Introduction

This is a study of literature and politics in the early decades of the seven-teenth century. It considers how the resources of satire, the pre-eminent literary mode of discrimination and stigmatization, helped people make sense of the confusing political conditions of the early Stuart era. Through-out, therefore, it brings into conjunction sets of questions from two dis-tinct academic disciplines. From a tradition of literary history, it asks what happened to satire in the decades after the Bishops' Ban of 1599, which evi-dently brought an abrupt end to a vigorous, late-Elizabethan outpouring of verse satire by writers such as John Donne, Joseph Hall and John Marston. In search of the following generation of satirists, it looks to the 'strange *Monstrous Satyrs*' that contemporaries encountered all around them.[1] I ar-gue that unconventional and uncanny forms of satire, though less visible than Elizabethan verse within the terms of a literary history concerned with print culture and canonical authors, were in fact vital and influential products of early Stuart culture. And from a tradition of political history, the book investigates changes in the language of politics, which enabled the articulation of radical new notions of ideological difference and political confrontation. Like many recent historical studies of the early seventeenth century, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* is thus concerned with the ways in which an orthodox Tudor commitment to consensus and har-mony gave way by the 1640s to some of the most devastating political ruptures of English history.[2]

More specifically, this book examines the *unauthorized texts* of early Stuart England. My use of this term is intended to identify a range of writing, in various textual forms, that rejects the dominant assumption in

---

[1] Arthur Wilson, *The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James I* (1653), p. 290.
[2] The word 'literature' in the title of this book, which might in some respects seem redundant, is not in any way intended to suggest a narrowly canonical approach to writing of the period. On the contrary, the book challenges such suppositions about literature and literary culture, and focuses on the functions of satire throughout English political culture.

1

early Stuart political culture that all authority to speak was derived from the monarch.[3] Models of speech at court and from the pulpit were founded on this powerful political fiction, while the period's various structures of censorship aimed to enforce it much more widely. Most writers within this context struggled to define for themselves positions of orthodoxy and legitimacy; increasingly, however, many rejected the system's constraints, and constructed new modes of illicit expression. Numerous writers and readers entered into political action through libels: licentious poems on individuals and political events, typically circulated anonymously within manuscript culture. Others explored politics in published poems, prose pamphlets, sermons and drama. Some such texts provocatively tested the uncertain constraints on public speech, while other authors and publishers evaded censorship by employing fugitive models of publication and speech. It is largely for this reason that the book does not look in any detail beyond the effective collapse of censorship early in the 1640s, after which modes of writing and political expression changed markedly.[4] Meanwhile, the only significant exception to the book's focus on the unauthorized is the work of Richard Corbett. Though determinedly orthodox and loyal, I suggest that Corbett's outspoken poetics of satire and sycophancy, which so forthrightly confront the nation's multiplying voices of dissent, serve to clarify the very lines of division he so fears.

It is no coincidence that Corbett is one of the few writers to be considered here who has survived, albeit on the fringes, in traditional narratives of literary history. When canons are constructed, it is advantageous for an author to be authorized and identifiable, working within established literary and cultural conventions. Yet I want to suggest that satire, more than most literature, is often most pertinent when it stretches conventions and challenges authority. Moreover, the book sets aside the concern with textual form that dominates many studies of literary genre, following some of the best recent work on satire by considering it not in accordance with neoclassical standards and conventions, but rather as a 'mode' that informs 'an astonishingly wide range of vastly varied works'.[5] This approach opens to scrutiny a plethora of texts previously considered only within the narrower

[3] See Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, CT and London, 2000), p. 27.

[4] On this period, see especially James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (London, 1997); David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999); Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, CT and London, 1994).

[5] Brian A. Connery and Kirk Combe, 'Theorizing Satire: A Retrospective Introduction', in *Theorizing Satire: Essays in Literary Criticism*, ed. Connery and Combe (Basingstoke and London, 1995), p. 9.

terms of political history. As Kevin Sharpe has observed, 'much recent work on pamphlets, news and ballads' has made the mistake of reading 'complex texts as straightforward documents', and has consequently overlooked much of their significance.[6] Crucially, I argue that while satirists do not necessarily see themselves involved in a rational and open debate, and rarely make any direct claim to a place in the history of political thought, satire nonetheless helps to shape the very contours of political debate. As one recent theorist argues, it is a mode committed to the production of difference, creating clarity and hierarchy out of complexity and uncertainty.[7] And it is precisely its textual and rhetorical resources – of provocation, outspokenness, indirection, wit – that can make it so effective.

I want to consider at once how satire adapts to the political and cultural circumstances of these decades, and how in turn it informs contemporary discourse. I argue that satire became, in many respects, pervasive: as much an attitude or an inflection as a literary genre.[8] Hence, in the narrative of one contemporary pamphlet, a decision to become 'a perfect *Satyrist*' involved an act of self-fashioning. 'Cource *Cynical* diet *sowr'd* my disposition,' the pamphlet's speaker reflects, and 'bitter'd all my thoughts, by eating passage for my *Gaul*, to overflow my *Heat*: and *Custom* setled my mind in affection of that, which before seem'd *unnaturall* to it'.[9] As we shall see in Chapter 3, some writers, such as George Wither, struggled to maintain satire as a public and authorized mode, distinct from the licentious and libellous. But most accepted that such distinctions were effectively valueless in the early Stuart context, and that satire might instead be forced into 'strange' and 'monstrous' shapes. In such shapes, I argue, it provided a vehicle through which existing political discourses could be fractured and reset. This is not to say that satire was necessarily 'oppositional'; indeed, binary models structured around poles such as monarch and opposition, court and country, absolutism and republicanism, can for this period be as crude when dealing with language as when discussing political alliances. Rather, and more fundamentally, satire provided the resources for the establishment of differences and the imagination of alternatives. As a result,

---

[6] *Reading Revolutions*, p. 5.
[7] Fredric Bogel, *The Difference Satire Makes: Rhetoric and Reading from Jonson to Byron* (Ithaca and London, 2001), stated esp. at p. 42. Cf. Lawrence Manley, who observes that Renaissance satire 'defined itself as *the* medium for discrimination, for the moral and social judgement that could establish differences no longer given or apparent in contemporary social life' (*Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* [Cambridge, 1995], p. 373).
[8] Cf. George A. Test's more general approach to satire (*Satire: Spirit and Art* [Tampa, 1991], esp. p. 4).
[9] T. M., *The Life of a Satyrical Puppy, Called Nim* (1657), p. 58. On the dating and authorship of this pamphlet, see below, pp. 29–30 and n.

it assumed unquestionable significance within a culture becoming increasingly anxious, and undeniably curious, about the phenomena of dissent and division.

In recent decades, the critical movements in literary studies of new historicism and cultural materialism have transformed the ways in which we read early modern texts. But while critics have focused superbly on genres such as epic, pastoral and love poetry, satire has somehow faded into the background. Perhaps it has seemed already too obviously historical; perhaps it has suffered from the new historicism's desire to find politics where we might least expect it. Whatever the case, apart from some suggestive reassessments of literary culture in the 1590s, readers of satire remain perforce heavily reliant on formalist and New Critical studies.[10] Moreover, consideration of satire in the following decades has been informed by a widespread perception that the Bishops' Ban drove satirists 'underground': becoming, as a result, more a concern for historians and archivists than literary critics.[11] Given my commitment to combining the archival and the critical, and my alignment with a form of cultural history concerned with 'the processes by which meaning is constructed', I want to outline at this stage some of the relevant literary issues for an historicized study of this mode.[12] In line with my approach throughout the book, it will be worth attending to contemporary perceptions of satire, the functions it served within its culture, and the conventional stances and strategies adopted by satirists. It will even be possible to glance towards the most vexed question of all: the very definition of this protean mode.

The satirists of the 1590s saw themselves as pioneers, bringing a classical genre to their native country. While Joseph Hall's 1597 claim to be the first English satirist is questionable on many grounds, it certainly highlights an

[10] On the 1590s, see especially Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley, 1976); Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context* (Oxford, 1989); and Neil Rhodes, *Elizabethan Grotesque* (London, 1980). The works of literary history that continue to influence this field include: Gilbert Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire* (Princeton, 1962); Alvin Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven, 1959); John Peter, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* (Oxford, 1956); and Raman Selden, *English Verse Satire, 1590–1765* (London, 1978).

[11] This narrative, which I will contest, continues to be rehearsed in studies of satire (see, for example, Connery and Combe, 'Theorizing Satire', p. 2). For the most important historical engagement with it, see Thomas Cogswell, 'Underground Political Verse and the Transformation of English Political Culture', in Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky, ed., *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 277–300.

[12] Roger Chartier, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1988), p. 14. In this respect the present book develops upon the interdisciplinary approaches of my *God Speed the Plough: The Representation of Agrarian England, 1500–1660* (Cambridge, 1996).

emergent mood of generic purification. For Hall and his contemporaries, satire was literature at its most unashamedly moralistic and unabashedly instructive: writing with 'Truth on my side', he sets out to 'unmask' the 'ugly face of vice'.[13] Renaissance satire is thus founded on comfortable assumptions about the relation between texts and contexts. Satirists aim to 'speake the truth', using their powers of forensic inquiry to expose vice, and their conventions of outspokenness and didacticism to 'heale with lashing'.[14] Although, as Alvin Kernan has convincingly demonstrated, much satire of this decade is informed equally by Calvinistic anxieties about the speaker's own sinfulness, poets almost universally assume that there is sin out there to be identified, and that their audience will agree on its definition.[15] Satire is concerned with acts of revelation rather than strategies of fabrication, and with attacks on agreed sins rather than particular sinners. Consequently, even what might initially appear libellous and scurrilous, and what might seem merely gratuitous descriptions of sinfulness, are supposedly underpinned by the most soundly orthodox of moral principles.

In general, the satire of this decade is not recognizably political: though this is in part because contemporary discourses of politics themselves require such efforts of reconstruction and historicization.[16] Donne's fourth satire, for instance, focuses attention on the court, but does so with a moralist's disgust in the face of rampant self-interest and dissimulation. After a tour of the court, the poem's speaker calls on preachers to 'Drown the sins of this place'; like so much other satire of this decade, Donne's suggests that the political realm requires no more, and no less, than a moral reformation.[17] The Bishops' Ban, however, alerts us to other possible ways in which satires may have been functioning politically. While the opinions of literary historians remain divided on the intent of the Ban, some of the more stimulating interpretations have highlighted the political ramifications of Elizabethan satire.[18] Cyndia Susan Clegg, for instance, argues that a discrete set of political events, relating especially to the Earl of Essex's unsuccessful Irish campaign, changed the ways in which certain satires were

[13] *Virgidemiarum*, Book 1 Prologue; in *Collected Poems*, ed. Arnold Davenport (Liverpool, 1949), p. 11.
[14] Everard Guilpin, 'Satyre Preludium', lines 76, 71; in *Skialetheia or A Shadowe of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*, ed. D. Allen Carroll (Chapel Hill, 1974), p. 61.
[15] This is Kernan's central argument in *The Cankered Muse*.
[16] See esp. John Guy, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, 1995); and Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1587–1597* (Cambridge, 1999).
[17] 'Satire 4', line 239; in *The Complete English Poems*, ed. A. J. Smith (London, 1986), p. 170.
[18] The text of the Ban is published in Richard A. McCabe, 'Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 11 (1981), 188–93.

read in 1599. The generalized moralism of the satirists thereby became, albeit briefly, politically sensitive, so the mechanisms of censorship were mobilized in an effort to ease tensions.[19] While she almost certainly underestimates the political motivations of some poets, her analysis highlights the notorious grey area between attacks on corruption and attacks on the corrupt: a field which early Stuart poets would inhabit far more knowingly. Douglas Bruster, who considers the full list of works banned in 1599, which also included prose pamphlets and Ovidian erotica, argues that the authorities were responding to 'an intensively familiar approach to others' bodies and identities'.[20] Though somewhat speculative and intuitive, his argument too directs attention to the political potential of satire, especially at a time when personal and factional identities were so thoroughly intertwined with any more abstract notions of politics or ideology. Whatever the intentions of the banned poets of the 1590s, their successors were consistently more explicit in their attention to particular individuals, yet also more rigorous in their commitment to look for causes and principles beyond the individual.

Although the effects of the Ban were localized, and conventional moral satires continued to pass through the London presses, this book argues that satiric practices under the Stuarts changed in subtle yet decisive ways. Consequently, approaches and questions that were appropriate for Elizabethan satire now need to be rethought and revised. What happens to satire, we might ask, when dominant cultural assumptions about the relation between morality and power are opened to question? What happens when satirists abandon their commitment to revealing truths, in favour of a willingness to shape perceptions and delineate confrontations? What happens when moralizing attacks on corruption at court give way to a consideration of radical political alternatives? And what happens when royalism is translated from a universal assumption into a discourse of division? Unquestionably, many writers in these years maintained Elizabethan principles; however, many others accepted the necessity of change. As one commented, 'This is a wondrous witty age that sees / Beyond the truth of things, forty degrees'.[21] Seeing 'beyond the truth', as this poet anxiously begins to perceive, involves accepting that literature shapes realities as much as it merely reflects them, and that satire might now be revealing itself as interested

---

[19] *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 198–217.
[20] 'The Structural Transformation of Print in Late Elizabethan England', in Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol, ed., *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England* (Columbus, OH, 2000), p. 49.
[21] Thomas Scot, *Philomythie or Philomythologie* (1622), sig. B1r.

and polemical rather than disinterested and aloof. I would suggest that a
recognition of these possibilities may underpin a newly historicized analysis
of political satire in this period.

Satire that sees 'beyond the truth', or that helps to construct its culture's
truths, is especially valuable under conditions of censorship, which work
to suppress more open and rational discussion of political issues.[22] The
extent and mechanics of censorship in the reigns of James and Charles
remain matters of dispute. Most recently, Clegg has argued against percep-
tions of a 'single abusive authoritarian system' of censorship in the early
Stuart period, and has sought instead to demonstrate the importance of
local circumstances, individual personalities and sheer chance.[23] Clegg's
research is often compelling, and helps to explain the vicissitudes experi-
enced by a poet such as Wither, who was variously punished, rewarded,
or simply ignored by the state in the course of his prolific publishing
career.[24] Yet she tends to underestimate the undeniable fear of repression
which informs writing throughout the period. Writers were imprisoned,
interrogated, fined and pilloried in this period; and even those who es-
caped such treatment were constantly aware of the risks they ran. Indeed
for the present study, concerned as it is with textual practices rather than
publication histories, the consciousness of censorship in the minds of writ-
ers is in most respects more significant than its actual achievements.[25] To
take one example, the pamphleteer Thomas Scott, looking back on the
1623 Spanish Match negotiations, recalled that 'the dore began to wax nar-
row, at which the Protestants sent out . . . their labours for the presse'.[26]
Like so many other writers in these years, Scott quite simply felt the
constraints of censorship, and shaped his writing and publishing career
accordingly.

The writing produced in these circumstances exists in a dialectical re-
lationship with its context: informed by the prevailing conditions, and in
turn helping to give definition to them. Of course, there were strong native
traditions of political satire, stretching back through Donne, Sir Thomas
Wyatt, John Skelton, and into the Middle Ages. It is also true that satire
informed some of the most prominent political literature of the Elizabethan

[22] Cf. Dustin Griffin, *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction* (Lexington, KY, 1994), p. 138.
[23] *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001), quote at p. 118.
[24] *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, pp. 45–50, 113–16; on Wither, see below, Chapter 3.
[25] Cf. David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, revised edn (Oxford, 2002), p. 310;
and Anthony Milton, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England',
Historical Journal, 41 (1998), 637.
[26] *Vox Dei* (1623), p. 69; reprinted in Scott, *Works* (1624); facsimile edn (Amsterdam, 1973). Cf. John
Reynolds, *Vox Coeli* (1624), sig. A4v.

years, produced by writers such as Edmund Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney.[27] But the early Stuart decades produced distinctly new kinds of satiric writing. Most notably, the libel, a form with established popular and courtly roots, flourished in the reign of James, providing perhaps the single most important textual site for interaction between political and literary cultures. And not only was the libel ideally suited to a reign marked by court scandals and notorious favourites, it was also malleable enough to invite further reflection on ideological conflicts and political contestation. Similarly, the pamphlet had emerged by the end of the sixteenth century as a distinct, though almost infinitely versatile, textual form.[28] The achievements of the anti-episcopal Martin Marprelate tracts, published anonymously in the late 1580s, established a vital precedent for satiric voice and political insurgency.[29] In the following decades, authors and printers alike explored ways of developing upon this precedent, especially by intervening in matters of political debate. While the term 'pamphlet' is in many respects a loose, catchall word denoting a wide range of writing – including poetry, prose, news reports, dialogues and sermons – an intention to stretch the parameters of popular political interaction is consistent across a whole range of cheap printed texts. Although I selectively glance beyond these principal sources – towards letters, speeches, history writing, religious tracts, and the most scandalous political play of the period, Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess* – the book is founded on a perception that libels and pamphlets were the most vital and influential vehicles for early Stuart political satire.

Given its focus on satire within a discrete historical context, this is not a book that makes bold claims to define the mode. Definitions have a tendency to become reified and ahistorical, whereas my contention is that satire is malleable, adaptable and sometimes most incisive when it fails even to announce itself. Nonetheless, like other recent studies this book is committed to challenging the residual influence of John Dryden's Restoration definition of the mode, which works so hard to establish clear boundaries between the native and the neoclassical, the scurrilous and the moral, the libellous and the properly satiric.[30] In search of a definition less overloaded with formal and aesthetic concerns, more than one scholar has adopted Edward

---

[27] See esp. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, pp. 53–139; and Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven, CT and London, 1996).

[28] See esp. Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers* (London, 1982); and Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1997).

[29] *The Marprelate Tracts*, ed. William Pierce (London, 1911).

[30] See Dryden's 'Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire', in *The Works of John Dryden, Volume IV: Poems 1693–1696*, ed. A. B. Chambers and William Frost (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 3–90; and Griffin's summary and critique of Dryden, in *Satire*, pp. 14–21.

Rosenheim, Jr.'s definition of satire as an 'attack by means of a manifest fiction upon discernible historical particulars'.[31] This helpfully suppresses the moral imperative claimed by both Dryden and the Elizabethans, and creates a space for serious analysis of libels. But Rosenheim's apparent assumption that a text will present itself unproblematically as a satire remains biased towards modern notions of literature and authorship, and might cause one to neglect occasional and tactical deployments of satire in the early Stuart decades. Moreover, his perception of 'discernible historical particulars' is overly simplistic, neglecting the extent to which texts help to shape their contexts, and thereby give definition to history itself. Even the seemingly historical facts of individual identity may be manipulated (as we shall see in Chapter 2), while political alignments and confrontations depend on a language of discrimination. In this book, therefore, satire is perceived at once as more fluid and available throughout its contemporary culture, and also as more active and influential in its political interventions. This is a study, that is, of a literary mode in action.

As a result, I would also suggest that debates over whether satire is conservative or radical are, at least within this specific historical context, reductive.[32] The very terms 'conservatism' and 'radicalism' assume an uncomplicated binary model of power, while the sense that 'satire' might somehow be consistent in its politics posits an unrealistically restrictive model of textual production. Nonetheless, it is fair to say that early Stuart satire had distinctly radical effects on political discourse: not because it dared on occasion to challenge the status quo, but because it helped to delineate entirely new discourses of politics. It was radical, that is, because it turned its techniques of discrimination upon a politics resting shakily on assumptions of consensus. What particular 'side' a satire might take is in this respect relatively unimportant: in part because the whole notion of sides is so loose and shadowy when applied to early Stuart politics, and in part because the satiric act of discrimination is itself more fundamental, no matter what the particular politics of any text. Satire is radical, in other words, to the extent that it lends contemporaries the resources to move beyond existing political structures.

These arguments in turn help to situate the book in relation to questions that have dominated studies in seventeenth-century political history for

---

[31] *Jonathan Swift and the Satirist's Art* (Chicago, 1963), p. 31. Cf. Kirk Combe, 'The New Voice of Political Dissent: The Transition from Complaint to Satire', in *Theorizing Satire*, ed. Combe and Connery, p. 75; and Bogel, *The Difference Satire Makes*, p. 8.
[32] On this debate, see Griffin, *Satire*, pp. 149–60.

the past twenty-five years. Crucially, the revisionist movement challenged previously accepted ideas that there were clear lines of political division in early Stuart England, evident especially by the late 1620s and 1630s, and often defined in terms of 'court' and 'country'. Though there is hardly the space here to do justice to their arguments, revisionists spoke of a nation that valorized consensus, and enjoined their colleagues against importing anachronistic terms to describe a pre-modern political world.[33] Conflict, to the extent that it existed, was primarily seen as a struggle to define the boundaries of orthodoxy, rather than to confront or challenge orthodoxy. But these arguments, though effective in demonstrating the false assumptions of earlier historiography, left many questions unanswered and many sources unexamined. In particular, in their intensive scrutiny of the mechanics of government, revisionists tended to neglect evidence of popular opinion and political language.[34] The best post-revisionist work has returned to such issues, and has championed some of the sources that form the basis of the present study. Above all else, such work has prompted researchers to rethink their very definitions of the political.

Perhaps most importantly, post-revisionist reassessments of the politics of court corruption and scandal create a context for my own engagement with a wealth of texts concerned with the early Stuart court. As Linda Levy Peck has argued, in this period 'the language of corruption', though overtly traditional and moralistic, in fact 'provided an essential vocabulary with which to criticize the early Stuart government'.[35] Similarly, the revisionist neglect of court scandals has been challenged for its 'curiously limited definition of the political'.[36] Indeed certain events and individuals became undeniably controversial in these years, producing distinct waves of satirical commentary; and at this stage it is worth outlining, however sketchily, some of the most significant of these. In the 1610s, the most notorious scandal centred on James's favourite, Robert Carr, and his wife, Frances Howard. After being married to the Earl of Essex as a child, Howard obtained a divorce on grounds of her husband's impotence, after a salacious legal process

---

[33] See esp. Kevin Sharpe, ed., *Faction and Parliament: Essays in Early Stuart History* (Oxford, 1978); John Morrill, *Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War*, 2nd edn (London and New York, 1999), pp. 1–74; and Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 1–84.

[34] See esp. Kevin Sharpe's review of early Stuart historiography, in *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 3–37.

[35] *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London, 1993), p. 11.

[36] Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 14.