brendan Jennings (ed.), 'Irish preachers and confessors in the archdiocese of Malines, 1609-1794', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 23 (1960) 148-166.
- Brendan Jennings, 'Irish students in the university of Louvain', in: S. O'Brien (ed.), *Measgra I gcuimhne Mhicil Uí Chléirigh: miscellany of historical and linguistic studies in honour of Brother Michael Ó Cléirigh, chief of the four Masters, 1643-1943* (Dublin, 1944), 74-97.
- Brendan Jennings, 'Irish swordsmen in Flanders, 1586-1610. 1. Stanley's regiment 1586-1587; 2. Independent Irish companies and the regiment of Henry O'Neill', *Studies: an Irish Quarterly review*, 36 (1947) 402-410.
- Brendan Jennings (ed.), *Louvain papers, 1606-1827* (Dublin, 1968).
- Brendan Jennings (ed.) *Wild geese in Spanish Flanders, 1582-1700. Documents relating chiefly to Irish regiments, from the Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels, and other sources* (Dublin, 1964).
- Augustus Jessopp, 'Walpole, Michael (bap. 1570, d. 1625)', rev. Peter Milward, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28597>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- David M. Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (New York, 1999).
- W. J. Jones, 'Carew, Sir George (c.1556–1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4627>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Jean J. Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', *The American Historical Review*, 27 (1922) 426-464.

- Sean Kelsey, 'Conway, Edward, first Viscount Conway and first Viscount Killultagh (c.1564–1631)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6120>, accessed 2 June 2006].
- Sean Kelsey, 'Davies, Sir John (bap. 1569, d. 1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7245>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Jürgen Kessel, *Spanien und die geistlichen Kurstaaten am Rhein während der Regierungszeit der Infantin Isabella (1621-1633)* (Frankfurt am Main, Bern and Las Vegas, 1979).
- John D. Krugler, 'Calvert, George, first baron of Baltimore (1579/80-1631)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 2004 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4420>, accessed 26 Apr 2005>.
- Chris R. Kyle, 'Cornwallis, Sir Charles (c.1555–1629)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6337>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Peter Lake, 'Constitutional consensus and puritan opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish match', *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982) 805-825.
- Henry Lancaster, 'Button, Sir William, first baronet (1585–1655)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4238>, accessed 25 July 2006].
- John J. La Rocca, 'James I and his Catholic subjects, 1606-1612: some financial implications', *Recusant History*, 18 (1986-1987) 251-262.
- J.H. Lea, 'Contributions to a Trumbull Genealogy', *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 44 (1895) 331.
- R. Lechat, *Les réfugiés anglais dans les Pays-Bas espagnols durant le règne d'Elisabeth, 1558-1603* (Louvain, Paris and Roulers, 1914).
- Maurice Lee, Jr., 'The Jacobean Diplomatic Service', *The American Historical Review*, 72 (1967) 1264-1282.
- Maurice Lee, Jr., *James I & Henry IV. An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603-1610* (Urbana, Chicago and London, 1970).
- J. Lefèvre, 'Les ambassadeurs d'Espagne à Bruxelles sous le règne de l'archiduc Albert', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 2 (1923) 61-80.
- J. Lefèvre, 'Mancidor (Juan de)', *Biographie nationale*, 30 (1958-1959) 534-536.
- Pádraig Lenihan, 'Preston, Thomas, first Viscount Tara (b. in or after 1585, d. 1655)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22731>, accessed 31 May 2006].
- Alphonse Le Roy, 'Leys (Léonard)', *Biographie nationale*, 12 (1892-1893) 79-82.
- Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: the life and political career of George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London, 1981).
- Roger Lockyer, 'Lake, Sir Thomas (bap. 1561, d. 1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15903>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Roger Lockyer, 'Villiers, George, first duke of Buckingham (1592–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28293>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- Albert J. Loomie, 'The armadas and the Catholics of England', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 59 (1973) 385-403.

-
- Albert J. Loomie, 'Bacon and Gondomar: an unknown link in 1618', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 21 (1968) 1-10.
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Gage, George (c.1582–1638)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10270>, accessed 19 July 2006].
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Gondomar's selection of English officers in 1622', *The English Historical Review*, 88 (1973), 574-581.
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Matthew, Sir Toby (1577–1655)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18343>, accessed 20 July 2006].
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Neville, Edmund (b. before 1555, d. in or after 1620)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19927>, accessed 26 May 2006].
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Philip II's armada proclamation of 1597', *Recusant History*, 12 (1974) 216-225.
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Philip III and the Stuart Succession in England, 1600-1603', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 43 (1965) 492-514.
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Religion and Elizabethan commerce with Spain', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 50 (1964) 27-51.
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Richard Berry: Gondomar's English Catholic advisor', *Recusant History*, 11 (1971) 47-57.
 - Albert J. Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans. The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II* (New York, 1963).
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Worthington, Thomas (c.1548–1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29993>, accessed 21 July 2006].
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Wotton, Edward, first Baron Wotton (1548–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30000>, accessed 28 July 2006].
 - Albert J. Loomie, 'Wotton, Sir Henry (1568–1639)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30001>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
 - Maurus Lunn, 'Chaplains to the English regiment in Spanish Flanders, 1605-1606', *Recusant History*, 11 (1971-1972), 133-155.
 - Maurus Lunn, 'English Benedictines and the oath of allegiance, 1606-1647', *Recusant History*, 10 (1969-1970), 147-163.
 - Laurence Lux-Sterritt, 'Les religieuses en mouvement. Ursulines françaises et Dames anglaises à l'aube du XVIIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, 52 (2005) 7-23.
 - Laurence Lux-Sterritt, 'An analysis of the controversy caused by Mary Ward's Institute in the 1620s', *Recusant History*, 25 (2001) 636-647.
 - M.A. Lyons, 'Reluctant collaborators: French reaction to the Nine Years' War and the flight of the earls, 1594-1608', *Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, XIX (2002) 70-90.
 - John D. Mackie, 'The secret diplomacy of King James VI in Italy prior to his accession to the English throne', *Scottish Historical Review*, 24 (1924) 267-282.
 - René Maere, 'Les origines de la nonciature de Flandre. Etude sur la diplomatie pontificale dans les Pays-Bas à la fin du XVIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 7 (1906) 565-584 and 805-829.

- F. Maier, *Die bayerische Unterpfalz im dreissigjährigen Krieg: Besetzung, Verwaltung und Rekatholisierung* (New York, 1990).
- S. Marron, 'The English Franciscans of Douai'. *Douai Magazine*, 4 (1927), 2-10.
- Albert H. Marshal, 'Sir Dudley Carleton, James I's Ambassador to Venice, 1610-1615', MA diss. (Wake Forest University, 1973).
- Rosalind K. Marshall, 'Stuart, Lady Arabella (1575-1615)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/601>, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York, 1988).
- John McCavitt, 'Chichester, Arthur, Baron Chichester (1563-1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5274>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- John McCavitt, *The flight of the earls* (Dublin 2002).
- John McCavitt, 'The flight of the earls, 1607', *Irish Historical Studies*, XXIX (1994) 159-173.
- Thomas M. McCoog, 'Baldwin, William (1562-1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1172>, accessed 26 May 2006].
- Thomas M. McCoog, *English and Welsh Jesuits, 1555-1650* (2 vols., London, 1994-1995).
- Thomas M. McCoog, 'Garnett, Henry (1555-1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10389>, accessed 22 Oct 2006].
- Thomas M. McCoog, 'Gerard, John (1564-1637)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10556>, accessed 26 May 2006].
- Thomas M. McCoog, 'More, Henry (c.1587-1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19180>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- Thomas M. McCoog, 'Perkins, Sir Christopher (1542/3-1622)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21968>, accessed 2 Aug 2006].
- Peter E. McCullough, 'Andrewes, Lancelot (1555-1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/520>, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- James McDermott, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536-1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13885>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Alan R. MacDonald, 'Murray, John, first earl of Annandale (d. 1640)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19625>, accessed 17 Oct 2006].
- F. A. Macdonald, 'MacDonald, Angus, of Dunyvaig and the Glens (c.1548-1613)', Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69916>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- John J.N. McGurk, 'Wild geese: the Irish in European armies (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries)', in P. O'Sullivan (ed.), *Patterns of Migration (The Irish world wide, I)* (London, 1992) 36-62.

- Rob Macpherson, 'Maxwell, John, ninth Lord Maxwell (b. in or before 1586, d. 1613)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18405>, accessed 17 Oct 2006].
- David Maland, *Europe at War 1600-1650* (Totowa, 1980).
- Thomas L. Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614* (Oxford, 1958).
- Peter Milward, 'Kellison, Matthew (1561–1642)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15290>, accessed 16 Aug 2006].
- Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978).
- Peter Milward, 'Weston, Edward (1565?–1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29118>, accessed 7 Aug 2006].
- Oscar R. Morales, 'Not only seminaries: the political role of the Irish colleges in seventeenth-century Spain', *History Ireland*, 9 (2001), 48-52.
- Peter A. Moran, 'The library of the Scots college, Douai'. *Innes Review*, 43 (1992), 65-69.
- John H.A. Munro, 'Anglo-Flemish competition in the international cloth trade, 1340-1520'. In: Jean-Marie Cauchies (ed.), *L'Angleterre et les pays bourguignons : relations et comparaisons (XVe-XVIe s.) Publication du Centre Europeen d'Etudes Bourguignonnes (XIVe-XVIe s.) No. 35 - 1995. Rencontres d'Oxford (22 au 25 septembre 1994)* (Neuchâtel, 1995), 37-60.
- Dennis Murphy, 'College of the Irish Franciscans at Louvain', *Journal of the Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 23 (1893) 237-250.
- Martin Murphy, 'Robert Abercromby, S.J. (1536-1613) and the Baltic Counter-Reformation', *The Innes Review*, 50 (1999) 58-75.
- Harman Murtagh, 'Irish soldiers abroad, 1600-1800', in T. Bartlett en K. Jeffrey (eds.), *A military history of Ireland* (Cambridge, 1996) 294-314.
- Jules Nauwelaers, *Histoire des avocats au souverain Conseil de Brabant* (2 vols., Brussels, 1947).
- Charles A. Newdigate, 'Notes on the seventeenth century printing press of the English college at St. Omers'. *The Library*, 3rd ser., 10 (1919) 179-90 and 223-42.
- Mark Nicholls, 'Catesby, Robert (b. in or after 1572, d. 1605)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4883>, accessed 29 May 2006].
- Mark Nicholls, 'Markham, Sir Griffin (b. c.1565, d. in or after 1644)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18066>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Mark Nicholls, 'Rookwood, Ambrose (c.1578–1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24066>, accessed 24 Oct 2006].
- Mark Nicholls, 'Sir Charles Percy', *Recusant History*, 18 (1986-1987) 237-250.
- Harold G. Nicolson, *The Evolution of the Diplomatic Method* (London, 1954).
- Jeroen Nilis, 'The Irish College Antwerp', *Clogher Record: Journal of the Clogher Historical Society*, 15 (1996) 7-86.
- Edward R. Norman, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan settlement to the Second Vatican Council* (Oxford and New York, 1986).
- Marian Norman, 'A woman for all seasons: Mary Ward (1585-1645), renaissance pioneer of women's education', *Paedagogica Historica*, 23 (1983) 125-144.

- Walles Notestein, Frances H. Relf and Hartley Simpson, *Commons Debates 1621* (7 vols., New Haven, 1935).
- Ernest Nys, *Les origines du droit international* (Brussels and Paris, 1894).
- James O'Boyle, *The Irish colleges on the continent. Their origin and history*. Dublin, 1935.
- Susan O'Brien, 'Ward, Mary (1585–1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28699>, accessed 19 July 2006].
- Tadhg Ó Cianáin, *The flight of the earls; edited from the author's manuscript, with translation and notes*, by Rev. Paul Walsh (Dublin 1916).
- Tadhg Ó Canáin, *Imeacht na nIarlaí* [Flight of the earls] (Dublin 1972).
- Thomas O'Connor, 'Irish migration to Spain and the formation of an Irish college network, 1589-1800', in: Luc François and Ann K. Isaacs (eds.), *The sea in European History* (Pisa, 2001).
- T. Ó Fiaich, 'The O'Neills of the Fews', *Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, 7 (1973-1974) 263-315.
- Dominic O'Laoghaire, 'Mary Ward, 1585-1645: a personal tribute', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 37 (1982) 3-10.
- Heinz Ollmann-Kösling, *Der Erbfolgestreit um Jülich-Kleve. Ein Vorspiel zum Dreissigjährigen Krieg* (Regensburg, 1996).
- Toby Osborne, *Dynasty and diplomacy in the court of Savoy. Political Culture and the Thirty Years' War* (Cambridge, 2002)
- 'Parishes: Ewhurst', *A History of the County of Surrey* (vol 3., LOCO, 1911), 97-101.
- Geoffrey Parker, *Empire, War and Faith in Early Modern England* (London, 2002).
- Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years' War* (London and New York, 2003).
- William B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Helen Payne, 'Howard, Katherine, countess of Suffolk (b. in or after 1564, d. 1638)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70618>, accessed 25 July 2006].
- Henriette Peters, *Mary Ward. Ihre Persönlichkeit und Ihr Institut* (Vienna, 1991).
- Edward R. Petre, *Notices on the English Colleges and Convents established on the Continent after the dissolution in England*, Frederick C. Husenbeth (ed.) (Norwich, 1849).
- Anthony Petti, 'New light on Peter Philips', *Monthly Musical Record*, 87 (1957) 58-63.
- Ian G. Philip, *Dragon's teeth : the crown versus the press in England in the XVII century* (Claremont, 1970).
- Hector B. Piers, 'Les Anglais a Saint-Omer (Calais, 1842).
- Lionel Pike, 'Philips, Peter (1560/61–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22128>, accessed 1 Sept 2006].
- Fiona Pogson, 'Cottington, Francis, first Baron Cottington (1579?–1652)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6404>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Albert F. Pollard, 'Trumbull, William', *The Dictionary of National Biography*, XIX, 1991-1192.
- Stephen Porter, 'Packer, John (1572–1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21075>, accessed 1 June 2006].

- Klaartje Proesmans, 'The Key Role of the Archducal Court in Spreading a New Musical Style in the Low Countries', in: Thomas and Duerloo (ed.), *Albert & Isabella. Essays* (Louvain, 1998), 129-135.
- J.J.E. Proost, 'Les Réfugiés Anglais et Irlandais en Belgique. A la suite de la Reforme Religieuse établie sous Elizabeth et Jacques Ier', *Messenger des Sciences Historiques ou Archives des arts de la Bibliographie de Belgique*, 35 (1865) 277-314.
- Brennan C. Pursell, 'The end of the Spanish match', *Historical Journal*, 45 (2002) 699-726.
- Eddy Put and Craig E. Harline, *A bishop's tale : Mathias Hovius among his flock in seventeenth-century Flanders* (London, 2000).
- Eddy Put and Craig E. Harline, *Verloren schapen, schurftige herders : de helse dagen van bisschop Mathias Hovius 1542-1620* [Lost sheep, scabby sheperds: the hellish days of bishop Mathias Hovius 1542-1620] (Louvain, 2002).
- Michael Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England. Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge 1996).
- Michael Questier, 'Crypto-Catholicism, anti-Calvinism and conversion at the Jacobean court: the enigma of Benjamin Carier', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 47 (1996), 45-64.
- Michael C. Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997) 311-329.
- Michael C. Questier, 'What Happened to English Catholicism after the English Reformation?', *History*, 85 (2000) 28-47.
- Charles Rahlenbeek, 'Longueval, Charles-Bonaventure De', *Biographie nationale*, 12 (1892-1893) 359-368.
- George D. Ramsay, 'The cloth trade at London in mid-sixteenth century: the Merchant Adventurers and their rivals', in: Marco Spallanzani (ed.), *Produzione Commercio e Consumo dei Panni di Lana (nei secoli XII-XVIII)* (Firenze, 1976) 377-380.
- George D. Ramsay, 'The settlement of the merchant adventurers at Stade, 1587-1611', in: Tom Scott and E.I. Kouri (eds.), *Politics and society in Reformation Europe : essays for Sir Geoffrey Elton on his sixty-fifth birthday* (London, 1986) 452-72.
- Rory Rapple, 'Stanley, Sir William (1548-1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26283>, accessed 26 May 2006].
- Glyn Redworth, 'Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza; a Spanish nun in England, 1605-1614', paper given at Talking Peace: Somerset House 1604, London, 27-29 May 2004.
- Glyn Redworth, 'Of pimps and princes: three unpublished letters from James I and the prince of Wales relating to the Spanish match', *Historical Journal*, 31 (1994) 401-409.
- Glyn Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (New Haven and London, 2003).
- Glyn Redworth, 'Sarmiento de Acuña, Diego, count of Gondomar in the Spanish nobility (1567-1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69257>, accessed 28 July 2006].
- L. J. Reeve, 'Carleton, Dudley, Viscount Dorchester (1574-1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4670>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- L.J. Reeve, 'review of Owen G. Dyfnallt (ed.), *Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire: Vol. V: Papers of William Trumbull the Elder September 1614-August 1616* (London, 1988)', *International History Review*, 12 (1990) 572.

- Elizabeth Rhodes, 'Luisa de Carvajal's Counter-Reformation Journey to Selfhood (1566-1614)', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51 (1998) 887-911.
- J. T. Rhodes, 'Stephenson, Thomas (1552-1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26402>, accessed 7 Aug 2006].
- Robert W. Richgels, 'The pattern of controversy in a Counter-Reformation Classic: the *Controversies* of Robert Bellarmine', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 11 (1980) 3-15.
- Robert W. Richgels, 'Scholasticism meets Humanism in the Counter-Reformation: The Clash of Cultures in Robert Bellarmine's use of Calvin in the *Controversies*', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 6 (1975) 53-66.
- Moriz Ritter, *Sachsen und der Jülicher Erbfolgestreit (1483-1610)* (Munich, 1873).
- Alphonse Roersch, 'Puteanus (Erycius)', *Biographie nationale*, 28 (1904) 329-344.
- D.M. Rogers, 'Henry Jaye (15?-1643)', *Biographical Studies 1534-1829*, i (1951) 86-111.
- Hermann J. Roggendorf, 'Die Politik der Pfalzgrafen van Neuburg um Jülich-Klevischen Erbfolgestreit', in: *Düsseldorfer Jahrbuch* 53 (1968) 1-211.
- Rosie Roothans, 'De diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen England and de Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de aartshertogen. Een analyse op basis van de rapporten van Conrad Schetz (1605-1609) MA diss. (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1999).
- Luis Rosales, 'La alanzia anglo-española en el año 1623', *Revista de estudios históricos*, 11 (1945) 79-107.
- J. Roulez, 'De Somere (Jacques)', *Biographie Nationale*, 5 (1876) 771-772.
- Nicola Royan, 'Barclay, John (1582-1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1342>, accessed 7 Aug 2006].
- Antony Charles Ryan, 'Carrier, Benjamin (bap. 1565, d. 1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4663>, accessed 8 June 2006].
- Ernest Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practise*. 2 vols. (London, New York, Bombay en Calcutta, 1917).
- Fernand M. Schickler, 'Hotman de Villiers et son temps', *Société d'histoire de protestantisme français: Bulletin historique et littéraire*, 17 (1868).
- Winfried Schleiner, '"A Plott to Have His Nose and Eares Cutt off": Schoppe as seen by the Archbishop of Canterbury', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 19 (1995) 69-86.
- Winfried Schleiner, 'Scioppius' Pen against the English King's Sword: The Political Function of Ambiguity and Anonymity in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 14 (1990) 271-284.
- Roy E. Schreiber, 'Hay, James, first earl of Carlisle (c.1580-1636)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12723>, accessed 4 Sept 2006].
- Roy E. Schreiber, 'Naunton, Sir Robert (1563-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19812>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Willem Schricks, 'An Early Seventeenth Century Catalogue of Books from the English Jesuit Mission in Saint-Omer', *Archief- en bibliotheekwezen in België*, 46 (1975) 593-618.
- Peter R. Seddon, 'Parry, Sir Thomas (1544-1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21434>, accessed 28 July 2006].

- Colleen Seguin, 'Addicted unto Piety. Catholic Women in England 1590-1690', PhD diss. (Duke University, 1997).
- Colleen M. Seguin, 'Lovel, Mary, Lady Lovel (c.1564–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69036>, accessed 26 June 2006].
- Robert Shephard, 'Sidney, Robert, first earl of Leicester (1563–1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25524>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- Jacob H.H. Siccoma, *Schets van de diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Brandenburg 1596-1678* (Utrecht, 1867).
- John J. Silke, 'The Irish abroad, 1534-1691', in: Theodore W. Moody, Francis X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (ed.), *A new history of Ireland, 3: Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1976), 587-633.
- John J. Silke, 'O'Donnell, Rury, styled first earl of Tyrconnell (1574/5–1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20559>, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Th. Simar, *Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Ier, roi d'Angleterre. Une épisode des controverses politico-religieuses au XVIIe siècle* (Louvain and Paris, 1910).
- Jared R. M. Sizer, 'Maxwell, John, earl of Morton (1553–1593)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18404>, accessed 17 Oct 2006].
- David L. Smith, 'Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587–1660)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25182>, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Allen G.R. Smith, 'Introduction', in Allen G.R. Smith (ed.), *The Reign of James I and VI* (London and Basingstoke, 1973), 1-21.
- David L. Smith, 'Digby, John, first earl of Bristol (1580–1653)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7628>, accessed 20 July 2006].
- David L. Smith, 'Sackville, Edward, fourth earl of Dorset (1590–1652)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24444>, accessed 7 July 2006].
- David L. Smith, 'Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587–1660)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25182>, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Murray Smith, 'Flight of the earls? Changing views on O'Neill's departure from Ireland', *History Ireland*, IV (1996) 17-20.
- Robert M. Smuts, 'Howard, Thomas, fourteenth earl of Arundel, fourth earl of Surrey, and first earl of Norfolk (1585–1646)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13943>, accessed 12 Sept 2006].
- Robert M. Smuts, 'The Making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War', in Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), *Royal Subjects. Essays on the Writings of James VI and I* (Detroit, 2002), 371-387.
- Anne Somerset, *Unnatural murder: Poison at the court of James I* (London, 1997).
- Samuel E. Sprot, 'Sir Edmund Baynham', *Recusant History*, 10 (1969) 96-110.
- Helen G. Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England* (New York, 1940).

- Victor Stater, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke (1580–1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13058, accessed 12 Sept 2006].
- Victor Stater, 'Knollys, William, first earl of Banbury (c.1545–1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15760, accessed 28 July 2006].
- Michael Strachan, 'Roe, Sir Thomas (1581–1644)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23943, accessed 11 Sept 2006].
- John Steele, 'Calendar of the life of Peter Philips', in: P. Philips, J. Steele (ed.), *Select Italian madrigals* (loco, 1970), xvi-xxi.
- John Steele, 'Philips, Peter', *The new Grove dictionary of music and musicians*, 19 (2001) 589-594.
- David Stevenson, 'Gordon, Patrick, of Ruthven (fl. 1606–1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11072, accessed 15 Aug 2006].
- Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King. A Life of James VI & I* (London, 2003).
- Richard A. Stradling, *The Spanish Monarchy and Irish mercenaries: the wild geese in Spain 1618-1668* (Blackrock, 1994).
- Barry E. Supple, *Commercial crisis and change in England 1600-1642. A study in the instability of a mercantile economy* (Cambridge, 1959).
- Anne F. Sutton, 'The Merchant Adventurers of England : their origins and the Mercers' Company of London', *Historical Research*, 75 (2002) 25-46.
- Ethelred L. Taunton, 'Bradshaw, John (1575/6–1618)', rev. David Daniel Rees, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29253, accessed 1 June 2006].
- Andrew Thrush, 'The personal rule of James I, 1611-1620', in: Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.), *Politics, religion, and popularity in early Stuart Britain: Essays in honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), 84-102.
- Louis Tierenteyn, 'Maes (Engelbert)', *Biographie nationale*, 13 (1894-1895) 131.
- Gilbert Tournoy, 'Erycius Puteanus, Isaac Casaubon and the author of the *Corona Regia*', *Humanistica Lovaniensia. Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*, 49 (2000) 377-190.
- David J. B. Trim, 'Peyton, Sir Henry (d. 1623)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22079, accessed 6 June 2006].
- Abraham J. Van der Aa, 'Aerssens (François van)', *Biografisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 1 (1852) 34-35.
- Abraham J. Van der Aa, 'Bergh (Frederik, Graaf van den)', *Biografisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 1 (1852) 121-122.
- Abraham J. Van der Aa, 'Filips Willem', *Biografisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 2 (1852) 29-31.
- Abraham J. Van der Aa, 'Maas (Engelbreght)', *Biografisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 5 (1852) 5.
- Léon Van der Essen, 'Le rôle d'un ambassadeur au XVIIe siècle. Contribution à l'histoire de la diplomatie', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 2 (1923) 305-320.
- Albert Vander Linden, 'Verhoeven (Abraham)', *Biographie nationale*, 26 (1936-1938) 649-651.

- Arie T. van Deursen, *Maurits van Nassau 1567-1625. De winnaar die faalde* [Maurice of Nassau 1567-1625. The winner who failed] (Amsterdam, 2000).
- K.S. Van Eeroe, 'The Spanish match through an English Protestant's eyes', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 32 (1968) 59-75.
- Jan A. Van Houtte, 'Déclin et survivance d'Anvers (1550-1700)', in: Amintore Fanfani, *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani: nel venticinquennio di cattedra universitaria* (Milan, 1962), v, 703-734.
- Peter Van Kemseke, 'Inleiding. Diplomatie: een kwestie van cultuur', in: Peter Van Kemseke (ed.), *Diplomatieke Cultuur* (Leuven, 2000), 9-34.
- Paul Verhaegen, 'Ursel (Conrad d)', *Biographie nationale*, 25 (1930-1932) 924.
- Paul Voeten, 'Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van het Handelsleven te Antwerpen tijdens de eerste jaren van het Twaalfjarig Bestand (1609-1612)', M.A. diss. (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1954).
- Michael J. Walsh, 'The publishing policy of the English press at St. Omer, 1608-1759'. in: Robbins, Keith (ed.), *Religion and humanism : papers read at the eighteenth summer meeting and the nineteenth winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1981), 239-50.
- Micheline K. Walsh, *Destruction by Peace. Hugh O'Neill after Kinsale: Glanconcadhain 1602 - Rome 1616* (Armagh, 1986).
- Micheline K. Walsh, 'The last years of Hugh O'Neill: Rome, 1608-1616', *Irish Sword*, 3 (1958) 234-244; 5 (1962) 223-235; 7 (1965) 5-14, 136-146, 327-337; 8 (1966) 120-129; (1967) 294-303.
- Micheline K. Walsh (ed.), 'The will of John O'Neill, third earl of Tyrone', *Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, VII (1974) 320-325.
- Alexandra Walsham, '"Domme Preachers"? Post-Reformation Catholicism and the Culture of Print', *Past and Present*, 169 (2000) 72-123.
- Andrew Warmington, 'Brydges, Grey, fifth Baron Chandos (1578/9–1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3804, accessed 12 Sept 2006].
- Thomas G. Watkin, 'Herbert, Sir John (c.1540–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68194, accessed 28 July 2006].
- Piers Wauchope, 'Wheeler, John (d. 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29188, accessed 10 May 2006].
- Alphonse Wauters, 'Breda (Corneille de)', *Biographie nationale*, 2 (1868) 913-914.
- Alphonse Wauters, 'Marselaer (Frédéric de)', *Biographie nationale*, 13 (1894-1895) 854-860.
- Elmar Weiss, *Die Unterstützung Friedrichs V. von der Pfalz durch Jakob I. und Karl I. von England im Dreissigjährigen Krieg (1618-1648)* (Stuttgart, 1966).
- Immolata Wetter, 'Mary Ward', *Stimmen der Zeit*, 203 (1985) 291-302.
- Basil Whelan, *Historic English convents of today: the story of the English cloisters in France and Flanders in penal times* (London, 1936).
- A.W. White, 'Suspension of arms: Anglo-Spanish mediation, 1621-1625', PhD diss. (University of Tulane, 1978).
- Jurgen Wiegandt, *Die Merchant Adventurers Company auf dem Kontinent zur Zeit der Tudors und Stuarts* (Kiel, 1972).
- Alain Wijffels, 'Caesar, Sir Julius (bap. 1558, d. 1636)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4328, accessed 28 July 2006].

- Timothy Wilks, 'The picture collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (ca. 1587-1645) reconsidered', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 1 (1989).
- Leopold Willaert, *Le college anglais de Saint-Omer: les debuts* (Louvain, 1914).
- Leopold Willaert, 'Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre L'Angleterre et les Pays Bas catholiques (1598-1625) d'après les papiers d'état et de l'audience conservés aux archives générales du Royaume de Belgique', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, vi (1905) 47-54, 566-581, 811-826; vii (1906) 585-607; viii (1907) 81-101, 305-311, 514-532; iv (1908) 52-61, 736-745.
- David H. Willson, *King James VI & I* (London, 1956).
- Philip Wilson, 'The flight of the earls: an unsolved problem of history', *Nineteenth Century and After*, 55 (1904) 479-491.
- Alfred C. Wood, *A history of the Levant Company* (London, 1935).
- Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I: two kings or one?', *History*, 68 (1983) 187-209.
- Henry R. Woudhuysen, 'Vaux, Thomas, second Baron Vaux (1509–1556)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28163>, accessed 18 Sept 2006].
- Laura Wrieth, 'Trade between England and the Low Countries: Evidence from Historical Linguistics', in: Caroline Barron and Nigel Saul (eds.), *England and the Low Countries in the Late Middle Ages* (Bodmin, 1998) 169-180.
- Rivkah Zim, 'Sackville, Thomas, first Baron Buckhurst and first earl of Dorset (c.1536–1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24450>, accessed 11 Sept 2006].

*Index of Names and Places*¹

- Aachen, 151, 247, 249, 250, 251, 252, 264, 268, 269
- Abbot, George, archbishop of Canterbury, 7, 33, 35, 43, 44, 47, 53, 54, 56, 57, 69, 70, 75, 106, 124, 125, 135, 137, 142, 143, 146, 147, 150, 152, 153, 154, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 178, 182, 183, 184, 189, 190, 191, 194, 195, 196, 200, 201, 228, 252, 281, 282
- Abercromby, Robert, 193, 300
- Achelen, Folkert van, 87, 250, 251, 269
- Acquaviva, Claudio, 149
- Aerssens, François d', 120, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 267, 268, 305
- Africa, 110, 168
- Aidie, Andrew, 193
- Albery, Thomas, 1, 21, 33, 56, 76, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 279
- Albrecht Friedrich, duke of Prussia, 243, 271, 294
- Aldenhove, Mr., 248
- Allen, William, 148
- Amiens, 170
- Amsterdam, 223, 286, 288, 290, 293, 306
- Andelot, Ferdinand d', 216
- Andre, Paul, 19
- Andrewes, Lancelot, 189, 299
- Anhalt-Bernburg, Christian, 246, 248
- Anne, Queen, wife of James VI/I, 93, 199, 209
- Antwerp, 19, 34, 47, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 92, 93, 104, 105, 108, 114, 115, 116, 127, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 154, 159, 161, 166, 170, 171, 173, 179, 185, 186, 188, 192, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 205, 206, 215, 216, 219, 223, 226, 230, 235, 236, 237, 272, 273, 280, 288, 300
- Arlense, Pietro, 191, 236
- Arras, 63, 197
- Artois, 63, 68, 72, 86, 151, 160
- Arundell, Thomas, baron of Wardour, 54, 98, 99, 100, 102, 295
- Ashton, Walter, first baron of Forfar, 17, 180, 289
- Aubery Dumaurier, Benjamin, 253, 263
- Auroy, Pierre, 191
- Austria, 3, 248, 266
- Avignon, 170
- Aynscombe, Sir Arthur, 76
- Babthorpe, Sir Ralph, 173, 174, 175, 281, 291
- Baecks, Dr., 235
- Baineham, William, 76
- Balbani, Francisco, 104
- Baldwin, William, 96, 97, 100, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 153, 282, 299
- Balen, Hendrik Van, 54
- Ballam, Henry, 32, 35, 47, 80, 156
- Balloe, Anthoine, 206
- Bally, Mr., 143
- Bancroft, Richard, 56, 189, 292
- Barbaro, Ermolao, 8, 286
- Barclay, John, 196, 197
- Barclay, William, 188, 197
- Barnes, Thomas, 132, 135
- Barret, William, 117
- Bassompierre, François de, 246
- Bath, 52, 163, 177, 200
- Bavaria, 276, 277, 284
- Baylie, Mr., 130
- Baynham, Edmund, 137, 304
- Beaulieu, John, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43, 99, 100, 133, 134, 142, 161, 162, 164, 169, 221, 246
- Bedingfield, Mr., 107
- Beecher, Sir William, 39, 45, 46, 244
- Bellarmino, Robert, 185, 187, 188, 190, 303
- Bennet, Sir John, 1, 17, 36, 57, 102, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 227, 229, 231, 232, 233, 285
- Bennet, Sir John (junior), 216
- Bennet, Sir Thomas, 216
- Bentivoglio, Guido, 132, 202, 294
- Berg, 242, 256, 257, 270, 271, 288
- Bergen-op-Zoom, 230
- Bergheim, 251
- Berkshire, 37, 38, 60, 287, 292
- Bilderbeck, Henry, 163, 164, 207, 208, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 244, 246, 251, 252, 256, 258, 265, 266, 269, 270, 279
- Bill, John, 200

¹ In this index I have not included William Trumbull, archduke Albert, infanta Isabella, king James VI/I, Brussels, London and England.

- Bingley, Sir John, 47
 Biondi, Francesco, 249
 Bishop, William, 185, 228
 Blackfriars, 26, 39, 40
 Blackwell, George, 187, 288
 Blaise, bishop, 143, 148
 Blankes, William, 33
 Blount, James, 99, 105, 129, 137, 138, 139, 176
 Blount, John, 99, 100, 105, 106, 137, 176
 Blount, Thomas, 99
 Bohemia, 7, 51, 57, 183, 238, 242, 245, 275, 284
 Boisshot, Anne-Marie de Camudio de, 199
 Boisshot, Ferdinand de, 28, 29, 84, 94, 135, 160, 175, 199, 208, 209, 210, 214, 238, 252, 262, 276, 284, 290, 292
 Boisshot, Jean-Baptiste de, 28
 Borja, Iñigo de, 257, 263
 Borremans, Pierre, 191
 Bouillon, 33
 Boulogne, 24, 142, 295
 Bower, Sir Thomas, 47
 Boyd, David, 1, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 279
 Brabant, 19, 55, 63, 66, 72, 77, 89, 128, 131, 151, 152, 204, 208, 209, 219, 220, 221, 274, 286, 288, 300
 Branthwait, Robert, 169, 170
 Braunsberg, 193
 Breda, 36, 80, 112, 177, 230, 237, 238, 306
 Breda, Cornelius, 237, 238
 Brenchley, Kent, 38
 Brill, 45, 162
 Brogden, Elizabeth, 23
 Browne, Mr., 34
 Browne, Robert, 143, 144
 Brownlowe, John, 71, 74, 76
 Bruges, 61, 63, 69, 86, 87, 88, 90, 143, 145, 146, 156, 162, 235, 292, 295
 Brumfield, Roger, 165
 Bull, John, 1, 126, 155, 163, 164, 165, 166, 184, 280, 283, 290, 295
 Burcke, Redman (Richard), 117, 118
 Burcke, William, 117
 Burgundy, 190, 236
 Butler, Sir Henry, 216
 Button, Sir William, 103, 297
 Buwinckhausen, Benjamin sieur de Walmerode, 189, 197, 222, 224, 256
 Buwinckhausen, Daniel, 67, 73, 74, 98, 296, 304, 305
 Bylings, Capt., 99
 Caesar, Sir Julius, 73, 74, 86, 205, 222, 295, 306
 Caffarelli-Borghese, Scipio, 170
 Calais, 54, 122, 154, 161, 301
 Calvert, Sir George first baron Baltimore, 5, 10, 11, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 48, 50, 109, 137, 141, 180, 236, 238, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 297
 Cambrai, 173, 174, 197
 Cambridge, 11, 75, 288, 289, 291, 300, 301, 302, 305
 Campell, Archibald, seventh earl of Argyll, 107, 108, 109, 110, 168, 290, 291
 Cant, G., 86
 Cardona, Philip de, marquis de Guadaleste, 257, 258
 Carew, Sir George, 25, 26, 290, 296
 Carier, Benjamin, 1, 155, 163, 164, 184, 280, 283, 302, 303
 Carleton, Sir Dudley viscount Dorchester, 14, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 32, 36, 37, 39, 41, 51, 53, 56, 57, 59, 74, 81, 83, 89, 90, 101, 107, 108, 109, 124, 125, 151, 161, 169, 170, 171, 180, 182, 183, 210, 212, 216, 218, 221, 222, 223, 232, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 273, 274, 277, 287, 295, 299, 302
 Carr, Sir Robert viscount Rochester, earl of Somerset, 5, 11, 24, 29, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 51, 52, 53, 61, 73, 78, 83, 86, 87, 95, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 135, 136, 147, 152, 167, 178, 191, 222, 255, 256, 259, 280, 283, 289, 292, 302, 304, 307
 Carvajal, dona Luisa de, 149, 154, 287, 293, 302, 303
 Casaubon, Isaac, 163, 164, 189, 195, 196, 199, 202, 205, 212, 214, 219, 238, 290, 291, 304, 305
 Castle, John, 35, 36, 58, 167, 169, 170, 174
 Catesby, Sir Robert, 96, 137, 191, 300
 Cavell, Hugh, 168
 Cecil, Anne, Lady Ros, 171
 Cecil, Sir Edward, 254
 Cecil, Sir Robert, first earl of Salisbury, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 39, 40, 41, 51, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 75, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105,

- 106, 111, 112, 116, 117, 119, 121, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 169, 171, 172, 173, 180, 188, 193, 194, 244, 245, 250, 251, 254, 279, 280, 281, 286, 287, 289, 292, 293
- Cecil, William, sixteenth baron Ros, 1, 155, 169, 170, 171, 172, 184, 280, 289
- Chamberlain, John, 41, 47, 51, 53, 60, 134, 178, 213, 287, 293
- Chambers, Anthony, 165
- Champney, Anthony, 228
- Chandler, John, 19, 47, 52, 69, 104, 105, 179, 192, 197, 234, 282
- Charles I Louis, elector Palatine, 278
- Charles I Stuart, king of England, 4, 7, 37, 53, 60, 110, 270, 278, 290
- Charles II Stuart, king of England, 53, 110
- Charles V, emperor, 55, 68, 69, 236, 242
- Chaworth, Sir George, 17, 153, 274
- Cheyney, Henry, 199
- Chichester, Arthur, 114, 299
- Clarcke, Thomas, 33, 42
- Clement VIII, pope, 141
- Clifford, Mr., 227
- Cokayne, Sir William, 45, 62, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 280, 288
- Coke, Thomas, 55
- Colford, Ms., 141, 255
- Cologne, 143, 150, 156, 163, 164, 170, 188, 189, 197, 198, 200, 206, 207, 208, 210, 212, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 241, 244, 246, 248, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 264, 265, 266, 269, 270, 279
- Comi, Filippo, 93
- Connaught, 115
- Conry, Florence, 152, 291
- Constantius, 193
- Conway, Sir Edward, 11, 34, 36, 37, 49, 50, 58, 59, 110, 125, 177, 271, 272, 277, 297
- Conyers, Mr., 141, 174, 295
- Conyers, Sir John, 174
- Coppigny, Mr. de, 216
- Corham, John, 34, 67, 70, 71, 72, 84, 92, 93, 282
- Cornwallis, Sir Charles, 14, 16, 27, 39, 96, 116, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 287, 297
- Cottington, Sir Francis, 14, 27, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 82, 90, 107, 108, 168, 169, 180, 287, 301
- Coursèle, Gerard de, 212
- Crane, Mr., 29
- Creswell, Joseph, 134, 181
- Crichton, Sir James, 110
- Cromptoz, Sir John, 216
- Cromwell, Oliver, 112
- Crosse, Lady, 205
- Cueva, Alonso de la, conde de Bedmar, 275
- Cynaten, Reyner, 55
- Dale, Adriaan Van, 92
- Damseau, Mr., 237, 239
- Darcy, William, 95
- Davis, Sir John, 115
- Deacon, 141
- Delft, 70, 83
- Deventer, 95
- Devereux, Robert, first earl of Essex, 9
- Devick, Elizabeth, 31
- Devick, William, 27, 28, 29, 31, 41, 43
- Dexter, John, 100
- Dickenson, John, 39, 193, 288
- Dickenson, Sir John, 39, 193, 288
- Dieppe, 170
- Digby, Sir Everard, 195
- Digby, Sir John, first earl of Bristol, 17, 19, 27, 30, 35, 39, 48, 101, 141, 144, 150, 181, 182, 183, 195, 196, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 284, 304
- Diocletian, 193
- Ditton Park, 31, 122, 199
- Dixmude, 110
- Doleman, Elisabeth, 141
- Donaldson, William, 4, 33, 292
- Donne, Sir Daniel, 73
- Donnell, Fergus, 19, 21, 23, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 152, 167, 168, 284, 296, 304
- Donnell, Hugh, 112
- Dormalius, Philippus, 196, 198, 205
- Dortmund, 243, 245, 265
- Douai, 32, 47, 70, 86, 126, 135, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 159, 173, 182, 185, 188, 190, 193, 196, 198, 203, 205, 206, 211, 212, 214, 222, 223, 227, 228, 232, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 299, 300
- Douglas, Agnes, 163, 167
- Douglas, William, 167
- Dover, 37, 68, 122
- Downe, William, 50
- Downs, 89
- Downton, Wiltshire, 37
- Driscoll, Cornelius, 117, 118

- Drury Lane, 228
 Duck, Arthur, 216
 Dudson, William, 23
 Duffield, Mr., 100
 Dumont, Jean, 11, 257, 286, 293
 Dunkirk, 37, 64, 65, 66, 82, 84, 85, 89, 90,
 109, 142, 146, 161, 162, 163, 170, 173, 219,
 296
 Duren, 251, 257
 Düsseldorf, 40, 134, 173, 193, 244, 246, 247,
 252, 253, 257, 265, 267
 East Harsley, Yorkshire, 23, 38, 153, 177
 East Pollingfold, Surrey, 177
 Easthampstead Park, Berkshire, 23, 32, 38,
 60, 287
 Edinburgh, 108, 204, 221, 292
 Edmondes, Sir Thomas, 14, 20, 22, 23, 24,
 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 41,
 42, 43, 44, 51, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 87, 96,
 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 111,
 112, 121, 122, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133,
 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 148, 149,
 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 161, 162, 172,
 173, 177, 178, 183, 187, 188, 191, 194, 214,
 244, 246, 263, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 287,
 290, 294
 Edward VI, king of England, 195, 287
 Efferne, 248
 Egerton, Thomas, baron Ellesmere, 25, 86,
 289
 Elizabeth I, queen of England, 5, 6, 7, 24, 28,
 38, 39, 69, 95, 114, 126, 127, 131, 155, 195,
 286, 293
 Elwes, Gervase, 179, 289
 Emerick, 254
 Ernest, margrave of Brandenburg, 247
 Erville, Mr., 30
 Eudaemon-Joannes, Andreas, 189, 286
 Eustace, Edward, 116, 117, 119, 120
 Ewins, Mr., 69
 Faille, Charles de la, 146, 175, 184, 214, 216,
 217, 233, 272, 275, 276
 Faille, Jacqueline Della, 92
 Faille, Maria Della, 92
 Farnam, 41
 Farnese, Alexander, duke of Parma, 61, 86,
 87, 95, 129
 Fawkes, Guy, 129
 Ferdinand, emperor, 57, 238, 242, 273, 276,
 Ferdinand, king of Aragon, 9
 Fiat, Mr. De, 270
 Finet, John, 52, 87
 Fitzgerald, Maurice, 95
 Fitzsimon, Henry, 228
 Flanders, 18, 19, 21, 63, 65, 68, 69, 72, 73, 78,
 80, 86, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 110,
 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120,
 121, 122, 126, 128, 133, 134, 140, 144, 151,
 156, 161, 165, 231, 251, 268, 283, 286, 292,
 293, 295, 296, 298, 302, 306
 Flavius, John Christopher, 185, 186, 187, 189,
 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207,
 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 219, 222,
 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 235, 236, 238,
 239, 283
 Floyd, Griffin, 193
 Fludde, Henry, 164
 Flushing, 33, 34, 45, 52, 74, 77, 123, 222, 223,
 257
 Font, Mr. De, 197
 Forde, John, 69
 France, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 19, 24, 25, 31, 32,
 33, 39, 44, 52, 60, 68, 83, 100, 102, 110,
 112, 115, 117, 126, 129, 142, 143, 145, 160,
 161, 162, 167, 169, 171, 174, 178, 180, 181,
 188, 191, 197, 198, 215, 223, 244, 245, 247,
 249, 250, 254, 255, 256, 259, 261, 263, 265,
 280, 287, 290, 306
 Francisco, Giacomo, 99, 104, 195, 209
 Frangipani, Ottavio Mirto, 98, 131
 Frankenthal, 275, 276, 277, 284
 Frankfurt, 104, 105, 195, 196, 198, 222, 297
 Franqueza, Pedro de, conde de Villa Longa,
 138
 Frederick V, elector Palatine, 7, 32, 48, 50,
 54, 107, 134, 183, 242, 259, 269, 271, 272,
 273, 276, 278, 282, 284
 Frederick V, Elector Palatine, 36, 107
 Frenius, Dr., 235
 Frost, Mr., 137
 Furbish, Mr., 34
 Gage, George, 181, 205
 Gallus, Adam, 193
 Garnet, Henry, 161
 Gember, Vosman de, 235
 Genova, 170, 171
 Gentili, Alberico, 12, 13, 15, 287, 294
 Georg Wilhelm, elector of Brandenburg, 50,
 271
 Gerald, Mr., 119

- Geraldin, Edward, 96
Gerard, John, 96, 129, 133, 135, 136, 140,
150, 152, 154, 175, 196, 287, 291, 299
Germany, 9, 62, 68, 74, 102, 116, 159, 163,
212, 224, 225, 236, 241, 242, 243, 244, 251,
252, 254, 257, 260, 272, 273, 275, 277, 278
Gesualdo, Ascanio, 144
Ghent, 63, 69, 74, 83, 134, 136, 142, 156, 220,
229, 235, 244, 253, 288
Gilpin, George, 69
Gilpin, Mary, 69
Giron, Fernando, 256
Godde, Gilles, 239
Goes, Alexander Van der, 93
Goes, Henry Van der, 55, 93
Goes, Alexander or Henry Van der, 55, 92,
93
Gontier, Mr., 247
Gordon, Patrick, 193
Grafton, Mr., 228, 252
Gravelines, 83, 98, 143, 144, 146, 153, 173,
296
Green, Mr., 228
Gregory XV, pope, 143, 181
Grevenbroich, 251
Griffin, Mr., 228
Groenlo (Grolle), 110
Grolle, 110, 112
Groote, Louis de, 67, 84, 235, 236, 289
Grysperre, Guillaume de, 141, 156, 292
Gueldres, 30
Gueretin, Mr. de, 32
Habers, François, 235
Hainaut, 72, 151, 160, 244
Hamburg, 77, 79
Hamilton, Captain, of Binny, 230, 231
Hamilton, Patrick, 92
Harris, 92
Hay, James, first earl of Carlisle, 59, 169, 231,
271, 303
Heer, Mr. De, 237
Heidelberg, 32, 163, 165, 222, 233, 256, 258,
269, 276
Hennesgrave, 102
Henry IV Bourbon, king of France, 4, 7, 9,
24, 129, 243, 244, 245, 290, 292, 297
Henry Stuart, prince of Wales, 8, 52, 55, 181,
204
Herbert, Sir Edward, 7, 41, 86, 180, 294, 305,
306
Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke,
41, 44
Herentals, 110, 231
Hertssen, Elizabeth, 92
Hertssen, Jan, 92
Hieratus, Anton, 223
Highgate, 54, 55
Hill, Arthur Francis Nicholas Wills, ninth
marquess of Downshire, 60
Hill, Arthur, second marquess of
Downshire, 60
Hill, Blundell Sandys Trumbull, 60
Hingam, Jean, 191
Hodgkins, Mr., 137
Hoens, Cornelius, 92, 93
Holland, 19, 77, 230, 287
Holliday, John, 71
Hoskins, Anthony, 158, 289
Hotman de Villiers, Jean, 12, 13, 19, 134,
244, 246, 287, 303
Howard, Alatheia, countess Arundel, 54
Howard, Charles, first earl of Nottingham,
23, 44, 54, 86, 101, 114, 144, 178, 288, 292,
295, 299, 301, 304
Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton, 69,
70, 75, 86, 135, 136, 144, 178, 292
Howard, Katherine, countess of Suffolk, 101
Howard, Thomas, first earl of Suffolk, 44,
51, 54, 101, 296
Howard, Thomas, fourteenth earl of
Arundel, 51, 54, 55, 59, 93, 94, 296, 304
Hoyde, Walter de la, 95, 122
Huddleston, Mr., 163
Hunt, Henry, 1, 84, 85, 86
Ireland, 21, 25, 50, 95, 96, 97, 108, 110, 112,
114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123,
124, 125, 137, 141, 152, 167, 168, 188, 191,
282, 283, 291, 300, 304
Italy, 6, 8, 9, 135, 150, 157, 160, 165, 167, 170,
171, 172, 188, 198, 261, 266, 268, 279, 280,
286, 298
Jansenius, Cornelius, 205
Jaye, Henry, 194, 303
Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg,
205, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248, 250, 252, 253,
255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 262, 264, 266, 267,
268, 270, 271, 304
Johann Wilhelm, duke of Jülich and Kleve,
242, 243
Jones, William, 171
Judice, Marcello del, 209

- Julian the Apostate, 193
Jülich, 1, 7, 18, 22, 31, 105, 106, 112, 178, 223,
241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249,
250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258,
259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 269,
270, 271, 276, 284, 285, 288, 301, 303
Kaster, 251
Kellison, William, 185, 227, 228, 300
Kempe, 153, 199, 274, 287
Kendrick, John, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 296
Kilkenny, 110
King, 92
Kingsman, Thomas, 100
Kinschot, Mr., 205
Kirchner, Herman, 12
Kirkham, Mr., 29, 160
Kleve, 1, 7, 18, 22, 30, 40, 105, 106, 112, 178,
241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249,
250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259,
260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 270, 271,
276, 284, 285, 288, 294, 301
Knatchbull, Lucy, 141
Knollys, William, 86, 305
Koblenz, 224, 225, 238
Krakow, 193
Lake, Sir Arthur, 170
Lake, Sir Thomas, 4, 10, 25, 42, 46, 47, 53,
55, 56, 58, 83, 103, 104, 107, 108, 127, 146,
164, 165, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177,
180, 184, 222, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 270,
280, 293, 297, 305
Lambeth, 35, 43, 44, 47, 53, 56, 57, 69, 106,
125, 135, 137, 142, 143, 146, 152, 155, 164,
166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 182, 183, 191, 194,
195, 196, 201
Lancashire, 153
Le Fever de la Boderie, Antoine, 245
Leech, Andrew, 193
Leedes, Edward, 179
Leedes, Mary, 174, 177, 179, 180
Leedes, Sir Thomas, 19, 164, 171, 173, 176,
177, 178, 180, 181, 205, 281, 282, 283
Leedes, Thomas, 179
Leiden, 200, 223, 288
Lemster, 115
Leopod, archduke of Austria, 244, 246, 264,
277
Leopold I, emperor, 271
Lessius, Leonard, 151, 188
Leunes, Johanna, 85
Libigny, Jean, 30, 50, 51, 205, 267, 268
Liège, 53, 55, 68, 136, 137, 142, 143, 145, 146,
150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159,
163, 164, 175, 176, 197, 198, 227, 228, 237,
295
Ligne, Anne de, duchesse of Aerschot, 30, 53
Ligne, Charles de, prince of Chimay, 53
Lignecourt, Mr. de, 216
Lille, 86, 90, 144, 145, 147, 173, 197, 203, 205,
290
Lillo, 34, 80
Limburg, 63
Lingelsheim, 258
Lippe, 252
Lipsius, Justus, 190
Lipstat, 265
Locke, Sir Thomas, 23, 169
Lodge, Thomas, 103, 294
Longin, Roland De viscount de Berges and
St. Winnoks, 141
Longueval, Charles Bonaventure De, count
of Bucquoy, 205, 221, 247, 266
Loo, 267
Lorraine, 219, 261
Louis XIII, king of France, 83, 181, 215
Louvain, 12, 19, 21, 22, 30, 70, 103, 115, 119,
123, 135, 136, 142, 144, 145, 147, 149, 150,
151, 152, 153, 154, 158, 164, 168, 169, 173,
174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182, 186,
189, 190, 191, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200,
203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 222,
223, 224, 225, 228, 229, 232, 234, 235, 236,
284, 288, 290, 291, 292, 293, 296, 297, 300,
301, 302, 304, 307
Lovel, Lady Mary, 142, 304
Lowe, Sir Thomas, 73
Loyola, Ignatius, 135
Lyon, 171, 238
MacAngan, Hugh, 115
MacAngnan, Hugh, 123
MacDonald, Angus, 167, 168, 299
MacDonald, Sir James, 167, 168, 299
Madrid, 17, 19, 27, 35, 39, 55, 68, 82, 89, 90,
96, 97, 101, 108, 116, 130, 132, 133, 137,
138, 145, 150, 168, 169, 171, 180, 181, 183,
195, 196, 255, 257, 263, 270, 287, 288
Maes, Engelbert, 78, 79, 175, 202, 203, 205,
208, 210, 213, 217, 218, 219, 233, 234, 305
Mainz, 48, 163, 205, 222, 248, 272, 273, 275,
293

- Malines, 70, 86, 137, 142, 143, 145, 159, 173,
194, 204, 205, 211, 223, 226, 228, 296
- Mancidor, Juan De, 124, 156, 297
- Mannheim, 276
- Maria de Medici, queen of France, 6, 7, 215
- Mariemont, 155, 156, 157, 160, 165, 217, 218,
219, 220, 262
- Mark, 242, 251, 256, 257, 264, 270, 271, 294,
300, 304
- Markham, Sir Griffin, 98, 99, 100, 169, 176,
180, 247, 300
- Marselaer, Frederick De, 12, 14, 238, 288,
306
- Martin, Sir Henry, 236
- Mathew, Tobie, 32, 54, 55, 169, 181, 205
- Mathias, emperor, 244, 268, 270, 302
- Matton, Anthony, 69
- Maulde, Guillaume de, 197
- Maurice, landgrave of Hessen, 248
- Maximilian, duke of Bavaria, 109, 247, 261,
275, 276, 277, 284
- Maxwell, John, 163, 167, 300
- Medard, Louis De, 229
- Melvin, Andrew, 33
- Merstraten, Nicholas Van, 64, 65
- Metternich, Mr., 248
- Meulder, Valentin de, 222, 224, 225, 226,
235, 283
- Middelburg, 34, 52, 65, 70, 72, 74, 77, 79, 82,
83, 84
- Milan, 95, 137, 292, 306
- Miranda, conde de, 138
- Mole, Mr., 134
- Monger, James, 47, 48
- Mons, 131, 159, 160, 162, 193
- Monson, Sir Thomas, 177, 178, 179, 289
- Montgomery, George, 193
- More, Henry, 175
- More, John, 26, 28, 29, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46,
47, 48, 50, 57, 76, 77, 88, 117, 118, 134,
145, 155, 176, 185, 186, 216, 232, 233, 246,
269, 280, 287, 299
- Morgan, Mrs., 141
- Morrison, John, 84, 91, 92
- Mulheim, 247, 249
- Munck, Levinus, 25, 28
- Munich, 143, 303
- Munster, 115, 118
- Murray, John, first earl of Annandale, 167
- Namur, 158, 186, 224
- Naples, 96, 115, 118, 143, 171
- Nassau, Ernst of, 252
- Nassau, Maurice of, count or prince, 31, 107,
120, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 252, 253, 258,
268, 284, 285, 306
- Nassau, Philip William, prince, 246
- Naunton, Sir Robert, 5, 10, 11, 83, 91, 107,
108, 109, 135, 168, 169, 172, 180, 212, 213,
235, 236, 237, 303
- Nero, 193
- Neville, Edmund, pretended earl of
Westmorland, 106, 108, 109
- Neville, Sir Henry, 14, 106, 178, 287, 294,
298
- Newmarket, 31, 121, 168, 202, 203, 260, 265
- Newport, Thomas, 76
- Nieuport, 112
- Niño y Lasso, Rodrigo conde d'Anouer, 216,
221
- Normandy, 116
- Norris, Allen, 106, 110, 111
- Nort, Anthony De, 33
- Norton, Dudley, 41
- Norton, John, 41, 98, 160, 189, 294
- Norton, Mr., 159, 160, 227
- Nugent, Francis, 144
- Nurnberg, 212, 250
- O Danne, Mr., 117
- O'Donnell, Rury, first earl of Tyrconnell,
115, 116, 120, 121, 155, 280, 296, 304
- O'Donoghue, Roderick, 112
- O'Neill, Henry, 21, 96, 111, 112, 124, 291,
296
- O'Neill, Hugh, second earl of Tyrone, 96,
114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123,
124, 125, 155, 280, 291, 306
- O'Neill, John, 96, 115, 116, 306
- O'Neill, Owen Roe, 96
- O'Reilly, Cornelius, 117
- Oldenbarneveldt, Johan, 249
- Oldenseel, 110
- Opham, Jacob Van, 71, 72, 103
- Opham/Ophal, 103
- Opmeer, Peter, 200
- Orme, Roger, 99, 100, 139
- Osroy, 257
- Ostend, 66, 112, 156, 160
- Overbury, Sir Thomas, 29, 41, 52, 53, 113,
114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 152, 154, 173, 179,
289, 292
- Owen, Bartholemew, 92, 93

- Owen, Hugh, 18, 23, 92, 93, 96, 97, 99, 100, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 172, 282, 287, 291, 293, 302
- Pacenius, Bartholus, 193
- Packer, John, 41, 43, 44, 53, 88, 120, 121, 301
- Palatinate, 7, 17, 22, 54, 109, 112, 126, 134, 135, 183, 230, 237, 253, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 282, 284
- Panton, Mr., 54
- Parham, Sir Edward, 99, 100, 105, 106, 110, 139, 173, 174, 176, 177, 180, 254, 255, 281, 282
- Paris, 7, 14, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 42, 43, 64, 134, 144, 145, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 169, 170, 176, 189, 197, 200, 215, 221, 223, 225, 226, 244, 245, 246, 253, 260, 263, 267, 290, 294, 297, 301, 304
- Park, 205
- Parry, Sir Thomas, 16, 86, 303
- Pasqualo, Carlo, 14
- Paul V, pope, 112, 115, 148, 170, 306
- Peckius, Peter, 77, 78, 79, 220, 253, 254, 255, 256, 260, 261, 262
- Percy, Mary, 141, 142, 288
- Percy, Sir Chares, 96, 300
- Periet, John (alias Nicolas de Laeken), 236, 237
- Perkings, Sir Christopher, 91, 92
- Perre, Reynier vanden, 85
- Perron, Jacques Davy Du, 164, 197
- Perry, Hugh, 70
- Persons/Parsons, Robert, 141, 149, 188, 290, 296
- Perugia, 143
- Peter Ernest, earl of Mansfeld, 148
- Petit, John, 141
- Petrozani, Francesco, 52
- Peyton, Sir Henry, 162, 163, 305
- Philip II, king of Spain, 6, 7, 24, 48, 61, 78, 87, 95, 96, 111, 112, 115, 118, 123, 127, 129, 132, 133, 137, 138, 148, 152, 165, 169, 172, 181, 183, 194, 195, 245, 263, 267, 273, 288, 298
- Philip III, king of Spain, 6, 7, 24, 48, 78, 96, 111, 112, 115, 118, 123, 129, 132, 133, 138, 148, 152, 169, 183, 194, 195, 245, 263, 267, 273, 288, 298
- Philip Ludwig, count Palatine, 243
- Philip the Fair, duke of Burgundy, 66, 68, 192
- Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, 66, 69
- Philips, Peter, 126, 165, 301, 305
- Pindar, Paul, 17, 289
- Piombo, Sebastiano del, 54
- Plessen, Wolfrad de, 19, 170, 222, 224
- Plouvier, Maximilian, 205, 237, 238
- Poland, 193
- Porter, Sir Christopher, 121, 174, 175, 179, 301
- Potts, Thomas, 34
- Powis, T., 86
- Prague, 245, 251
- Prats, Philippe De, 87, 133, 135, 155, 156, 159, 160, 166, 192, 260, 262
- Preaux, Gilbert marquis de, 196, 203, 253, 255, 260, 261, 263, 268
- Pressburg, 143
- Preston, Thomas, 95, 190
- Prideaux, John, 189, 295
- Prince, Mr., 216
- Puteanus, Erycius, 1, 48, 57, 185, 189, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 228, 229, 230, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 274, 286, 303, 304, 305
- Quester, Matthew de, 32, 33, 47
- Raddock, Paul, 101, 105, 110, 111
- Ragh, Mr., 117
- Raphael d'Urbino, 54
- Raresby, sergeant-major, 110
- Rathe, John, 120, 121
- Rauschenberg, Johan von, 246
- Ravenstein, 242, 256, 257, 270, 271, 288
- Rees, 56, 98, 254, 256, 305
- Reffuge, Eustache Du, seigneur de Courcelle, 253, 254, 255, 256, 258
- Remonde, Christian, 196, 197, 202, 205
- Reynolds, Owen, 23
- Rheinberg, 112, 247, 251
- Rhine, 50, 252, 265
- Richardot, Jean, 61, 98, 132, 133, 149, 194, 245, 290, 292
- Riche, Lady, 141
- Rivius, Gerard, 196, 198, 205
- Roberti, Remacle, 189, 198, 205, 237
- Robiano, Baltasar de, 67, 72, 78, 79, 80, 251, 292
- Rodney, Mr., 156, 159
- Roe, Sir Thomas, 17, 60, 96, 291, 305

- Rome, 8, 9, 95, 107, 115, 116, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 141, 143, 144, 145, 148, 150, 156, 161, 168, 170, 171, 172, 181, 187, 195, 196, 215, 223, 225, 235, 282, 288, 294, 306
- Rooke, 103, 104
- Rookwood, Ambrose, 228, 300
- Roper, Sir John, baron Teynam, 142
- Roper, Sir William, 173, 281
- Rose, Mr., 196
- Royston, 31, 43, 53, 124, 195, 222
- Rubens, Peter Paul, 56
- Rudolf, emperor, 243, 244, 246
- Rusdorf, Johan Van, 277, 278, 287
- Ryckius, Justus, 228, 229
- Rymer, Thomas, 11, 287
- Sackville, Edward, fourth earl of Dorset, 177
- Sackville, Thomas, first earl of Dorset, 25
- Salcedos de, Diego, 276
- Salmon, Mr., 33
- Sandoval y Rojas, Francisco de, duke of Lerma, 132, 195
- Sandys, Martin, 60
- Sanford, John, 33, 99
- Sannes, Sir Edwin, 29
- Sanvietores, Mr. de, 206
- Sarmiento, Don Diego de, conde of Gondomar, 81, 91, 108, 109, 110, 168, 171, 183, 221, 235, 267, 298, 302
- Sassenus, Dr., 192, 235
- Sassenus, Jehan, 235
- Sauveur, Lambert, 238, 239
- Savoy, 9, 169, 180, 183, 245, 257, 285, 301
- Schantinell, Mr., 269
- Scheldt, 61, 65, 67, 70, 72, 78, 82, 127
- Scherpenheuvel, 173, 216, 262
- Schetz, Conrad, baron of Hoboken, 27, 61, 84, 96, 97, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 138, 140, 149, 303, 306
- Scholliers, Mr., 225, 235
- Schomberg, Hans, 248, 254
- Scioppius, Gaspar, 195, 196, 303
- Scot, Mr., 104
- Scotland, 4, 5, 6, 43, 46, 89, 96, 102, 108, 155, 167, 168, 169, 204, 221, 232, 233, 286, 292, 293, 304
- Searle, John, 31, 40, 47
- Sedan, 33
- 't Serclaes, Jean count of Tilly, 276, 277
- Sestich, Antoon, 235
- Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, 24, 162
- Seymour, William, 1, 24, 140, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 184, 279, 280, 281, 283, 289, 293, 304
- Sidney, Robert, first earl of Leicester, 53, 176, 304
- Sigismund III Wasa, king of Poland, 193
- Silva, Diego de, 170, 171, 172
- Simple, Colonel, 106
- Skinner, Daniel, 67
- Smith, Sir Thomas, 5, 8, 17, 25, 99, 116, 155, 177, 182, 290, 292, 293, 294, 304
- Soest, 255, 265
- Somere, Jacob De, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 89, 303
- Spa, 53, 56, 107, 142, 151, 158, 163, 174, 176, 177, 182, 221, 251
- Spain, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 24, 27, 64, 68, 69, 78, 82, 84, 89, 95, 96, 104, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 123, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 137, 138, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150, 158, 159, 164, 165, 168, 169, 172, 180, 181, 182, 183, 188, 215, 231, 241, 242, 245, 247, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 266, 270, 275, 276, 277, 284, 287, 288, 296, 298, 300, 301, 305
- Spanghen, Jean de, 216
- Spifame, Samuel seigneur de Buisseaux, 157
- Spinola, Ambrosio, marquis de, 7, 31, 36, 57, 78, 79, 83, 99, 100, 106, 109, 112, 123, 176, 178, 216, 220, 221, 237, 241, 244, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 284, 285, 290
- St. John, Pedro, 275
- St. Omer, 70, 84, 135, 136, 141, 143, 145, 146, 148, 153, 154, 159, 161, 163, 173, 181, 188, 192, 197, 203, 205, 211, 223, 232, 295, 300, 306
- St. Winoksbergen, 161, 162
- Stade, 76, 77, 302
- Stanhope, John, baron, 86, 295
- Stanley, Sir William, 21, 95, 96, 100, 105, 106, 118, 123, 128, 129, 130, 137, 283, 296, 302
- Steenhuys, Guillaume de, 104, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 235, 236, 238, 290
- Stephenson, Thomas, 191, 303
- Sticke, Henry, 268

- Stile, John, 9
- Stone, Thomas, 1, 84, 93, 94
- Strange, Mr., 134
- Stuart, Arabella, 155, 156, 157, 159, 162, 163, 184, 280, 299
- Studder, Sir Thomas, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 139, 176, 283
- Stuttgart, 189, 222, 224, 225, 265, 306
- Sussex, countess of, 141, 190
- Swetnam, Mr., 164
- Syberg, 264
- Taxis [Tassis, Antonio?], 55, 98
- Taylor, Henry, 30, 32, 146, 186, 201, 204, 205, 206, 207, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228, 239, 283
- Taylor, Robert, 165
- Ten Kelly, Lese Ireland, 112
- Ter Goes, 223
- The Hague, 19, 39, 56, 57, 69, 81, 83, 101, 107, 151, 169, 182, 205, 222, 223, 244, 245, 246, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 272, 276, 284, 287
- Thorys, John, 176, 206
- Throckmorton, Clement, 227
- Throckmorton, Sir John, 34, 52, 77, 222, 223, 256, 257
- Thymon, Jean, 19, 67, 88, 89, 91, 94, 103, 104, 191, 192, 195, 196, 197, 198, 203, 204, 206, 209, 238, 279
- Tielt, 229
- Torre, Francisco de la, 209
- Tournaisis, 86
- Townsend, Francelliana, 106
- Treves, 143, 163, 248
- Trumbull, Anne, 33, 34
- Trumbull, Deborah, 28, 33, 34, 38, 69, 177
- Trumbull, John, 33
- Trumbull, William (junior), 33
- Trysteynes, Mr., 100
- Tudeley, Kent, 38
- Tuscany, 10, 93
- Tyrwytt, Roger, 100
- Ulster, 115
- United Provinces, 7, 8, 9, 16, 18, 21, 34, 39, 44, 45, 56, 61, 62, 65, 71, 72, 74, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 95, 97, 106, 107, 116, 120, 126, 129, 130, 140, 146, 161, 162, 169, 173, 180, 181, 186, 198, 207, 222, 223, 230, 241, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 276, 284, 285
- Unton, Sir Henry, 14, 24, 294
- Van Male, Jean-Baptiste, 81, 90, 214, 222
- Van Once, John Henricks, 204, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 222, 223, 224, 226, 239
- Vander Vele, Mr., 248
- Vanderhaer, Mr., 198
- Vaux, Edward, 109, 307
- Velasco, don Alonço de, 84
- Velasco, don Diego de, 144
- Velasco, don Luis de, 257, 259
- Velpius, Roger, 205
- Veluwe, 112
- Venesis, Mr. De 157, 160
- Venice, 9, 19, 28, 29, 56, 104, 105, 124, 125, 161, 180, 183, 196, 219, 223, 249, 286, 287, 299
- Vera, Jan Antonio De, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
- Verdussius, Hieronymus, 196, 200
- Verhoeven, Abraham, 198, 305
- Verreycken, Louis, 205, 249, 293
- Verstegan, Richard, 67, 194, 289
- Vienna, 143, 271, 276, 301
- Villiers, George duke of Buckingham, 5, 11, 12, 13, 47, 48, 51, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 121, 170, 181, 183, 219, 222, 231, 244, 274, 277, 287, 295, 297, 303
- Visconti, Octavio, count, 247, 255
- Vlierbeek, 145, 205
- Vuthen, Jehan, 90
- Wake, Lionel, 19, 48, 50, 54, 55, 56, 59, 67, 70, 282
- Wake, Sir Isaac, 180
- Walsche, William, 119
- Walsingham, Sir Francis, 9, 24, 288
- Ward, Mary, 136, 143, 153, 298, 300, 301, 306
- Warsaw, 193
- Wateringbury, Kent, 38
- Watten, 148, 150, 151
- Weekes, Mr., 216
- Wenthworth, Thomas, 84
- Wesel, 112, 176, 178, 205, 247, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 264, 265, 271
- West Indies, 116
- Westminster, 60, 76, 86, 87, 88, 92, 128, 155, 233, 234, 235, 272, 273

- Weston, Edward, 190, 191, 192, 195, 227, 228
- Weston, Sir Richard, first earl of Portland, 17, 179, 272
- Westphalia, 278
- Weymbs, Dr., 235
- Wheeler, John, 70, 71, 288, 306
- White Mountain, Battle of (1620), 271
- Whitehall, 26, 35, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 52, 56, 65, 77, 80, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 102, 116, 118, 119, 120, 124, 125, 131, 136, 139, 152, 157, 158, 159, 160, 166, 170, 173, 192, 194, 207, 208, 209, 213, 214, 215, 226, 233, 235, 249, 258, 264
- Wiche, Peter, 60
- Wickmans, Hans, 205
- Wicquefort, Abraham de, 12
- Wilhelm V, duke of Jülich and Kleve, 241, 242
- Williams, Abraham, 101
- Wilson, Mr., 116, 126, 127, 161, 293, 307
- Windsor, Sir William, 60, 96, 99, 129, 137, 139, 161, 175, 196, 222, 231
- Windsor, Thomas, 55, 56
- Wintour, Thomas, 97
- Winwood, Sir Ralph, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 57, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 134, 136, 139, 142, 143, 144, 146, 151, 152, 153, 154, 164, 167, 168, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 187, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 244, 246, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 294
- Wisbitch, 199
- Wither(s), Anthony, 56, 62, 76
- Wolfgang Wilhelm, duke of Neuburg, 176, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 262, 265, 270, 271, 303
- Wolley, John, 18, 30, 31, 32, 47, 55, 56, 58, 83, 89, 93, 103, 104, 105, 175, 194, 205, 234, 238, 285
- Wolley, Mrs., 31
- Wolsey, Thomas, 9, 54
- Woodford, John, 31, 59, 169
- Worthington, dr., 145, 149, 171, 288, 298
- Wotton, Edward, 86
- Wotton, Sir Henry, 16, 29, 37, 86, 105, 180, 196, 223, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 298
- Wragge, Christopher, 33
- Wraysbury, Buckinghamshire, 38
- Wright, Dr., 61, 163
- Wriothsley, Henry, third earl of Southampton, 119, 176, 251, 257, 295
- Württemberg, 222, 224, 225, 261
- Württemberg, John Frederick, duke of, 32
- Xanten, 1, 22, 31, 248, 254, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 265, 267, 268, 270, 285
- Yalding, Kent, 38
- Yates, Edward, 94
- Yeats (Yates), presumably Edward, 93, 94
- Ypres, 63, 142, 205
- Zangiras, Mr., 205
- Zeeland, 67, 122
- Zeschlinn, Johannes, 254
- Zierikzee, 223
- Zoesius, Henricus, 235

Nederlandse samenvatting

William Trumbull. Een Jacobijnse diplomaat aan het hof van de aartshertogen in Brussel, 1605/9-1625

Toen William Trumbull in de herfst van 1625 terug voet aan wal zette in zijn geliefde vaderland kon hij terugblikken om een rijkge vulde diplomatieke carrière die twee decennia overspande. De carrière van Trumbull vormt een uitstekend uitgangspunt om de Engelse diplomatie in de periode van James VI/I te bestuderen. Trumbull genoot een praktische diplomatenopleiding onder Sir Thomas Edmondson. Als zijn eerste secretaris landde Trumbull in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden in mei 1605. Toen Edmondson werd teruggeroepen in 1609 bleef Trumbull achter in Brussel als chargé d'affaires, maar al snel als residerend agent. Terwijl het buitenlands beleid in de historiografie vaak wordt belicht vanuit het standpunt van de koning, zijn ministers en zijn favorieten, wil dit proefschrift de materie benaderen vanuit een totaal andere invalshoek: de man op de laagste trede van de ladder, de individuele ambassadeur, in het geval van Trumbull een agent. De tweede invalshoek die aan bod komt, is de relatie tussen de Zuidelijke Nederlanden en Engeland. Maar al te vaak is die relatie in de historiografie verengd tot haar religieuze dimensies.

Aan de hand van verschillende topics komt een duidelijk beeld van de Jacobijnse diplomaat in de vroege zeventiende eeuw naar voren. De taken die een diplomaat moest vervullen waren veelzijdig. Sinds het ontstaan van de residerende diplomatie in Italië stond het observeren en rapporteren centraal in het takenpakket. Sir Robert Cecil, graaf van Salisbury, ontwierp een systeem dat zelfs na zijn dood in 1612 standhield. Ambassadeurs en agenten werden verwacht om op regelmatige basis te rapporteren aan London en aan collega-ambassadeurs doorheen Europa. Trumbull levert een uitstekend voorbeeld van dat systeem. Zijn, soms lange, rapporten werden op wekelijkse basis naar Engeland gestuurd zoals duidelijk blijkt uit de State Papers in de *National Archives* in Londen. Aangezien de brieven die Trumbull ontving, de zogenaamde *Trumbull papers*, eveneens bewaard zijn (*British Library*), wordt duidelijk dat de residerende agent in Brussel contact hield met zijn collega-diplomaten doorheen Europa. Naast de contacten met Engelse agenten en ambassadeurs had Trumbull ook een frequente briefwisseling met de afgevaardigden van protestantse landen, zoals met Henry Bilderbeck, agent van de Verenigde Provinciën in Keulen. Naast het observeren en rapporteren moest een agent of ambassadeur ook interveniëren om de belangen van koning en landgenoten te behartigen en desnoods te verdedigen. Na het ontvangen van instructies of op eigen initiatief ondernam Trumbull wat hij nodig achtte om voor genoegdoening te zorgen voor zijn cliënten en zijn koning. Succes was, ondanks het harde werk, zeldzaam. De zaken van Thomas Albery en David Boyd, respectievelijk een Engelse handelaar en een kolonel, leveren de meest frappante voorbeelden. Deze individuen, gesteund door koninklijke aanbeveling, zochten hun toevlucht bij Trumbull om de justitie in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden aan te sporen. Ondanks de hulp van Jean Thymon, een advocaat, duurde de procedure jaren zonder ooit te resulteren in een overwinning. Onderzoek in dergelijke zaken is tot nu toe afwezig in de historiografie. Een diplomaat in het buitenland was zonder enige twijfel een duidelijk aanspreekpunt voor landgenoten,

een aspect van de diplomatie van de vroege zeventiende eeuw dat meer aandacht verdient.

Kijkend naar Trumbulls carrière, zijn successen en zijn falen, wordt het duidelijk dat een diplomaat op post in het buitenland weinig slagkracht had om het buitenlands beleid te beïnvloeden. Wat het succes of het falen van een diplomaat bepaalde, hangt af van verschillende factoren, waarvan de twee belangrijkste zijn de eerste staatssecretaris en het buitenlands beleid. Nadat James VI/I de troon van Elizabeth I had ingenomen bleef Sir Robert Cecil die hoge functie uitoefenen. Trumbull, als agent, stuurde zijn wekelijkse rapporten op naar Salisbury. Instructies van Salisbury waren evenwel schaars. Enkel nadat William Seymour naar de Zuidelijke Nederlanden vluchtte, stuurde Salisbury op regelmatige basis instructies naar Trumbull. Seymour was, tegen het bevel van James in, gehuwd met Arabella Stuart. Beiden werden gevangengezet, maar slaagden er in om te ontsnappen. Enkel Seymour lukte het om de oversteek te maken. Arabella daarentegen werd opnieuw gearresteerd en eindigde haar dagen in gevangenschap. James had getracht om Stuart en Seymour gescheiden te houden. De vlucht naar het continent verwezenlijkte de plannen van de Engelse koning. Door constant vragen te stellen op elk mogelijk niveau in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden slaagde Trumbull er in om Seymour op de been te houden. Na de dood van Arabella Stuart in 1615 kreeg Seymour de toestemming om terug te keren naar zijn vaderland.

Niet enkel dynastieke belangen lagen aan de oorsprong van instructies voor Trumbull. Toen William Cecil, baron Ros, vluchtte naar het continent, was het Sir Thomas Lake niet zozeer te doen om de zovelse Engelse katholieke vluchteling. Lake gaf Trumbull de opdracht om zoveel mogelijk informatie in te winnen. De achterliggende reden was familiaal en financieel. Ros was immers gehuwd met zijn dochter, Anne Lake. Andere vluchtelingen brachten de koning eerder in verlegenheid zonder dat ze ooit een gevaar vormden: Benjamin Carier, één van zijn kapelannen en John Bull, één van zijn organisten. Carier bezorgde Trumbull weinig moeilijkheden aangezien hij enkel door de Zuidelijke Nederlanden reisde richting Frankrijk waar hij korte tijd later stierf. John Bull daarentegen werd door de aartshertogen in dienst genomen tot groot ongenoegen van de Engelse koning. Trumbull slaagde er in om het contract tussen Bull en de aartshertogen te verbreken. Bull werd uiteindelijk organist in de Antwerpse kathedraal.

Observeren en rapporteren betekende niet dat London automatisch aandacht had voor problemen die Trumbull voorschotelde. Toen het verbieden van de invoer van Engels laken op de agenda stond in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden bleef London gehuld in stilzwijgen. Uiteindelijk nam Trumbull contact op met zijn oude leermeester Edmond. Edmond leverde Trumbull een cynisch antwoord. Hij beklagde zich dat London vaak te laat reageerde. In plaats van preventief op te treden, waren de Engelse autoriteiten vaak gedwongen om te remediëren en liepen ze zo achter de feiten aan. Desondanks gaf hij Trumbull ook praktisch advies. Hij moest Albert en Isabella eraan herinneren dat een dergelijk verbod inging tegen de gesloten verdragen. Anderzijds is het voor de hand liggend dat de Engelse lakenhandel zich voornamelijk concentreerde op de Noordelijke Nederlanden, waardoor het oorspronkelijke stilzwijgen in London kan worden begrepen. Niet alleen rapporteerde Trumbull naar zijn oversten, maar hij hield ook contact met de *Company of the Merchant Adventurers* dat grotendeels verantwoordelijk was voor de export van het Engelse laken. Meer onderzoek moet gebeuren om de impact van de

Aarthertogelijke Nederlanden op de Engelse lakenhandel te kunnen schetsen, alsook naar het lakenbeleid van de aartshertogen. Dan pas kan het verhaal dat Trumbull brengt voldoende worden gekaderd.

De dood van Salisbury had een grote invloed op het werk van alle Engelse diplomaten doorheen Europa. In plaats van een nieuwe eerste staatssecretaris te benoemen nam James VI/I zelf de honneurs waar, samen met Sir Robert Carr, burggraaf Rochester. Ook financieel veranderde heel wat. Terwijl Salisbury er nog in slaagde om de diplomaten op een regelmatige basis te laten betalen, wijzigde dit vanaf 1612. Het Engelse hof was constant op zoek naar geld. Dit had grote gevolgen voor het binnen- en buitenlands beleid. De Engelse koning stond huiverachtig tegenover het idee om het parlement bijeen te roepen en moest dus op zoek naar andere inkomsten. Taksen, benevolenties, het verkopen van de zogenaamde *Cautionary towns* zijn een aantal voorbeelden. Desalniettemin slaagde de Engelse staatskas er niet in om de diplomaten op een regelmatige basis uit te betalen. Trumbull wees regelmatig op zijn weinig benijdenswaardige situatie en beklagde zich ook dat hij geen compensatie kreeg voor zijn uitzonderlijke kosten, in tegenstelling tot een aantal van zijn collega's. Trumbull wendde zich tot Rochester en was na enige moeilijkheden in staat om klerk van de Geheime Raad te worden, een functie die hij pas zou uitoefenen eens hij terug in Engeland was. In 1614 benoemde de Engelse koning dan toch een nieuwe eerste staatssecretaris. Sir Ralph Winwood, een uitgesproken protestant en voormalig diplomaat, ontpopte zich tot dé beschermheer van William Trumbull. In 1617 kreeg Trumbull eindelijk een toelage voor zijn uitzonderlijke kosten. Na de dood van Winwood kreeg Trumbull zelfs een verdubbeling van zijn loon, dat evenwel tot op het einde op een onregelmatige basis werd uitbetaald.

In de oude historiografie wordt vaak exclusief geconcentreerd op de Britse en Ierse katholieken die hun toevlucht namen in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden om te ontsnappen aan de vervolging van katholieken in England. Trumbull formuleerde vele klachten tegen de ontvangst van die *recusants* en de stichting van Britse en Ierse kloosters en colleges in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden. De aartshertogen traden vaak op als sponsors. Trumbull was er evenwel van overtuigd dat die instellingen enkel konden overleven dankzij het geld dat uit Engeland werd gesmokkeld. Twee van Trumbulls correspondenten toonden een uitzonderlijke interesse voor die vluchtelingen: Winwood en George Abbot, de aartsbisschop van Canterbury. Alhoewel er aandacht was voor een aantal hooggeplaatste vluchtelingen doorheen de periode, was er een piekmoment tussen 1614 en 1617, de periode van Winwood. Winwood was de enige die zijn interesse in een aantal individuele vluchtelingen duidelijk maakte. Sir Thomas Leedes, Sir Edward Parham, Sir Ralph Babthorpe en Sir William Roper werden in het vizier genomen. Het is de enige tijd dat de Engelse regering, voor een korte tijd althans, interesse toonde in individuele *recusants* die in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden resideerden.

Katholieke historiografie op het einde van de negentiende en het begin van de twintigste eeuw is vaak apologetisch van aard als het op de Engelse katholieke vluchtelingen aankomt. Auteurs als Guilday, Willaert en Proost varen uit tegen de misdadige protestantse vervolgingen van heroïsche katholieken. Recente historiografie is heel wat genuanceerder. James VI/I maakte zelf een onderscheid tussen gematigden en radicalen. Datzelfde onderscheid werd door Salisbury duidelijk verwoord in de nasleep van het *Gunpowder Plot*. Het vervolgen van katholieken stond nooit hoog op de agenda,

een paar momenten niet te na gesproken. Het tweede deel van de regering van James VI/I werd gekenmerkt door een relatieve rust voor de Britse en Ierse katholieken.

Hugh Owen en de Jezüiet William Baldwin werden gezocht voor hun betrokkenheid bij het *Gunpowder Plot*, één van die piekmomenten. Alhoewel dit nog onder Edmondes was, wordt hier al een patroon duidelijk dat zich tot 1625 zou bestendigen. Toen James VI/I de uitlevering vroeg aan aarthertog Albert, vertelde de aartshertog dat beiden niet tot zijn jurisdictie behoorden. Baldwin was immers lid van de clerus en Owen was een dienaar van de Spaanse koning. Uiteindelijk werden de mannen verbannen uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden. Ondanks het argument van de jurisdictie kan toch verder worden gekeken. Waarom zou Albert katholieken uitleveren? Het was voor hem onmogelijk om daadwerkelijk iets te ondernemen ten voordele van zijn geloofsgenoten op de Britse eilanden en Ierland. Hen ontvangen, zelfs als dat het ongenoegen van de Engelse koning opwekte, was het minste wat hij kon doen.

Alhoewel uit Trumbulls correspondentie blijkt dat hij zich het best in het protestantse kamp kon vinden, met Winwood en Abbot als spil, was hij evenzeer pragmatisch. Hij wist dat hij niet kon functioneren als residerend agent in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden zonder katholieke contacten. Bovendien verschilde zijn mening soms van die van zijn broodheren. Van de vier mannen die Winwood terugriep naar Engeland leveren twee van hen de interessantste gegevens op: Leedes en Parham. In 1614 had Trumbull Parham al aanbevolen als mogelijke bevelhebber van een Engels regiment ten dienste van de aartshertogen. In 1625 kreeg hij die functie. Leedes had een uitgebreide briefwisseling met Trumbull. De ware aard van de relatie tussen de twee mannen blijft desalniettemin bijzonder vaag. Trumbull vertelde Winwood dat zijn relatie met Leedes misschien wel de vorm had van een vriendschap, maar dat die relatie veeleer een praktisch doel had: gebruik maken van de goede contacten die Leedes nog steeds had aan het Engelse hof.

Na de dood van Winwood in oktober 1617 verdween de interesse in de vluchtelingen nog meer. Het was Abbot die uitleg verschafte over het non-beleid jegens die ballingengemeenschap. Eén van de belangrijkste pijlers van het beleid van de Engelse koning was een huwelijkspolitiek. Zijn dochter, Elizabeth, was al gehuwd met Frederik V, keurvorst van de Palts. Nu ging de Engelse koning op zoek naar een huwelijk met een katholieke familie, de Spaanse Habsburgers. Die zoektocht naar een Spaanse infanta voor de kroonprins zou elke beslissing van James beïnvloeden. Abbot betreurde dat daardoor niets kon worden ondernomen als het op de katholieke vluchtelingen aankwam. Het was pas in 1624 duidelijk voor James VI/I dat het voorgestelde huwelijk er nooit zou komen, maar tegen die tijd had de Engelse koning zelf nog weinig tijd over. De Engelse, vaak katholieke, handelaarsgemeenschap werd nooit in het vizier genomen. De contacten van Trumbull met een aantal van die handelaars was bijzonder uitgebreid zoals met John Corham, Lionel Wake en John Chandler.

Terwijl de focus in oude historiografie zich concentreerde op die Britse en Ierse vluchtelingen verloor het één diplomatiek incident uit het oog, *Corona Regia*. Boeken en pamfletten bezorgden de Engelse agent uiteindelijk het meeste last. Het kostte Trumbull veel tijd en veel geld. De publicatie van *Corona Regia* in 1615 was helemaal geen unicum, al vroeger had Trumbull geprotesteerd tegen het verschijnen van boeken in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden die de Engelse koning beledigend vond. *Corona Regia* creëerde evenwel een grootschalig diplomatiek incident. Alhoewel het voor de hedendaagse lezer moeilijk te begrijpen valt waarom James VI/I zoveel aanstoot nam aan een dergelijke boek, toont de

episode duidelijk aan hoezeer de Engelse koning het nodig vond om zijn eer te verdedigen. Alhoewel de zaak een piekmoment kende in 1616 en 1617 bleef het op de agenda staan. Uiteindelijk was Trumbull in 1624 klaar met het boek. De drukker Flavius legde dan bekentenissen af. Andere zaken eisten echter de aandacht van de Engelse autoriteiten op: de Dertigjarige Oorlog. *Corona Regia* levert het scherpste beeld van hoe Trumbull werkte als agent, hoe hij zijn informatie verzamelde en hoe hij zijn mensen inzette.

Een andere groep die regelmatig in de correspondentie opduikt zijn de Britse en Ierse soldaten die in regimenten dienden in het leger van Albert en Isabella. Na 1604 vond er een recruteringsgolf plaats in Engeland, Schotland en Ierland, maar de regimenten van Engelsen en Schotten was op dat moment maar een kort leven beschoren. Het Ierse regiment behield daarentegen zijn sterkte van om en bij de 1.000 manschappen. Trumbull kon zich evenwel niet vinden in de politiek die in Engeland werd gevoerd. Onder andere Winwood was ervan overtuigd dat het beter was de Ieren op het continent te houden dan in Ierland. Trumbull was veeleer op zoek naar manieren waarop hij het Ierse regiment kon verzwakken. Hij vreesde immers dat het Ierse regiment ooit zou kunnen worden ingezet tegen Engeland of protestantse bondgenoten. Toch moet voor ogen worden gehouden dat Trumbull weinig belang hechtte aan rapporten en geruchten dat Spanje een invasie van Engeland of Ierland aan het voorbereiden was. Volgens Trumbull was daar geen geld voor. Op aansturen van Winwood hield Trumbull het Ierse regiment nauw in de gaten. Eén van zijn informanten die hem op de hoogte hield van het reilen en zeilen in het regiment was Fergus Donnell, die stevast praatte over samenzweringen.

Op het internationale niveau werd Trumbull geconfronteerd met verschillende conflicten: de twee Gulik-Kleefse kwesties (1609-1614) en de start van de Dertigjarige Oorlog (1618-1648). Het Twaalfjarig Bestand (1609-1621) betekende een einde aan de vijandelijkheden tussen de Noordelijke en de Zuidelijke Nederlanden. Jammer genoeg volgde uit dat bestand niet noodzakelijkerwijze vrede en welvaart voor de regio. De strategisch gelegen hertogdommen Gulik en Kleef waren zowel voor protestanten als katholieken interessant. Alhoewel de markies van Spinola en Maurits van Nassau forten en steden innamen in de regio's stonden ze nooit tegenover elkaar op het slagveld. Het Twaalfjarig Bestand werd op die manier gevrijwaard, maar de oplossing voor de successieproblemen was nog decennia verwijderd.

De traditionele focus op Bohemen bij de start van de Dertigjarige Oorlog moet worden gecompliceerd met aandacht voor de Palts. Toen Frederik V de Boheemse kroon aannam, zonder het advies van James VI/I af te wachten, sleurde hij de Palts mee in het conflict. De Engelse koning was er nog altijd van overtuigd dat hij de rust in Europa kon herstellen door te steunen op diplomatie en een dynastiek huwelijk tussen Engeland en Spanje. Verschillende uitzonderlijke ambassadeurs werden naar de diverse hoven gestuurd. De aandacht van Trumbull verschoof dan ook vanaf 1618 naar het conflict dat Europa dertig jaar in de greep zou houden.

De rol van Trumbull in de diplomatie rond de Dertigjarige Oorlog concentreerde zich op de Palts. Alhoewel James VI/I nooit de aanspraak van Frederik V op de Boheemse kroon zou steunen, wilde hij wel optreden ten voordele van zijn schoonzoon in de Palts, dat onder de voet werd gelopen door de markies van Spinola en Maximiliaan van Beieren. In 1621 werd een tijdelijk staakt het vuren bereikt. Natuurlijk mag dit niet

worden toegeschreven aan briljant diplomatiek overleg, maar veeleer aan de specifieke omstandigheden.

Corona Regia en de Gulik-Kleefse kwesties leggen het zwakke punt van het beleid van de Engelse koning bloot. Na alle discussies en dreigementen was de Engelse koning bereid om veel in te leveren om de vrede te kunnen bewaren. De belofte die Spinola van Maurits van Nassau bij de Vrede van Xanten (1614) eiste, is misschien wel één van de meest opvallende voorbeelden. Oorspronkelijk nam James VI/I een hard standpunt in dat alsmaar werd afgezwakt tot op het moment dat hij voorstelde om de formulering van de aartshertogen op te dringen aan de Verenigde Provinciën. Na het vertrek van Sir John Bennet, uitzonderlijke ambassadeur in de zaak *Corona Regia*, in juni 1617 verloor Trumbull zijn diplomatieke status. De instructies waren duidelijk geweest. Als het bezoek van Bennet geen genoegdoening voor de Engelse koning opleverde, dan moest Trumbull eveneens terugkeren naar Engeland. De aartshertogen en hun ministers hechtten weinig geloof aan dat voornemen, berichtte Trumbull. Winwood was zelf blij dat Trumbull was gebleven na het vertrek van Bennet. Uiteindelijk keerde Trumbull terug naar Engeland, maar eerder op verlof. De ambassade in Brussel bleef open onder leiding van John Wolley, Trumbulls secretaris.

Onderhandelingen die op niets uitdraaiden, het optrekken van rookgordijnen en onvervulde dromen, zo beschrijft Toby Osborne de diplomatie in de vroege zeventiende eeuw. Trumbulls mandaat in Brussel past perfect in dat plaatje. De kern van de taken van een diplomaat, observeren en rapporteren, deed Trumbull voortreffelijk. Interventies hadden zelden de gewenste afloop. Dit was te wijten aan het beleid in Brussel en in Londen, maar niet aan een gebrek aan inzet van de Engelse agent in Brussel. Nooit verloor Trumbull het vertrouwen van zijn oversten. Trumbull, voor wie plicht centraal stond, was een ambtenaar *avant-la-lettre*, die koning en land diende, soms ondanks hun beleid.