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ABSTRACT

PUBLISHING THE STUARTS: OCCASIONAL LITERATURE AND POLITICS FROM 1603 TO 1625

REBECCA A. CALCAGNO

This dissertation examines occasional events at the Jacobean court through the literature written about them—the largely understudied and yet voluminous occasional works published in inexpensive formats during the first Stuart reign. Through a series of contextualized readings of key occasional events and texts, I argue that these poems and pamphlets not only move beyond the epideictic to engage in key political debates, but also that they present competing visions of the Stuart realm and illustrate the international frame of its court. By examining the relationship between occasional works and the “real” events which they discuss, I show how writers sought to persuade the public to accept their political viewpoints through fictional representations of the Stuarts. More importantly, I demonstrate the need to look beyond representations of the Stuarts sponsored by the Stuarts such as masques to fully understand their iconography. Attending to the contexts which shaped occasional literature and the meaningful ways in which authors yoked descriptions of state events to commentaries on political issues, demands a new history of occasional events at court and a new understanding of the Stuart court as polycentric in nature and international in scope.

Scholars have long acknowledged the importance of occasional events at court, but dismissed the printed works published about them as ephemeral propaganda. To understand the court, they turned instead to manuscript correspondence and entertainments such as masques, from which they created an image of the Stuarts as a patriarchal family centered on James. By studying representations of the Stuarts in printed works intended for an audience comprised of more than the royal family, nobles, and courtiers, I seek to show a different vision of the Stuarts,
one that is international, multi-centric, popular, and poly-vocal. Each chapter focuses on a major court event and the literary response to it: the 1606 state visit to London of the Danish king Christian IV; the death of Henry, Prince of Wales, in London in 1612; the wedding of Elizabeth, daughter of James VI & I and his consort Anna of Denmark, to Frederick, Count Palatine, in London in 1613; and the funeral of Anna in London in 1618. Offering densely contextualized readings of representative occasional works, I argue that authors used these events to envision idealized relationships between, respectively, Britain and Denmark; Britain and France; Britain and Germany; and, England and Scotland. In each case, they picture one member of the royal family establishing and maintaining these relationships. In other words, they imagined different members of the royal family in critical positions of power, and as mediating, through these events, a wide range of religious and political controversies. By examining representational wars over the images of various members of the Stuarts, I hope to offer a complex portrait of a royal family at the center of international debates. These representations which insist on the multiplicity and internationality of the Stuart courts reveal a complex set of cultural and political exchanges across Europe.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1616, a book appeared entitled *Triumphall Shews Set for lately at Stuttgar* *t. Written first in German, and now in English by G. Rodolfe Weckherlin, secretarie to the Duke of Wirtemberg*. Weckherlin intended *Triumphall Shews* to be sold in England. In his “Address to the Reader,” he imagines his readers as customers in English bookshops: “Gentle reader, behold here a small book written in English by a German, and printed in Germany. Therefore if thou art too dainty a reader, I do entreat thee, to seek somewhere else fit food, to be pleased withal, as I know, there is greater store of it in England, then in any other country.”¹ Weckherlin published *Triumphall Shews* in an inexpensive octavo edition for widespread consumption.² In other words, *Triumphall Shews* is a popular, English account of a German court event.

The book, dedicated to Princess Elizabeth, daughter of James VI and I, documents the celebrations which had taken place at the christening of Friedrich, the son of Johann Friedrich and Barbara Sophia, daughter of the Elector of Brandenburg. Elizabeth had attended the christening and at least one of the shows performed was addressed to her. The book tells of how on the third day of the celebrations, three English Ladies processed through the crowds to present themselves before the court: the Countesses of Pembroke and Derby, and the Marchioness of Winchester. However, these women were not actually the aforementioned English ladies, but rather cross-dressed German nobles, appearing in disguise for a tournament. These noblemen, moreover, were Lewis-Frederic

---


² I thank Stephen Tabor, Curator of Early Printed Books at the Huntington, for informing me of the book’s format and saving me a trip to California.
and Magnus, Dukes of Württemberg, and the Earl of Hohenlohe, leading members of the
Protestant Union, a defensive alliance formed by German states in 1608 in response to
aggression from the Catholic Habsburg Empire. Why did these prominent men dress as
English ladies in a tournament put on before Elizabeth? Did they do so to honor her? To
advise her? To signal a political alliance with her?

The christening was both a family and a political event. As almost all of the
members of the Protestant Union were either sanguine or affine relations, they used
family gatherings to meet for covert political talks. The christening in Stuttgart was the
sixth of these occasions, now known to scholars as the “Festivities of Protestant Union.”
While enabling secret political meetings, these events—all weddings and christenings—
also built and strengthened the kinship networks between the members of the Protestant
Union (in the case of christenings, through the choice of godparents). The Stuttgart
christening was particularly important because Elizabeth publically signaled that she was
a part of this German kinship group by standing as one of Friedrich’s godparents
alongside her husband Frederick, Count Palatine, head of the Protestant Union. Given

---

3 Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly argues that these “festivities of Protestant Union” form a recognizable group
from their shared themes, participants, and format. See her book *Triumphal Shews: Tournaments at
German-speaking Courts in their European Context, 1560-1730* (Berlin: G. Mann Verlag, 1992). She
includes among these festivities: the wedding of Johann Friedrich, Duke of Württemberg, and Barbara
Sophia, Margravine of Brandenburg, in Stuttgart in 1609; the marriage of Johann Georg, Margrave of
Brandenburg, and Eva Christina, Duchess of Württemberg, in Jägerndorf in 1610; the celebrations for the
marriage of Elizabeth Stuart, Princess of Scotland and England, and Frederick, Count Palatine, in
Heidelberg in 1613; the wedding of Sophie Elisabeth, Princess of Anhalt-Dessau, and Georg Rudolf, Duke
of Silesia, in Liegnitz in 1614; the christening of Friedrich, Duke of Württemberg, in Stuttgart in 1616; the
christening of Sophie Elisabeth, the only child of Christian Wilhelm of Brandenburg in Halle in 1616; and
the joint festival celebrating the christening of Ulrich, Johann Friedrich’s third son, as well as the wedding
of Ludwig Friedrich, Johann Friedrich’s brother, and Elisabeth Magdelana of Hesse-Darmstadt in Stuttgart
in 1617 (“The Protestant Union: Festivals, Festival Books, War and Politics,” in *Europa Triumphans: court
and civic festivals in early modern Europe*, eds. J. R. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly, and Margaret
the symbolic significance of the affair, the presence of the three cross-dressed German nobles is striking.

*Triumphall Shews*, then, was a cheaply printed, English version of a German book about an important event at a German court which was attended by an English princess and featured three German nobles cross-dressed as English ladies. Understanding this complicated book requires answering a series of questions about political and cultural relations between the English and German courts. Such issues, moreover, cannot be fully grasped without understanding the political positions and actions of different members of the Stuart royal family. My attempts to puzzle out the meaning of *Triumphall Shews* characterize this dissertation which examines events at court through the literature written about them—the largely understudied and yet voluminous occasional works published in inexpensive formats during the first Stuart reign. Through a series of contextualized readings of key occasional texts, I argue that these poems and pamphlets not only move beyond the epideictic to engage in key political debates, but also that they present competing visions of the Stuart realm. They thus illustrate the diversity of this court.

Scholars have long acknowledged the importance of occasional events at court, including coronations, state visits, weddings, and funerals. However, printed works like *Triumphall Shewes* have often been dismissed as propaganda. Historians seeking the “truth” about the past have considered printed works less reliable as evidence of what actually happened than certain privileged manuscript materials such as correspondence. John Nichols, one of the earliest scholars to recognize the significance of state occasions, was strongly influenced by this bias. He compiled two collections of texts written for and about state events during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI and I: *Progresses and
public procession of Queen Elizabeth (1788) and Progresses, processions, and magnificent festivities, of King James the First (1828). In his multi-volume sets, he included letters, chronicles, and pamphlets which describe events at court; poems written to commemorate them; and entertainments written to be performed at them. The extensive amount of extant material meant that he could not include everything and, though he includes representatives of the various types of writing, he privileges certain forms of manuscript evidence, since “[compared with] Pamphlets . . . the intrinsic value of original correspondence [is] . . . far superior.”4 He quotes the Literary Gazette on the value of manuscript materials:

no history affords so good materials as that which is drawn, like the present, from original manuscripts, authentic records, and correspondence never framed for the mere purpose of meeting the public eye. Here we have facts, not theories; documents, not the hypotheses raised by partial or prejudiced writers.5

Nichols’ partiality for manuscripts seems, in part, to have derived from the supposition that manuscript writers were not writing for an audience in the way that print writers were. For him, autograph materials represent “truth, simplicity, and freedom,” while printed works are full of “adulation, affection, and pedantry.”6 Nichols implies that manuscript writers were more truthful because they were not catering to an audience and, hence, could write freely.

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
By the twentieth century, this prejudice for manuscript sources had become common historiographical practice for historians of the Stuart court. In *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (1990), Linda Levy Peck matter-of-factly states, “Much of our knowledge of factional politics comes from the evidence of diplomatic correspondence in which foreign policy matters, of course, dominated.”

This statement is borne out by the scholarship of other contemporary historians. For example, in *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (1997), W. B. Patterson provides “compelling evidence” that James’s actions with regard to the Netherlands were dominated by his “plan for religious and political pacification.” The evidence that he offers comes almost entirely from correspondence in manuscript copies. Pauline Croft justifies favoring manuscript sources in her landmark essay “The Reputation of Robert Cecil” (1991). She argues that manuscript writers wrote with freedom because it enabled them “to escape censorship, or a prosecution in Star Chamber for *scandalum magnatum*—the libeling of great men.”

Similarly, in his 2002 study of court culture and scandal, Alastair Bellany contends that printed works were tainted by government and economic forces: “To a far greater extent than orally and scribally produced news, print production and dissemination were normally subject to various forms of official

---


9 His evidence about the Synod at Dort comes from letters in the PRO or letters that have been reprinted in the collected correspondence of John Chamberlain or Dudley Carleton. See Patterson, 260-93.

control, including a system of pre-publication licensing. Print production was also far more driven by commercial pressures.”

From Nichols to Bellany, historians have viewed manuscript sources as more objective than print for information on the court, being free from the pressure to cater to readers or potential censors.

Yet scholarship on manuscript circulation in early modern England has shown that neither premise is true. Manuscripts were a form of publication and many writers intended their manuscripts for an audience: as Arthur Marotti notes, “During the English Renaissance, despite the widespread effects of the Gutenberg revolution, much literature continued to be written for manuscript circulation rather than for print.” Manuscript accounts have been particularly relevant for understanding the Jacobean court. Writers frequently circulated manuscripts amongst coteries at court, using their works to persuade readers to endorse a particular agenda, as scholars such as Marotti, Henry Woudhuysen, and Peter Beal have demonstrated. Harold Love has explained that for these “scribal communities” manuscript circulation was “a model of social bonding whose aim was to nourish and article a corporate ideology.” This “politicized


12 Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1995), xii. Margaret Ezell claims that manuscripts were popular as a form of publication into the eighteenth century, arguing that “even after 1710 and the institution of the Act of Queen Anne, script was still a competitive, if not the dominant, mode of transmitting and reading what we term ‘literary’ and ‘academic’ materials. Rather than being a nostalgic clinging to an outdated technology representing a fading aristocratic possession of the world of letters, the older practice of circulating scribal texts was instead a choice” (*Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999], 12).


manuscript culture,” as Michelle O’Callaghan calls it, was not limited to literary manuscripts.\textsuperscript{15} Pauline Croft notes that manuscripts of “political, education and polemical texts, separates of parliamentary speeches” circulated alongside literary works and “all reached a wide public through manuscript rather than print.”\textsuperscript{16} Notably, while some letters conveyed “personal, private communications,” many others were intended for a public or semi-public audience.\textsuperscript{17} Letters of the latter type were sometimes circulated as part of political debates, the most famous of which was Sir Philip Sidney’s \textit{A letter to Queen Elizabeth}. \textit{A letter} was at the center of a propaganda campaign to stop Queen Elizabeth I from marrying Francois, Duc d’Alençon.\textsuperscript{18} According to Beal, Sidney’s “\textit{Letter} was politically the most important work he ever wrote and the one most extensively disseminated in manuscript form.”\textsuperscript{19} Importantly, \textit{A Letter} demonstrates that while manuscripts were not censored prior to being circulated, their circulation sometimes brought them to the attention of the authorities and resulted in punishment for their authors. Sidney was banished from court for having written the letter. Manuscript writers, like print writers, thus needed to be careful about the content of their works.

\textsuperscript{15} O’Callaghan, “Publication: Print and Manuscript,” 85.

\textsuperscript{16} Croft, “The Reputation of Robert Cecil,” 45.

\textsuperscript{17} Peter Beal offers examples of the many manuscript documents that were public: “It was by means of manuscripts that you corresponded with your fellow human beings at long distance and conducted business and administration—local, civic, or nation; ecclesiastical, military, and all matters of state—as well as personal, private communications. It was with carefully drawn up documents that you sealed legal agreements, bought, sold, rented, leased, and entailed land and property. . . . It was with a document that you made known and secured the enactment of your wishes and bequests after death. In the most dramatic of cases, it might even be a simple document with \textit{determined} death: the execution warrant” (3).

\textsuperscript{18} Henry Woudhuysen writes that “Sidney’s \textit{Letter} was part of a carefully orchestrated campaign to dissuade the Queen from marriage and to whip up opposition to her suitor the duc d’Alencon. There seems little doubt that Leicester was the figurehead behind the propaganda offensive and that Sidney’s letter was intended to circulate initially among courtiers and nobles . . . To be effective in the campaign against the Queen’s marriage, Sidney’s letter had to circulate in fairly large numbers of copies” (151).

\textsuperscript{19} Beal, vii.
Indeed, they may have needed to exercise more caution. As Beal points out, fiction provided writers with an out that letters did not: “[A Letter] was no Arcadia, which he could pretend to pass off as ‘but a trifle, and that triflingly handled.’”

Whereas historians quickly passed over printed works because they were considered propaganda, literary scholars dismissed cheap print as ephemeral and non-literary. As Frederick Waage puts it in *Thomas Dekker’s Pamphlets* (1977), “Whatever the terms on which a given work has been considered ‘popular,’ . . . the epithet has generally served to limit study of it, because it connotes a lack of literary intent on the part of the author, and an inability to present interesting, subtle, or profound material.”

In *Elizabethan Pamphleteers* (1983), Sandra Clark notes that literary scholars have ignored pamphlets because they considered them the province of other disciplines: “The popular pamphlet as such has escaped attention; it is elusive and difficult to categorize, a literary chameleon, which fades now into the background of sociology, now into that of history, or else lurks in the obscure vegetation amongst ‘other works’ of authors better known for something else.” As recently as 2005, Susan Staub felt the need to justify

20 Ibid., 110.

21 Frederick O. Waage, *Thomas Dekker’s Pamphlets, 1603-1609, and Jacobean Popular Literature* (Salzburg: Institut Für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1977), 5. The belief that occasional literature is inferior had become widely accepted by the twentieth century, helped along by the Romantic conception of the author as genius. In 1910, Brian Hooker argued that “Occasional poetry is commonly inferior; for the wind of inspiration bloweth where it listeth, and poetic emotion refuses to burn opportunely at the bidding of occasion” (“New Poets and Old Poetry,” *The Bookman: An Illustration Magazine of Literature and Life* 32 [March-August 1910]: 482).

studying pamphlet literature because the genre “suggests something both ephemeral and trivial.”23

Yet, the movement to study popular culture has caused both historians and literary scholars to recognize the value of cheap print as a source of historical evidence. 24

Following the call of scholars such as Lawrence Wroth who advocated studying printed books and Lucien Febvre who pushed for studies of “l’histoire des mentalités collectives,” some scholars focused their attention on printed texts as a means of learning about popular culture.25 Victor Neuburg, for example, looked at the interplay between

---


24 However, current scholarship refers to the persistence of the bias for manuscripts. Jeremy Popkins defends his methodology “To historians, who often favor manuscript sources over printed ones in their research” (*History, historians, and autobiography* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005], 72). As recently as 2010, Jason McElligott and David Smith claimed that the Royalist experience has been misunderstood, in part, because of scholars “who looked down on printed items in favour of manuscript sources” (*Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010], 11).

25 In “The Bibliographical Way,” Lawrence Wroth expounded upon the importance of printed sources while declaring against “historians who consistently ignore the printed book in favor of manuscript source materials” (“The Bibliographical Way,” in *About Books: A Gathering of Essays*, ed. James Hart [Berkeley: University of California Berkeley Press, 1941], 79). Lawrence Stone quotes Febvre in *The Past and Present Revisited* (New York: Routledge, 1987), 178. Scholars realized that cheaply printed books were one of the main ways of representing and shaping the “mentalités collectives,” as they were to, for, and about the general public. As Margaret Spufford explains, “The attention of historians interested in pre-industrial communities and in non-élites within them has only recently slowly turned from the reconstruction of the economic framework of such communities to the much more nebulous and more difficult attempt to recreate the mental world and imagery which such people had at their disposal. One of the very limited ways in which this can be done is to describe the fictional world to which the men, or women, who could read but could not necessarily write could be admitted in the late seventeenth century, if he, or she had 2d to spend on the type of small book sold by chapman” (*Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and Its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* [Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981], 1-2). Tessa Watt compellingly argues for the value of cheap print as a source of historical evidence: “The development of ‘cheap print’ is important as a chapter in publishing history; acting both as an instrument and a measure of ‘typographic acculturation’ in rural England. These paper artefacts also have insights to offer us on some of the wider questions of the period, especially on the impact of Protestantism, and of print, on traditional culture” (*Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 322). Jerome Friedman expresses this nicely in his preface to *The Battle of the Frogs* (1993): “This volume will examine the newsbooks and pulp press from 1640 to 1660 to assess how ordinary English people conceived of the English Revolution” (*The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford’s Flies: Miracles and the Pulp Press During the English Revolution* [New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993], x).
oral and print culture, and showed that studying cheap print opened a “window . . . upon
the world of ordinary men and women in the past.” Historians Margaret Spufford,
Tessa Watt, and Alexandra Walsham have demonstrated the influence of cheap print on
the religious beliefs of communities across England. Literary scholars have examined
the significance of different forms of cheaply printed books. Julie Crawford, for
example, has studied the key role broadside ballads played in local religio-political
debates throughout England; Alexandra Halasz and Joad Raymond have shown the
importance of pamphlets to political life in sixteenth and seventeenth century England;
and Malcolm Jones has established the value of single-sheet prints to cultural life in
Britain.

As cheap print became an accepted and burgeoning field of study, so did
occasional events at court. Though Nichols proclaimed the significance of state


27 In Contrasting Communities, Margaret Spufford concluding that “in some cases it demonstrably influenced the religious beliefs of individuals” (Small Books, xvii). In Small Books and Pleasant Histories, she studied how the literate were affected by the “steady hail of printed pamphlets of news, political and religious propaganda, astrological prediction and advice, songs, sensation, sex and fantasy” (Ibid., xiii). Following Spufford, Tessa Watt examined cheap print as a means by which to understand “popular culture and popular religion” (1). She notes that cheap print crossed class and geographical divisions, acting as a unit of “social cohesion” and forming a “shared culture” (5). In other words, cheap print cut across class barriers to unify a diverse cross-section of the public.

28 See Julie Crawford, Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post-Reformation England (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2005). Alexandra Halasz focuses on late sixteenth and early seventeenth century English pamphlets, showing how the publication of pamphlets contributed to the democratization of political discourse. She writes, “Two premises underlie my discussion. First, because pamphlets are—in the abstract—ubiquitous and polymorphous, they imply a generalized access to the circulation of printed discourse and thus open up the social space that will come to be conceptualized as a public sphere. At the same time, they imbue that nascent sphere with ambivalence about the loss of social distinction that generalized access suggests” (The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997], 4). Joad Raymond claims that the pamphlet “created influential moral and political communities of readers” and was “the most effective means of persuasion and communication” in the seventeenth century (Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003], i and dust jacket). Malcolm Jones examines single-sheet prints, demonstrating their value to cultural history (The Print in Early Modern England [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010]).
occasions in the nineteenth century, it was not until the work of Roy Strong and Stephen Orgel in the twentieth century that court events became a popular subject of scholarship. Examining these events, Strong and Orgel demonstrated the significance of entertainments such as the masque which they identified as the primary way in which the Stuart court represented itself. Orgel defined the masque as a Tudor genre that “came into its own artistically with the accession of the first British Renaissance monarch, Henry VIII.” According to Orgel, this Tudor form was the essential means by which the Stuart court represented and defined itself. Stuart masques “were for the court and about the court.” The masques which defined this singular, Tudor-derived court were put on at Whitehall in London, the center of the court, and paid homage to James. “The supreme expressions of Renaissance kingship,” masques showed the Stuart royal family an idealized image of itself at the center of which was “the pacific king, not a warrior, but a classical scholar and poet.” For Orgel, the royal family is unified under James and English. Orgel’s work proved influential for the New Historicist critics of the 1980s, led by Jonathan Goldberg, author of *James I and the Politics of Literature* (1983). Goldberg argued that James manipulated images of the royal family, depicting himself as the central and controlling figure.

---


30 Ibid., 38.

31 Ibid., 58 & 65.

32 Though Orgel’s work came out in the 1970s and much work has been done to complicate studies of the court and masque since that time, his work has proven to be tenacious.

In recent years, scholars have attempted to de-center James and offer a new vision of the Stuarts, but they have added details to the existing picture rather than redrawn it. Lindy Levy Peck, introducing a collection of essays that argues for the court as “multifaceted . . . with a polyphony of voices,” defines those voices in relation to James’s: “If the king emphasized the word, other centres within and without the court became more and more interested in visual culture.”34 Using the “if, then,” construct, she places James as the norm to which everyone is compared. Like Orgel, she represents the Stuarts as deeply invested in both their Tudor heritage and the masque. The Stuarts “built on Tudor iconography” and used masques as their primary means of self-representation: “Masques put on before and by the king and court were central texts of court culture during the reign of James.”35 Scholars who have worked to show the polycentric nature of the court continue to be James-centric, even when arguing for the importance of other figures. Leeds Barroll, Barbara Lewalski, and Clare McManus, for example, have shown the significance of Anna of Denmark’s court as a center of artistic patronage and performance; however, they maintain that her court’s importance relies on the arts and its opposition to James.36 Anna’s significance, in their arguments, depends upon James.

This James-centric picture of the Stuarts is one derived largely from representations of the Stuarts that were endorsed by the royals themselves—court


36 Barbara Lewalski describes Anna’s opposition to James as promoting Spain, Roman Catholicism, and her court appointments (Writing Women in Jacobean England [London: Harvard University Press, 1993], 15). Peter Holbrook asserts that Anna “had a foreign policy programme that was discernibly her own . . . Catholic and pro-Spanish” (“Jacobean Masques and the Jacobean Peace,” in The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque, eds. David Bevington and Peter Holbrook [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 79 & 83).
productions that they patronized. In this dissertation, I hope to offer a new vision of the Stuarts by studying representations of them in printed works intended for an audience comprised of more than the royal family, nobles, and courtiers. Despite the recent surge of interest in cheap print on the one hand and court events on the other little scholarship has been done on the printed works about occasions at court. These works were “popular literature” in the sense that their authors intended them to be read by a mass audience. Writers publishing texts on state occasions argued that these events could be fully understood only in printed works, as the printed texts shape the occasion into a complete, meaningful unit in a way that an eyewitness could not possibly experience, as a spectator’s vision and hearing was always compromised no matter how privileged his/her position.

Writing about the events that took place during Christian of Denmark’s state visit in 1606, the author of *The King of Denmark’s Welcome* admits that he encountered difficulties as an eyewitness. Unable to see and hear everything, he had to turn to other eye-witnesses to fill in the gaps in his account, writing “such particulars as either my self particularly noted, or else I received from others, which were eye witnesses.”

John Davies claimed that it was better to read about the celebrations held in honor of Christian’s visit than to see them, since the exigencies of live performance prevent spectators from fully grasping them:

\[\text{And, let thy Muses so in Pageants speak,}\]

\[\text{That they may make the clamorous Crowd attend:}\]

\[\text{Although their voice, though wants become so weak,}\]

---

37 *The King of Denmarke welcome: Containing his ariuall, abode, and entertainement, both in the Citie and other places* (London: Edward Allde, 1606), A3r.
That they may seem to speak to little end:
Sith the rude Multitude will silence break,
Though speak there may an Angel, or a Fiend:
Yet what they speak, in Print, in Print may be
Conveyed aloft, down to Posterity.³⁸

In this passage, Davies is describing a pageant presented before James and Christian during their progress through London. He says that the angels and fiends, the allegorical figures starring in the entertainments, were difficult to hear because of the noisy crowd (the rude multitude who broke the silence). Describing the same event in his continuation of John Stow’s Annales, Edmund Howes reported that the spectators created such a commotion not even the kings could understand the actors. Divine Concord “with a lowd voyce, spake an excellent speech,” but the “unrulie multitude” drowned her out and “the Kings could not well heare it, although they enclined their eares very seriously thereunto.”³⁹ Writers argued for the superiority of reading accounts of events to witnessing them, in part, as a marketing strategy for selling books to those who had seen the events. Nevertheless, they made a convincing case for print, showing how the meaning and import of events could only be known and fully understood by reading about them.

Having made the case for the significance of printed accounts of state events, many writers used these accounts to reflect on the realm and promote competing visions

³⁸ John Davies, Bien Venv. Greate Britaines Welcome to Hir Greate Friendes, and Deere Brethren The Danes (London: Nathaniel Butter, 1606), C1v.

of the British polity. Throughout the country people were eager for such texts. As Croft notes, “there was already an audience avid for news and quick to pick up topical references at the theatre and in printed satire, political epigrams and tracts were quickly carried to readers in the localities, in both manuscript and print.”40 Appealing to this audience, writers praised James while simultaneously advocating agendas often distinct from his. These writers negotiated a careful line between compliment and opposition. Their works are not propaganda nor transcripts of what occurred, but subtly crafted commentaries on the Stuarts. In studying such works, I seek to go beyond the work of scholars who have begun to explore other ideas of representations of the Stuarts by understanding them as essentially different from previous depictions: international in nature, comprised of forces other than James, intended for widespread public consumption, and created by individuals who were not working for the Stuarts.

The court was not English, but international. James, a Scot, was not alone when he came to England in 1603; his wife Anna was a Danish princess, who maintained her ties to Denmark (as we see in chapter one) throughout her life; their three children who survived infancy, Henry, Elizabeth and Charles, were born in Scotland and established strong relationships with continental Europe. Henry (as chapter two examines) with the French and Elizabeth (as chapter three explores) with the German states. As such relationships suggest, the Stuarts were not a unified entity dominated and defined by James. Anna, Henry, Elizabeth, and Charles were independent from James and had their own political agendas which were always informed and buttressed by other factions. By 1604, James was not the only one with a court. Anna had established her own court by

that point, one which, to take only one example, eventually had an independent legal
court with its own judicial jurisdiction and powers. As Henry grew into maturity, he
also gained a separate, functioning court. Scholars studying works patronized by
members of the royal family have not examined the vast body of occasional literature
written for the public which depicts them not as the ideal patriarchal family proposed by
Goldberg in the 1980s, but as a family of autonomous individuals bound together by
kinship and, more importantly, by a variety of dynastic and factional ties.

These themes—representations as international, multi-centric, popular, and poly-
vocal—will run through the chapters, each of which centers on a major court event and
the literary response to it: the 1606 state visit to London of the Danish king Christian IV;
the death of Henry, Prince of Wales, in London in 1612; the wedding of Elizabeth to
Frederick, Count Palatine, in London in 1613; and the funeral of Anna in London in
1618. Offering contextualized readings of representative occasional works, I show that
authors used these events to envision idealized relationships between, respectively,
Britain and Denmark; Britain and France; Britain and Germany; and, England and
Scotland. In each case, they picture one member of the royal family establishing and
maintaining these relationships. In other words, they imagined different members of the
royal family in critical positions of power, and as mediating, through these occasions, a
wide range of religious and political controversies. Examining representational wars over
the images of various members of the Stuarts, I hope to offer a complex portrait of a royal
family at the center of international debates.

41 N.R.R. Fisher, “The Queenes Courte in Her Councell Chamber at Westminster,” The English Historical

In chapter one, I will examine the literature printed on the state visit of Christian IV, King of Denmark, to England in July of 1606. It was the first such visit in 84 years, the last having been when the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V visited Henry VIII in 1522.43 The occasion inspired a print phenomenon, dominating the Stationers’ Register from 25 July to 19 August.44 Within that time, only one work was entered for publication that was not about the visit.45 Six works were entered in the register while Christian was in England: the anonymously authored pamphlet *The King of Denmarques Welcome*, Henry Robarts’ pamphlets *The Most royall and Honourable Entertainement, of the famous and renowned King, Christiern the fourth, King of Denmarke and Englands Farevvell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke*, John Davies of Hereford’s poem *Bien Venv. Greate Britaines Welcome to Hir Greate Friendes and Deere Brethren the Danes*, John Ford’s poem *The Monarches meeting: or The King of Denmarkes welcome into England*, and Thomas Playfere’s *Caesaris superscriptio Siue Conciuncula, coram duobus potentissimis regibus, Iacobo Britanniae, & Christiano Daniae*.46 These authors expected their works to be read by an international public. In the words of the

43 For an account of Christian’s activities during the visit, see Appendix B.

44 For a list of these entries, see Appendix C. The only work published that was not about Christian’s visit was entered in the register on 12 August 1606 by William Welby and Martyn Clerk. They “Entered for their Copy under th[e h]ands of master Owyn Gwy, and the Wardens a book called the Translation of Master Perkys De Predestination” (Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554-1640. Text. Entries of Books to 11 July 1620, Entries of Freemen to 31 December 1610, Succession of Master Printers in London 1586-1636* [London: Privately Printed, 1876], Vol. 3, 142).

45 This work was entered in the register on 12 August 1606 by William Welby and Martyn Clerk. They “Entered for their Copy under th[e h]ands of master Owyn Gwy, and the Wardens a book called the Translation of Master Perkys De Predestination” (Ibid.).

46 Robarts had entered the work in the Stationers’ Register on 30 July 1616: “Henrie Robertes ‘Entred for his Copie vnder th[e h]andes of Master Wilson and the wardens the Kinge of Denmarkes entertainment at Tilberie Hope by the kinge &c.’” (Ibid.).
anonymous author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome*, “[Britain was] both in the eyes & eares of all domestique and fornaine people.” At least two of the works did circulate on the Continent. Conradus Khunrath, a German medical writer, combined Robarts’ pamphlets into one account which he published in German: *Relatio oder Erzehlung, wie der Grossmechtigste Herr Christianvs Quartus, zu Dennemarck* (1607). Christian’s visit was, in both history and print, an international event.

The pamphlets and poems concentrate on depicting the relationship between James and Christian. I will argue that when Christian arrived in Britain, he rather than James was the most powerful man in the country—a situation that explicitly challenges the standard James-centric understanding of the Jacobean court. Highlighting Christian’s wealth and power, the authors of the occasional poems and pamphlets acknowledge his position. Christian rather than James is at the center of events, and the model king: intelligent, thoughtful, chivalric, and courageous. He has, as the author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome* puts it, “the markers of the best Conquerors.” I will argue that the poems and pamphlets work to show James as Christian’s equal. They strive, as John Davies says, to show that James is “as square/ As any Potentate of Christendome.”

---

47 *The King of Denmarkes welcome*, A2v.


49 *The King of Denmarkes Welcome*, B2v.

50 Ibid.
In chapter two, I will explore the literature written in response to the death of the nation’s great hope: Henry, Prince of Wales. When Henry died on 6 November 1612, the British were devastated. In the month and a half following his death, 38% of new works entered in the Stationers’ Register were about him (in December, over 60% of new works were about him). When the last elegy was printed in 1614, a total of 58 eulogies had been published. The literary response was incredible—never before had so many elegies been written by such a variety of authors. Dennis Kay characterized it as “an unprecedentedly intense, widespread, and unequivocal outburst of lamentation” in his study of the early modern funeral elegy *Melodious Tears*.

---

51 See Appendix D: Texts on the Death of Prince Henry in the Stationers’ Register. Between 7 November and 21 December, 42 new works were entered in the register 15 of which were about Henry. In December, 24 works were entered in the register 15 of which were about Henry. The nine books which were not about Henry include: A table [i.e. a broadside] of Oeconomical or household government fitt for everey housholder and his familie, entered by Arthur Johnson on 7 December; A booke called A briefe Demonstration who haue and of the certenty of their saluation that haue the spirit of Christ &c. by James Speght bachelor in diuinitie, entered by William Hall and John Beale on 11 December; A booke called pointes of instruccon for the ignorant with an examinacon before year [their] cominge to the Lordes table and a short direccon for spending of tyme well, entered by Francis Burton on 11 December; A booke called Mariamne The Tragedie of the fayre Mariamne Quene of Jurye, entered by Richard Hawkins on 17 December; A ballad called the storye of John of Conace, entered by Master Elde on 18 December; A booke called A Description of the estate of Ireland as nowe it standes vnder the gouernement of Kinge James, entered by John Jaggard on 19 December; A booke called An abridgement methodical of the sea laues gathered out of all Writinges and monuments whiche are to be found amonge any people or nation vpon the coastes of the great Ocean and Mediterranean sea and specially ordered and disposed for the use and benefit of all benevolent seafayrers within his maiesties dominions of great Britaine Ireland and the adjacent Isle thereof by William Wel[v]yd professor of Civil Lawe, entered by the elder Jonse man 20 December; A book called Microcosmographia. or the little Worlds Description, or the map of Man translated out of Latyn by Josua Siluester, entered by Master Humfrey Lowness on 22 December; and A book called A plaine and easie table whereby any man maie be Directed howe to reade ouer the whole bible in A yere by John Waymouth gent, entered by Master Welby on 25 December (Arber, Vol. 3, 230-232v).


54 Ibid.
Scholars studying these elegies have argued that they continued in the mythmaking process begun during Henry’s investiture, portraying him as the hope of Protestant Europe. For example, in his elegy, Robert Allyne pictures the future Henry would have had if he had not been “bereft by death before time.” He imagines Henry leading forces to “glorious conquests in the continent . . . [and making himself] famous by the fall of Rome.” While recognizing that Henry was seen to be the hero of international Protestantism, scholars have consistently depicted him within a strictly English tradition. According to Roy Strong, Henry “should firmly be placed” in a line of descent that “runs as follows: Elizabeth I’s first favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester; secondly his nephew, Sir Philip Sidney; and finally his stepson and the Queen’s last favourite, Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex.”

In contradistinction, I will argue that the British authors composing the elegies emphasized Henry’s ties to Britain because of a competing tradition which connected Henry with France. To illustrate this contest over Henry’s image, I turn to two works: the Scottish writer George Marcelline’s *The Triumphs of King Iames The First* (1610) and the French writer Jean l'Oiseau de Tourval’s *The French Herald Symmoning All True Christian Princes to a generall Croisade* (1611). Both men were cultural emissaries. Marcelline wrote his first book on King James, publishing it in French for French readers: *Les trophees du roi Iacques I. de la Grande Bretaigne, France, et Irlande* (1609). Tourval, on the other hand, worked as a translator in England, producing French

---


56 Ibid.

versions of English texts (including his French edition of James’s apology for the Oath of Allegiance). Tourval also claimed a personal connection with Prince Henry, maintaining that he moved to London from Paris in order to serve the prince. Addressing Henry, Tourval avers that “a most speciall and holy zeale to your Princely servise . . . eight yeares agoe, brought me into your Country, and [is] still working in my hart.”

Marcelline and Tourval both dedicate their works to Henry, but they encourage Henry to see himself as part of different traditions. Marcelline positions Henry within a Scottish line of kings, “this house of Stuart in Scotland” which has issued a line of “rare and excellent” kings concluding with “Our Great King [James], who hath produced the most Noble Prince Henry.” Having established Henry’s place within a Scottish ancestral line, Marcelline reminds Henry of his “Naturall dutie” to Britain. In contrast, Tourval highlights Henry’s French ancestors (the “drop of French blood” in him) and his close relationship with the French court, in particular Henri IV (his “second father”). I argue that some of the funeral elegies evince an anti-French sentiment and emphasize Henry’s love of Britain in response to works such as Tourval’s which advocate favorable relations between Britain and France based on Henry’s close ties with the French.

---

58 Jean l'Oiseau de Tourval, *The French Herald Svmmoning All Trve Christian Princes to a generall Croisade, for a holy warr against the great Enemy of Christendome, and all his slaues. Vpon the Occasion of the most execrable murther of Henry the gerat. To the Prince* (London: Edward Allde for Mathew Lownes, 1611), A2v.

59 George Marcelline, *The Triumphs of King Iames the First, Of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland, King; Defender of the Faith. Published vpon his Majesties advertisement to all the Kings, Princes, and Potentates of Christendome, and confirmed by the wonderfull Workes of God, declared in his life. Devoted, Dedicated, and Consecrated to the most excellent Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London: John Budge, 1610), L3r-v.

60 Ibid., L3v.

61 Tourval, G2v & G1r.
In chapter three, I will examine the literature written about the marriage of Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James VI & I and Anna of Denmark, and Frederick, Count Palatine, the head of the Protestant Union. The marriage bound together two of Europe’s leading Protestant countries and the literary response to the affair suggests its significance—over twenty-two works were published in England alone, fifteen of which were entered in the Stationers’ Register within five months of the wedding. Two works were entered in the register in the two weeks before the wedding took place—

*Triumphs or a description of the honorable and royal celebration of the princess Elizabeth and the prince Palatine’s nuptials* and George Wither’s *Epithalamion or nuptial Poems on the most happy marriage of the Prince Fredericke and the Lady Elizabeth*—and more than half of all works entered in the register in the month following the wedding were about the wedding. 19% of all printers who registered texts in the Stationers’ Register in 1613 entered one on the Palatine wedding.

62 For a list of these entries, see Appendix F. Appendix E provides an account of the festivities that took place in London.

63 Henry Gosson entered *Triumphs* on 30 January 1613 and Master Welby entered *Epithalamion* on 10 February 1613 (Arber, Vol. 3, 234v & 235). Eleven new works were entered in the register between 14 February 1613 and 14 March 1613 and six of these were about the wedding—see Appendix F for a list of the wedding entries. The five which were not about the wedding were: [a ballad called] the shepheardes hard fortune or his Lamentacon, entered by Edward White on 20 February; A booke called A sermon of loue instructing all men to vnite and Joyne themselves in h[e]artye loue and Christian Charitye by master Rogers, entered by George Norton on 25 February; A booke called foure sermons, entered by Master Burton on 26 February; A ballet called A newe Mahomet lately sprange vp in Barbary who hath twice defeated Mulley Sydan, entered by Thomas Thorpe on 27 February; A booke called The Cunduyt of Comfort conteyninge sundry shorte and swete prayters to the glorious Trynitie, entered by William Whyte on 2 March (Ibid., 235-236).

were also publishing texts on the wedding, printing works such as Tobias Hübner’s account of Elizabeth’s reception in Heidelberg: *Beschreibung Der Reiss* (1613). Authors continued writing responses to the wedding through 1616, including Henry Peacham, with his *Prince Henry Revived* (1615), and Georg Weckherlin, with his *Triumphall Shews* (1616).

Those celebrating the match consistently depict Elizabeth and Frederick as representatives of Britain and Germany, their relationship of Anglo-German relations. Taking Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage as a metaphor for Protestant Union, they advocate a pan-European alliance through positive visions of their relationship. Scholars from Frances Yates to Jaroslav Miller have seen the wedding literature as a unified campaign for an international religious union, but in fact nationalism engendered significant disagreements about the alliance. A close reading of Peacham and Weckherlin shows how national loyalty motivates them to depict different visions of the marriage and, hence, union. Peacham, a British author closely tied to the Stuarts, imagines a relationship in which Elizabeth (Britain) takes precedence over Frederick (Germany), arguing that Elizabeth outranks her husband. In comparison with Elizabeth’s ancestral line, Frederick’s is “common, new.”

Weckherlin, a German who served the Duke of Württemberg, envisions Elizabeth and Frederick as equals. In his dedicatory

---


---

65 Henry Peacham, *Prince Henrie revived. Or A Poeme Vpon The Birth, And In Honor of the Hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick, First Sonne and Heire apparent to the most Excellent Princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine, And the Mirrow of Ladies, Princesse Elizabeth, his Wife, onely daughter to our Soueraigne Iames King of Great Britaine, &c.* (London: William Stansby for John Helme, 1615), C1r-C1v.
poem, for example, he says that he hopes “That Germanie may England like bee
found.” 66 I will then turn to other responses to the wedding by British and German
writers: the English dramatist Thomas Heywood’s *A Marriage Triumphe Solemnized In
An Ephithalamivm* (1613) and the German writer Tobias Hübner’s *Beschreibung Der
Reiss* (1613). Heywood and Hübner divided along the same lines as Peacham and
Weckherlin, their disagreements reflecting public sentiment in their respective countries.
By showing this I do not mean to argue that literature should be divided along national
lines, but rather to show how patriotism complicates international relations.

In the final chapter, I will turn to Anna of Denmark and the literary response to
her death. Anna was known for her involvement in court events, having commissioned,
helped to create, and performed in six masques. Scholars have recognized her as critical
to the development of court entertainments in the Stuart period. Despite her involvement
in state events during her lifetime, the largest body of occasional works depicting her as
the central figure of importance was written in response to her death. She died on 2
March 1619 and was buried on 28 May 1619. Considering the long delay between her
death and funeral, as well as James’s failure to take part in the funeral, scholars have
argued that it was not a major occasion at the Stuart court. 67 However, it was standard

66 Weckherlin, ).(3v. Weckherlin tailors his account to appeal to English readers, changing the dedicatee
from Barbara Sophie (wife to the Duke of Württemberg) to Princess Elizabeth, describing events in terms
of English literary references, and adding descriptions of local German customs such as the Kübelstechen, a
German custom in which local peasants perform in a mock joust. For more on the Kübelstechen, see
Watanabe-O’Kelly, *Triumphall Shews*, 33. In 1619, Weckherlin published another poem in English,
printed by John Wyrich Resslin in Stuttgart, entitled “A Panegyricke to the Lord Hays, Viscount of
Doncaster, His Majesties of Great Britaine Ambassadour in Germany, sung by the Rhine,” suggesting that
Weckherlin fostered relations between the English and German courts through his literary work (Hermann
[1893]: 36.)

67 Clare McManus, for example, argues that “Anna’s distance from the courtly mainstream is confirmed by
her funeral, delayed by financial crisis for a month longer than tradition dictated . . . the circumstances of
Anna’s death and its aftermath seem only to confirm her loss of power” (*Women on the Renaissance Stage:*
practice for James not to attend funerals and the funeral was delayed not because of neglect, but because James arguably wanted it to be an appropriately spectacular affair and, as was the case with so many things, had difficulty raising the money to finance it.  

The final bill for the funeral was over £40,000, far in excessive of Prince Henry’s (£15,000) or Queen Elizabeth’s (£18,000). According to the famous letter-writer John Chamberlain, James intended to bury Anna “with the same solemnitie and as much pomp (yf yt may be) as Quene Elizabeth.”

While the court was honoring Anna’s life in expensive, public ceremonies, authors were commemorating her in print. Five works were published following her death: Patrick Hannay’s *Two Elegies On the late death of our Soueraigne Queene Anne with Epitaphes*; James Maxwell’s *Carolanna, That is to say, A Poem in Honor of Our King, Charles-James, Queen Anne, and Prince Charles, but principally in honor of the immortal memory of our late noble and good Queen*; William Slatyer’s *ΘΡΗΩΔΙΑ . . . Elegies and Epitaphs* [in honor of Queen Anne]; a collection published by the University of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court 1590-1619 [New York: Manchester University Press, 2002], 202-3).

68 John Chamberlain reported that James was so desperate for money that he considered “melting the Queen’s golden plate and putting it into coin besides that the commissioners for her jewels and other moveables make offer to sell or pawn diverse of them to good value” (Norman Egbert McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain* [Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939. Reprinting 1962], Vol. 2, 232-3).

69 Abraham Williams, the agent of Elizabeth and Frederick, wrote Dudley Carleton on 20 March 1619, reporting that “The Queen’s funeral will cost 24,000l.—more than Prince Henry’s, which was 15,600l., or Queen Elizabeth’s, which was 18,000l.” (Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I. 1619-1623* [London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858], Vol. 10, 26). In a letter to his employer the diplomat Dudley Carleton, Nathaniel Brent, an ecclesiastical lawyer, claimed that “Queen’s funeral [cost] more than 40,000l” (Ibid., 44). On 14 April 1619, John Chamberlain told Carleton that “the number of mourners and the whole charge spoken of is beyond proportion, above three times more then was bestowed upon Queen Elizabeth” (McClure, Vol. 2, 232).

70 Ibid., 220.
of Oxford, *Academiae Oxoniensis Fvnebria Sacra. Aeternæ Memorìae Serenissimæ Regìne ANNAE*; and a print, *The Scala Coeli of the Gracious Queen Anne*. The books were collections of poems, the largest of which was that published by the University of Oxford—it contained over 210 poems. In number these works cannot compare with those composed for Sir Philip Sidney or Prince Henry. However, the number of elegies written for Anna was comparable to the number published in England for King Henri IV, the French monarch whose sensational murder in 1610 was major news.71 Moreover, writers continued to feature representations of Anna long after her death. In 1624, a fictional representation of Anna appeared in the merchant John Reynolds’s *Vox Cœli*, a controversial text in which deceased English monarchs question whether or not James should marry Charles with the Spanish Infanta.

Yet these works have received little scholarly attention, a consequence of the historical consensus that Anna had lost her influence at court in the years preceding her death. In this chapter, I will attempt to redress such neglect by studying posthumous

---

71 I have found nine texts printed in 1610 on subject of Henri’s death in the Stationers’ Register, EEBO, and ESTC. However, only three appear to be elegies: *The lamentable complaint of Fraunce, for the death of the late King Henry the 4* (London: William Barley, 1610), *The sighes of Fraunce for the death of their late King, Henry the fourth* (London: John Budge, 1610), and Thomas Pelletier, *A lamentable discourse, vpon the paricide and bloudy assassination: committed on the person of Henry the fourth (of famous memorie) King of France and Navarre. Translated out of the French copy* (London: Edward Blunt and William Barret, 1610). The other six published include: *newes from Ffraunce contayninge a true reporte of the murther of the late king Henry the 4th the crowning of the Queene and Dauphine of Ffraunce with the state of the Cuntry as noe it standeth*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on 10 May 1610 by John Busby Sr.; *A ballad The wofull complaint of Fraunce for the deathe of the late kinge Henry the Fowrth*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on 15 May 1610 by William Baryley; Claude Morillon, *The funeral pompe and obsequies of the most mighty and puissant Henry the fourth, King of France* (London: Nicholas Okes to be sold by L. Lisle, 1610); *A true report of the most execrable murder committed vpon the late French King Henrie the 4 of famous memory* (London: Thomas Purfoot for John Budge, 1610); Pierre Du Coignet, *Anti-Coton, or A refutation of Cottons letter declaratorie: lately directed to the Queene Regent, for the apologizing of the Iesuites doctrine, touching the killing of kings. A booke, in which it is proued that the Iesuites are guiltie, and were the authors of the late execrable parricide, committed vpon the person of the French King; and Philippe de Mornay, A discourse to the lords of the Parliament. As touching the murther committed vpon the person of Henrie the Great, King of Fraunce. Manifestlie proving the Iesuites to be the plotters and principall deuisers of that horrible act. Translated out of French, and published by authority* (London: Thomas Purfoot for Nathaniel Butter, 1611).
representations of Anna. Writers, I will argue, used these representations of Anna to state claims in contemporary controversies. For example, Reynolds wrote *Vox Cæli* as part of the debate over the negotiations to arrange a marriage between the Protestant Prince Charles and the Catholic Spanish Infanta. In it, Reynolds, who openly opposed the match, portrays Anna as against the match; at one point, she contends that two people of different religions should not marry and supports her case with scripture, quoting two passages which condemn Israelites who marry outside of their faith: “Ezra. Ch. 9 [and] Nehem[iah]. Ch. 13.” Anna uses an intimate knowledge of the bible to challenge James’s authority to match Charles with a Catholic and thus becomes a politically savvy champion for Protestants. I will examine Patrick Hannay’s *Two Elegies* as exemplary of this phenomenon. Hannay, a Scottish writer who had followed the royal family south to England, was invested in the success of the Union of Great Britain. Hannay wrote *Two Elegies* as his contribution to the Union controversy, drawing a portrait of his ideal version of Union and featuring Anna as its leader. Hannay envisions Anna as successful and powerful in her role as Britain’s “first, Crowne-vnited,” a vision that invites us to reconsider Anna’s posthumous legacy.

Attending to the contexts which shaped occasional literature and the sometimes surprising ways in which writers yoked descriptions of state events to commentaries on

---

72 John Reynolds, *Vox coeli, or, Nevves from heaven Of a consultation there held by the high and mighty princes, King Hen.8. King Edw.6. Prince Henry. Queene Mary, Queene Elizabeth, and Queene Anne; wherein Spaines ambition and treacheries to most kingdomes and free estates in Europe, are vnmasked and truly represented, but more particularly towards England, and now more especially vnder the pretended match of Prince Charles, with the Infanta Dona Maria. Whereunto is annexed two letters written by Queene Mary from heauen, the one to Count Gondonmar, the ambassadour of Spaine, the other to all the Romane Catholiques of England* (London, 1624), 51.

political issues, demands both a new history of events at court and a new understanding of the international nature of the Stuart court. In this dissertation, I will study the relationship between occasional works and the “real” events which they discuss to understand how writers sought to persuade the public to accept their political viewpoints through fictional representations of the Stuarts. More importantly, I hope to demonstrate the need to look beyond court representations of the Stuarts to popular ones to fully understand their iconography. By examining diverse responses to specific historical moments of international interest and significance, I will tell the story of battles fought over British foreign policy through representations of the Stuarts in cheap print, battles which highlight both the polyleadership of the court, and its international scope.
CHAPTER ONE

‘MONARCHES . . . LINKT IN AMITIE’:
BRITAIN, DENMARK, AND THE 1606 STATE VISIT OF CHRISTIAN IV

In July of 1606, Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway and brother-in-law to King James VI & I, arrived in England for a state visit: the first time a king had done so in living memory (the last time had been 84 years earlier when Emperor Charles V came to Henry VIII’s court in 1522).¹ Nobles, Parliament, and the citizens of London spent exorbitant amounts on public and private festivities to celebrate the occasion.² For example, Robert Cecil, Secretary of State, spent 1,180 pounds and 11 pence during the five days James, Christian, and their entourages stayed at his country estate Theobalds.³

Christian galvanized Britons to follow him wherever he went; it was reported that they

---

¹ This fact was noted by contemporaries. The poet and pamphleteer William Drummond, in a letter dated 18 July 1606, wrote, “The afternoon they [James and Christian] came by the tide up the River, which had never more eyes upon it than then; and no wonder, for since the coming of the Emperor to Henry VIII it had never borne two Kings” (John Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family and Court [London: J. B. Nichols, 1828. Reprinting 1965], Vol. 2, 53).

² Sir John Harington claimed that Parliament provided James “so seasonably with money . . . there hath been no lack of good living; shows, sights, and banquetings, from morn to eve” (Ibid., 72). Londoners spent liberally on pageants, decorations, and gifts for Christian's progress through the city. Thage Thott, one of the Danish courtiers, reported that there were “three wells in the streets, [one] which ran with white wine and 2 with red wine” and that the citizens of London presented Christian with “a handsome gold goblet” (Lene Peterson, “The Journey to England: The Royal Visit of King Christian IV in the Summer of 1606,” forthcoming in English Literary Renaissance, 28).

³ It is interesting that the entertainments which have dominated the critical conversation about the visit comprised a mere five percent of the total expenditures at Theobalds, while the charges for the King of Denmark’s horses made up about twenty-two percent of the money spent. There is an “Abstract of moneys paid for charges of provisions made at Theobalds against the King of Denmark’s coming thither with his Majesty, and spent while their Majesties lay there, being 5 days ending July 28, 1606” dated 10 August 1606. The money broke down as following: Charges of diet: 551 pounds, 12 shillings and 4 pence; Necessaries and ordinary expenses: 150 pounds, 5 shillings and 1 pence; Charges of the show at Theobalds: 57 pounds, 16 shillings and 8 pence; Rewards to the King’s servants: 84 pounds; Charges of the great horses given to the King of Denmark: 264 pounds, 12 shillings and 4 pence; Charges of the dogs given to the King of Denmark: 18 pounds, 14 shillings, and 6 pence; Paid Aug. 16 to Mr. Levynus for 18 oz. of gold: 54 pounds. Sum Total: 1180 pounds and 11 pence (M.S. Giuseppi, ed., Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire [London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1940], Vol. 18, 237).
trailed after him on horse or foot—even to Rochester, Kent, a town 30 miles from London. Authors were inspired to write pamphlets and poems, and their literary response to the occasion dominated the print world. Only one entry in the Stationers’ Register is not about Christian’s visit from July 25th through August 19th. In other words, for nearly a month, the literate were either writing or reading about the occasion. These printed works—the anonymously authored pamphlet *The King of Denmarkes Welcome*, Henry Robarts’ pamphlets *The Most royall and Honourable Entertainement, of the famous and renowned King, Christiern the fourth, King of Denmarke and Englands Farevvell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke*, John Davies of Hereford’s poem *Bien Venv. Greate Britaines Welcome to Hir Greate Friendes and Deere Brethren the Danes*, Thomas Playfere’s *Caesaris superscriptio Siue Conciuncula, coram duobus potentissimis regibus, Iacobo Britanniae, & Christiano Daniae*, and John Ford’s poem *The Monarches meeting: or The King of Denmarkes welcome into England*—were likely the primary way that people learned about the visit. Scholars have focused on a letter by

---

4 Henry Robarts reported that the kings were “by the way so followed with people, as was wonderfull, and did make the trayne of Courtiers admire: yea, such was the multitude of people, Londoners, & others, which came to Rochester, that thousands could get no lodgings, or meate for their money” (*Englands Farevvell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke: With a relation of such shewes & severall pastimes presented to his Maiestie, as well at Court the fift day of August past, as in other places since his Honorable passage thorow the Cite of London. The most Honorable Entertainement of his Highnesse, afoord his Maiesties Ships in the roade of Gyllingause, neere the Cite of Rochester in Kent. With the Kings Entertainement afoord the Denmarke Ships, at Grauesend: As also their Honorable leve-taking and farewell, Setting Sayle from Grauesend on Munday night, the eleuenth of August. 1606* [London: William Welby, 1606], C3r).


6 The pamphlets and poems were available in shops around London. The booksellers who sold the occasional works were located in highly trafficked areas: St. Paul’s Churchyard, Saint Austens gate, Leaden Hall gate, and Old Fishstreet. Francis Burton, for whom John Ford’s *The Monarches meeting* was printed, was located in St. Paul’s Churchyard; Nathaniel Butter, for whom John Davies *Bien Venv* was printed, had “his shoppe neere Saint Austens gate”; William Barley, for whom Henry Robarts’ *The Most...*
Sir John Harington rather than the poems and pamphlets, adopting Harington’s interpretation of the visit as evidence of the corruption of the court under James. While scholars have argued that domestic matters such as the state of the British court comprise the primary significance of the visit, I will show that international concerns dominated the visit. I will examine the neglected occasional works celebrating Christian’s visit, questioning the long-held belief that internal issues were focus of the occasion. Demonstrating that the occasional pieces focus on international concerns, specifically the relationship between Britain and Denmark, I will argue that they portray James and Christian’s friendship as a metaphor for Anglo-Danish relations. The authors of the poems and pamphlets present their friendship and, hence, the Anglo-Danish alliance as a ready-made pan-European Protestant Union. However, they also expose challenges to this union such as the imbalance of power between Britain and Denmark. Returning to Harington’s letter, I re-read it in light of such issues, proffering a new understanding of both the letter and Christian’s state visit.

I will argue for the historical significance of the 1606 presentation of James and Christian’s friendship as the foundation of a Protestant Union because James took the opportunity of Christian’s presence to discuss forming a Protestant Union with him.7 James considered himself and Christian to be the leaders of Protestant Europe. Writing

royall and Honourable entertainement was printed, sold his wares “in Gracious Streete, neere Leaden Hall gate”; William Welby, for whom Robarts’ Englands Farevell to Christian the fourth was printed, had a shop in St. Paul’s Churchyard; and Edward Allde, who printed the anonymous The King of Danmarkes welcome, was located near Old Fishstreet (Ronald McKerrow, A dictionary of printers and booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of foreign printers of English books 1557-1640 [London: Bibliographical Society, 1968], 57, 286, & 5). At least one author and publisher thought the public was still interested in the occasion a year later. In 1607, the Eliot’s Court Press published Edmund Bolton’s Tricorones, sive soles Gemini in Britannia. Carmen de Christiani IV Regis adventu in eandum.

7 This will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.
to Christian in 1605, he discussed their “common bond of religion” and claimed that “among all kings we two now are left against whom the plots and attempts of Papists are especially directed.”

During Christian’s visit the following year, the two kings attended sermons and communion together on several occasions, showing religious solidarity, and publicly declaring their particular regard for one another. According to the news-writer and parliamentarian John Pory,

[Christian] told the King [James] . . . he gave himself and his hart to do the King, as long as he lived, all friendly offices both in word and deed.

Whereto the King answered, ‘That never man was to him so welcome as the King of Denmark; nor ever should any—till he came againe.’

The backdrop to this exchange, a perfect view of “all the whole navy,” set it in its political context, as did the religious firework display Christian offered to James the following day. Such actions suggested to the public what James and Christian were

---


9 Nichols, Vol. 2, 92. The Venetian Ambassador Zorzi Giustinian records a similar exchange in a letter dated 24 August 1606: “There were those who noticed that in taking leave of each other on board the Danish vessel, after dining sumptuously there along with the Queen and the Prince, the King of Denmark assured the King of England that he would always preserve the accord between their respective kingdoms” (Horatio Brown, ed., *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. 1603-1607* [London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1900], Vol. 10, 394).

10 Nichols, Vol. 2, 92. Edmund Howes describes the fireworks in his extension of John Stow’s *Annales, or, A Generall Chronicle of England*, noting how they not only depicted the triumph of virtue over the seven deadly sins, but also warned sinners against committing them by displaying the tortures sinners suffer in Hell: “The Deuice of wild fire was in pageant wise, betwene four round pillers, vppon a lighter framed, where the seuen deadly sinnes in their lively colours shape: and Caracters, sate chained fast, and for their wickednesse bound to endure eternall punishment, and ouer their heads in the midst of them, vppon the top of a pinacle was a fierce Lion cow-chaunt, signifying sudden vengeance, holding in his teeth the lose ende of the chaine, which compassed them about, and from the Lyons mouth the fire first did issue forth, and from thence, without any confusion, or further ayde, by degrees and distinct proportion, descended into all parts, making sundry sorts of sounds, with loffit Rocketts and fire flakes mounting in the ayre, and great number of thunder crackes like peales of ordinance, and for the space of more then a quarter of an hower,
negotiating in private: forming a confessional alliance. That the authors would support James’s agenda is not surprising, for three of the four—Davies, Ford, and the anonymous author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome—were connected to the court, while the fourth—Robarts—was a devout Protestant.\footnote{Davies was a writing Master who counted Prince Henry amongst his pupils, Ford a recently defrocked member of the Middle Temple who had been educated at Oxford, and the author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome a self-proclaimed “Gentlemen” who had connections at court (he claimed to be present at private court events). For example, he attended a tennis match in the “priuie Gardens” at Greenwich, where he “stoode a good space opposite against his Maiestie, [having] a perfite and full view of him” (The King of Denmarkes welcome: Containing his ariuall, abode, and entertainement, both in the Citie and other places [London: Edward Allde, 1606], B2r).} It is equally unsurprising that they would use friendship as a metaphor for political union, given the long history of doing so. I argue that the authors of the 1606 literature use tropes of classical friendship to present James and Christian as equals, masking their actual inequality. Christian was far wealthier and more powerful than James. In this chapter, I contribute to the critical conversation by studying the hitherto unexamined literary representations of the relationship between James and Christian and by arguing that their focus on James and Christian intentionally sidelined Anna of Denmark, James’s queen consort.\footnote{Those scholars who have speculated on the literary significance of the visit have largely been theater historians, focused on identifying the plays put on before Christian. In a tradition that dates back at least as far as the eighteenth century, they have searched the repertories of the companies known to have performed before the court for plays that would appeal to the Danes. Relying on the Danes’ reputation as drunkards, they have put forward plays which heavily feature drinking as likely candidates for performance. In 1799, George Chalmers argued that Shakespeare revived and improved The Taming of the Shrew as part of the competition between theaters on the occasion of Christian’s visit and he offers Harington’s description of the court as proof for his claim that the play was reworked for an audience of alcoholics: “There are, moreover, sufficient grounds, for believing that Shakespeare revised, and improved, the first sketch of the Taming of the Shrew, in 1606. . . . A very particular occasion, which the commentators have overlooked, gave rise to a competition at the theatres, and among the booksellers. It was the arrival of the Royal Dane, in London; and, the banqueting on that joyous event. . . . While he remained, there were nothing but}
and Christian’s friendship established male political union, it also negated female political power.

Harington and the notorious celebrations at Theobalds

In his portrayal of the festivities at Theobalds given in honor of James and Christian, John Harington presented a particularly shocking tale of debauchery impressive in its scope: the entire court drunk. According to Harington, Christian literally toppled over when he attempted to stand during the first entertainment, and needed to be “carried to an inner chamber and laid on a bed of state.”

Sir John Harington has, indeed, left us a very amusing account of one of those banquets . . . The Induction to the Taming of the Shrew, which exhibits drunkenness to the eye, and the understanding, in the most ridiculous light; was properly revived, at [this] moment’ (A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers [London: Thomas Egerton, 1799], 373-5). More recently, J. W. Binns and H. Neville Davies argued that the Children of the Revels played a revised version of The Dutch Courtesan because the vintner in the comic subplot was “very appropriate for the Danish visit” (“Christian IV and The Dutch Courtesan,” Theatre Notebook 44, no. 3 [1990]: 120). Michael Srigley has argued that Shakespeare added the lines on Danes drinking to the 1604 edition of Hamlet in anticipation of Christian’s visit (“‘Heavy-headed revel east and west’: Hamlet and Christian IV of Denmark,” in Shakespeare and Scandinavia: A Collection of Nordic Studies, ed. Gunnar Sorelius [Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002], 168-92). These scholars have mined the literature written for and about the visit for references to plays, ignoring the texts themselves. While their work may contribute to theater history by identifying plays put on before the court or explaining why certain elements are in plays, it reveals nothing about the literature that speaks directly about the visit. The occasional literature ignores the national stereotypes scholars have based their arguments upon and contradicts what has been taken as the historical significance of the visit: proof of the degeneration of the court under James. The poems and pamphlets present a positive image of James, Christian, and their courts, in which their shared religion leads to virtuous behavior and forms the central tie in a strong international Protestant alliance.

---

13 Sir John Harington, Nugæ Antique: Being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers in Prose and Verse: Written in the Reigns of Henry VIII. Queen Mary, Elizabeth, King James, &c. (London: for T. Cadell and L. Bull, 1792), Vol. 2, 128. The entertainers were in no better shape, for “wine did so occupy their upper chambers” that they could not perform (Ibid.). For example, Faith, Hope and Charity’s act was cut short when Hope was unable to speak her lines—“wine rendered her endeavors so feeble that she withdrew” (Ibid.). Faith followed Hope and “left the Court in a staggering fashion” (Ibid.). Shortly thereafter, Charity discovered Hope and Faith “sick and spewing in the lower hall” (Ibid., 129). Alcohol similarly affected the performances of the other actors. Victory appeared “but did not triumph long; for, after much lamentable utterance, she was led away like a silly captive, and laid to sleep in the outer steps of the anti-chamber,” while Peace was so besotted that she “much contrary to her semblance, most rudely made war with her olive branch, and laid on the pates of those who did oppose her coming” (Ibid.).
remained, “The Entertainment and show went forward.” Unfortunately, “most of the
Presenters went backward, or fell down; wine did so occupy their upper chambers.”
Harington noted that most of the performers were too drunk to walk or talk (two were
later discovered vomiting in the hall). Drawing an unfavorable picture of James’s court
in comparison with Elizabeth’s, he commented,

I have much marveled at these strange Pageantries, and they do bring to
my remembrance what passed of this sort in our Queen’s days; of which I
was sometime an humble Presenter and Assistant: but I never did see such
lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety as I have now done.

He concludes his account by expressing fear for the future of the country. Given “howe
tolly dothe grow,” he worried that there would be “future mischiefs of those our
posterity, who shall learn the good lessons and examples helde forthe in these days.”

Scholars have followed Harington in their assessment of Christian’s state visit. Already
by 1890, Mandell Creighton, in his entry on Harington for the *Dictionary of National
Biography*, described the letter as “the stock quotation for the intemperance of James’s
court.” Such readings have had strong critical purchase, holding up despite evidence of

Interpreting the events as proof of the corruption of the court under James, Harington drew an unfavorable picture of James’s court in comparison with Elizabeth’s, claiming that the “strange Pageants” at Theobalds were in sharp contrast to “our Queen’s days ... [when he] did never see such lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety” (Ibid.).

14 Ibid., 128.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid., 129.
17 Ibid., 131.
Harington’s personal bias against James (he had failed to find favor with James, who had recently rejected his requests for the posts of Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Chancellor of Ireland) and efforts by scholars to recuperate James’s reputation. As recently as 2008, Clare McManus described the letter as an allegory for the disorder of the court under James.19 Christian’s visit, therefore, has a long and continuing history as an important marker of the internal politics of Britain.

However the pamphlets and poems written in honor of Christian’s state visit are predominately concerned with British foreign policies, specifically Anglo-Danish relations. The anonymous author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome provides an overview of the entire visit in his pamphlet, comparing James favorably to Elizabeth. According to this writer, James gives his subjects “joyfull and not formerlye hearde-of howers of moste vnspeakable happinesse.”20 The source of his subjects’ joy: James’s marriage to a Danish princess, which not only presumably secures the succession (they had three living children) but also brings “allyance” with a powerful Protestant country.21 Henry Robarts, writer and publisher, similarly focuses on the alliance in his pamphlets on the occasion: The Most royall and Honourable Entertainement and Englands Farevvell. While scrupulously documenting every activity Christian undertook while in Britain, Robarts argues for the historical consequence of the visit as a symbol of Anglo-Danish relations: “the Chronicles of these two vnited and famous Nations, to the end of all ages ensuing, shall record the honors giuen and receiued, between these two most famous and


20 The King of Denmarkes welcome, A2v.

21 Ibid.
royall Brothers, Kings of England and Denmarke.” 22 He claims that the kings’ relationship examplifies a “rare loue,” setting a “a kingly and royall president for all people to note” and, thereby, defining the relationship between Britain and Denmark. 23 Likewise, the writing-master and poet John Davies of Hereford maintains that his poem on the visit, Bien Venv, tells the history of an important pan-European alliance: “The Danes, and ours made one vnited Might.” 24 John Ford, who would later be known primarily for his drama, similarly focuses his poem on James’s and Christian’s friendship which he describes as “Power with power, realme with realme vnited . . . [a force] all the world could scarce . . . withstand. 25 Asserting that James and Christian establish a powerful political union, Ford declares it to be international significance.

Political Friendship: James, Christian, and an Anglo-Danish Protestant Union

Though it was commonplace to represent the relationship between two countries as a friendship between its rulers, the authors of the occasional works argue that James’s and Christian’s friendship is special. Robarts claims that the friendship between James

---

22 Henry Robarts, The Most royall and Honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, Christiern the fourth, King of Denmarke, &c. who with a Fleeete of gallant ships, arrived on Thursday the 16. day of July 1606 in Tylbery-Hope, neere Grauesend. With a relation of his meeting, by our royall King, the Prince and Nobles of our realme: the pleasures sundry times shewed, for his gracious welcome, and most famous and admirable entertainment at Theobalds. With the royall passage of Thursday the 31 of July, thorough the City of London, and honorable shewes there presented them, and maner of their passing (London: H.R. to be sold by William Barley, 1606), B4v.

23 Robarts, Englands Farewell, B1v.

24 John Davies, Bien Venv. Greate Britaines Welcome to Hir Greate Friendes, and Deere Brethren The Danes (London: Nathaniel Butter, 1606), C4r.

25 John Ford, Honor Trivmphant. Or The Peeres Challenge, by Armes defensible, at Tilt, Turney, and Barriers . . . Also The Monarches meeting: The King of Denmarkes welcome into England (London: Francis Burton, 1606), F1r.
and Christian differs from those between other European rulers, maintaining that a unique tie exists between them. Depicting James and Christian as part of a group of European monarchs who are friends, he explains the networks of communication among the rulers: ambassadors bring tidings of the government, health and welfare of one king to another, thereby allowing “The affinitie of bloud, and desire of true brotherly loue to be continued: which Loue is the true Loadestone that draweth friends, and moueth the heart to desire the company, which they most honour and esteeme.”26 But he qualifies this, averring that the relationship between James and Christian is closer than that of other kings: “But in mans memory hath not beene heard, (nor hearing) with more reioycing seene, so rare and most excellent a simpatheie of true and honorable love, as is most apparent, by that most royal King Christian of Denmarke.”27 Robarts along with Davies, Ford, and the author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome* claims to show how this “simpatheie of true and honorable love” manifests itself in the actions of Christian and James. On the title page, Davies declares that the kings demonstrate the true love between friends, proclaiming that in their behavior “Loue is well exprest in Worde, and Deede,/ T’wixt Friendes.”28 Similarly, the author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome* argues that Christian has shown his love “with his owne words.”29 All the authors aver


27 Ibid., B1r. James similarly distinguished his relationship with Christian from his relationships with other monarchs, arguing that their position as the two foremost Protestant leaders in Europe bonded them together in a deeply meaningful way. He assured Christian that while he might be friends with other princes his friendship with Christian was of a different kind, professing that “if by chance some comparison should be made” between his “bond of friendship” with other princes and his bond with Christian, then Christian should “have no doubt how much distinction . . . [he made and would] always make between . . . [Christian’s] friendship and that of any other” (Meldrum, 53).

28 Davies, title page.

29 *The King of Denmarkes welcome*, A2v.
that Christian’s journey to Britain proves the special nature of his alliance with James. Ford interprets Christian’s visit as a “True instance of . . . fast vndoubted loue.” For him, the rarity of a royal visit proves the truth of his claim and he repeatedly remarks on it: “It is no common thing seene euery day,” “It is no common honour, that is done,” “Two Kings in England haue beene rarely seene.” Robarts offers both the unusual nature of the visit—“[it is] so rare & excellent a sight, two kings”—and the risks involved in undertaking such a journey—“the dangers of the seas . . . any other accidents,” “the aduenture of feares and enemies”—as evidence of Christian’s genuine love for James.

The author of The King of Denmarke’s Welcome also submits Christian’s presence as proof of a particular friendship between James and Christian. Christian is a King I say blest with all the felicities of power, peace and fertilitie: not to send his loue, but to bring his loue: not to protest by the mouth of others, but to witnesse with his owne words: not to giue vs hope what he will be, but to assure vs in himselfe what hee is: as it is an example exceeding all examples, a blessednesse beyond the compasse of memorie, and an instance (how euer imitable in parte) yet in the whole beyond the records of our longest Chronicles.

Implicitly comparing Christian with other monarchs, the author claims that his actions prove that his friendship with James is different from the friendships of other European monarchs. Transparency (Christian “witnesse[s] with his owne words”) dominates their

30 Ford, F2r.
31 Ibid., F1v.
32 Robarts, The Most royall and Honourable entertainement, C1v, MR, & B1r; Englands Farewell, B1r.
33 The King of Denmarkes welcome, A2v.
relationship. Whereas other rulers keep one another at a remove, sending their love through ambassadors (“the mouth[s] of others”), James and Christian have no distance between them, as Christian brings his love. The author highlights the intimacy this action creates by describing Christian as “the neerest of all great ones in blood and friendship.”34 As an adjective modifying blood and friendship, “neerest” means “close at hand,” referring to the fact that Christian is now in Britain. However, “neerest” might also denote emotional affection, in the sense of “closely attached to.”35 In either case, “neerest” serves as an indicator of a particular intimacy between the kings, one which distinguishes James and Christian’s relationship from those of other rulers.

The authors examine this closeness between the kings, describing and analyzing other instances of deeds that show their love for one another. Such deeds, they argue, are manifestations of a tight bond between the kings that leads them to think and behave the same way, constituting them as a single political body: two kings working as one. Davies offers the vast amounts of money spent on the visit as evidence of their special relationship, carefully documenting every sign of magnificence, including the rare wines and costly garments, for “The Master of a feast the more he spends,/ The more it seems, he loues th’inuited friends.”36 The author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome presents

34 Ibid.


36 Davies, B3r. Contemporaries demonstrated a similar concern with documenting the affection between the kings. John Pory records that “On the Queen he [Christian] hath bestowed his picture richly set with jewels; and on the Prince, his Vice-admiral and best fighting ship . . . and a rapier and hanger” (Nichols, Vol. 2, 93). He notes gifts of specific political meaning: Christian gives his own picture to Anna, a symbol of the family bond that unites Britain and Denmark, and Prince Henry a ship and rapier, symbols of militarism and chivalry that identify both as proponents of an interventionist Protestant agenda. Dudley Carleton literally values the relationship between the two kings, marking down the price of each item exchanged: “The two kings parted on Monday . . . The gifts were great on our king’s side and tolerable on
James’s special treatment of Christian as a sign of their partiality—James provides Christian with “his owne priuie Bardge,” gives him “the first place, and right hand” at dinner, and walks “arme in arme” with him.\textsuperscript{37} He marks signs of love between the kings as evidence of “affection.” For example, he writes that their embraces express “a most tender & royall affection” and that their “words & such royal accomplements [show a] most vnuiolable & inexpressable affection.”\textsuperscript{38} Ford also employs the term “affection” to categorize James’s and Christian’s relationship, stating that they are “euerlastingly affectionate.”\textsuperscript{39} Their use of “affection” recalls the now standard definition: “the external manifestation or representation of a feeling or emotion.”\textsuperscript{40} This is particularly clear in the text by Ford, who notes that when James and Christian are in one another’s company they experience joy: “So did these Princes meet, in whose first meeting, Ioy was aboundant . . . Eyther reioycing in the others sight.”\textsuperscript{41} However, by using “affection”

\textsuperscript{37} The King of Denmarkes welcome, A4v-B1r.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., A3v

\textsuperscript{39} Ford, F1r.

\textsuperscript{40} OED.

\textsuperscript{41} Ford, E4v.
to describe both physical and mental actions, they invoke other definitions of “affection” such as a “favourable or kindly disposition towards a person or thing,” “the state of the mind as regards some specific object,” as well as a “biased feeling.” Affection thereby becomes more than a mere indicator of an emotional bond—it suggests both a mental state and a specific type of relationship (one that is partial). Ford suggests that their closeness leads James and Christian to think alike, “As they love none of both, who do one hate.” The kings, in other words, choose the same political allies and enemies. 

Davies iterates a similar train of thought when he avers that James and Christian are “two great Kings [who] so agree,/ [It is] As if the one, the others Heart did owe” and concludes that they are a single being. Christian, he says, “Is one with ours [James], to make ours more compleat.” The bond between them incorporates them into a political entity by causing them to act as one.

Shared religious beliefs and practices form the heart of this political union. Robarts attributes their unity in thought and action to religion. He describes their friendship as the “perfit loue of friends” commanded by God. Religion, specifically “the prescript rule of God which commaundeth wee loue one another,” brings friends together and leads to unity of thought: “[they] truly embrace that heavenly commandment, to love one another . . . [and] profess Christ Jesus in one sympathy of hart

---

42 OED.

43 Ford, F1r.

44 Davies, A3r.


46 Robarts, Englands Farewell, A4v.
James and Christian exemplify such a friendship, having demonstrated the perfect love of friends: “the rare, and most honorable loue of his Maiestie [King James] shewed to the person of his royall Brother, King of Denmarke, betweene whose loues there may be no comparison.” Robarts shows the kings embracing their shared faith throughout Christian’s visit, scrupulously documenting the kings’ devotions, observing them in prayer and attending religious services on Sundays. The author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome* shows how their devotion manifests itself in society as impeccable behavior. He celebrates James and Christian as models of moderation, whereas Harington had lamented their “lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety.” The author maintains that “All this infinite world of abundance was governed by such a discrete and even hand of well experienced judgment, that there was neither seen lavishment in the expense, nor disorder in the use.”

47 Ibid., A4r-B1r.

48 Ibid., B1r.

49 For example, he records that “On Sunday the 19 day, King James, accompanied with his brother of Denmark, and Nobility of both kingdoms . . . went to the Chapel, where they heard a learned Sermon, preached by the Reverend Father, the Bishop of Rochester” (Ibid., B4r). He also notes, “This Sunday spent in God’s praises and their comfort” and “On Sunday they rest from their pleasures, giving the honor of that day to him that sanctified the same, and hearing learned Sermons” (Ibid., B4r & C2v). In *Englands Farevvell* he notes, “The next day, being Sunday [the tenth of August], which [was the] Holy appointed day of the Lord, their Majesties came to the Cathedral Church the College, where they heard a most learned Sermon, by a reverend grave and learned Doctor” (C2r). Additionally, he writes, “The next day, being Sunday, her Majesty was churched, to the great joy of all the beholders, the two Kings being present at that time, where they heard a learned Sermon” (Ibid., B3v).

50 Harington, 129.

51 *The King of Denmarkes welcome*, B3r-v. He had also praised the moderation of the English and Danes earlier in the pamphlet, writing, “I gathered and observed this note, that however the Kingdom of Denmark hath in precedent times, been either commended or accused, for the free-hearted entertainment, or to great delight in drink, yet these (I mean the meaner sort of this royal Kings followers, in whom ever is soonest discerned the most common error) did show at this great feast, where they could but wish and have it effected. Nay, where many men of many Nations, I know, would have esteemed it more barbarous to have refused drink, then disgrace to be drunk: such discrete temperance, refusing with such modest courtesy, and shunning surcharge . . . sure I am, for our own Nation, I have neither at home, nor abroad seen them more
cardinal virtues—prudence and temperance. Similarly, Robarts interprets the events at Theobalds in a way that suggests the kings’ moral uprightness, describing them as a tribute to God: “The four days appointed for the stay of this royal company there, brought to end with many delights and pleasures, to God’s glory and their Graces good contentment.”

Ford argues that the most important connection between James and Christian is religion, for they are “yet more great,/ In being vertuously religious.” Considerations of Catholic plots against James and Christian fix the nature of their relationship as a religious union. Throughout *The Most Royall and Honourable entertainement*, Robarts refers to “their royal persons” facing “mallice and traytors practises,” “Trayerous practises,” and “all detestable practises.”

Davies raises the specter of Catholic plots by directly referencing the Gunpowder Plot, the attempted “powdring [of the] Prince, and Peers.” He decries those who use religion to attack modest . . . the meanest might some times be an example to some of ours that have or sue for much higher place” (B1v-B2r).

Robarts, *The Most royall and Honourable entertainement*, C3r. Robarts claims that nothing untoward took place during the visit and informs readers that Christian appointed a marshal to monitor and punish bad behavior: “For the government of his followers of all sorts, according to his Kingly pleasure, he ordained a Marshall, who had under Marshalls many, with great charge from his Majestie, that if any man of his company should be drunk, or otherwise to abuse himself in any manner towards Englishmen, or his own followers, to be published sharply” (Ibid., B2r). He also noted, “it hath very seldom, or never been seen, so many Strangers together in this Land, so well governed, and so kindly used: Such was his Princely care of them, and our Nation, for breeding of quarrels by any of his people, that of all other Vices, their charge was to keep them from being drunk: and withall, inflicted upon them a heavy punishment, for any that should offend, contrary to his commandment: for the execution of this his Majesty’s pleasure herein, he appointed a Marshall, who had diverse men, as Officers under him, to have a vigilant care over them; which with all diligence performed the same: and such as they found drunk, were brought to a House appointed for their Prison; where their Thumbs were chained together, and nailed by it to a post: where they remained till some suit was made for their delivery, & hearty repentance for their faults: the due execution whereof, kept them in such awe, that you should seldom after the first week, see any of them out of order” (*Englands Farewell*, C4r-v).

Ford, F1r.


Davies, B4v. Robarts also writes of Catholic plots against the throne, the “horrible sinne, by whome, & through whom many great outrages haue beene attempted and done. And dayly we haue seene the Subiect
rightful rulers, “Using thy [zeal’s] name to pull Kings from their Thrones.” He argues that James and Christian’s alliance must defend their faith and prevail against such foul deeds as “mak[ing] the SACRED bleed.” Shared religious beliefs and practices create an agreement of minds so strong between them that, as Davies says, “the ones case now becomes the other[’s].” For now, “both, as one,/ Must stand or fall, by force of Union.” Britain and Denmark, in other words, are a de facto Protestant Union.

That the authors of the 1606 occasional literature should advocate an international Protestant alliance is not surprising, for despite their diverse backgrounds—they had different places of origin, levels of education, occupations, and ranks—they shared a commitment to Protestantism and identify their works as Protestant texts. Davies’ dedicatees, Sir James Hay and Philip Herbert, were not only favorites of James, but also steadfast Protestants. In 1604, Hay undertook a mission to France to offer King Henri
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56 Davies, B4r.
57 Ibid., B4v.
58 Ibid., C3r.
59 Ibid., A4r.
60 While all of them were transplants in London, they had relocated from a variety of regions in Britain – Davies from Wales, Ford and Robarts from Devonshire. The anonymous author of The King of Denmarke’s welcome never specifies where he is from, but he does consistently identify himself as an English and says that he is writing “to a friend of his in the northerne parts” (A2r).
61 James had appointed Hay, a Scot naturalized in 1604, to his bedchamber in 1603 and established him as Lord Hay on 21 June 1606, a month before Christian’s arrival (Roy E. Schreiber, “Hay, James,” DNB, Vol. 25, 1006-9). He had showered Herbert with titles, naming him a gentleman of the privy chamber, knight of the Bath, gentleman of the bedchamber, Baron Herbert of Shurland, and first earl of Montgomery by 1605 (David L. Smith, “Herbert, Philip,” DNB, Vol. 26, 714-20).
IV James’s condolences on the loss of his sister Catherine of Navarre or de Bourbon and, in the course of his stay, offended Henri by pressing him too hard on the issue of the Huguenots. Herbert was named after a famous Protestant activist: his uncle Sir Philip Sidney, who died in Zutphen fighting for the Netherlanders’ revolution against Spain. Herbert was part of the Sidney-Pembroke network which advocated for an international Protestant alliance. Like Davies, Ford dedicated his work to members of the Herbert family: Mary Talbot (wife of William Herbert and the Countess of Pembroke) and Susan de Vere (wife of Philip Herbert and the Countess of Montgomery). The anonymous author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome presents his work as a tribute to the “Diuine imbroiderye” that has given England a Protestant King, pronouncing James’s reign a reason to “aboundantley . . . praise the Maiestie of Maiesties.” In his pamphlets The Most royall and Honourable entertainement and Englands Farevell, Robarts consistently interprets the festivities as celebrations of “Gods glorie” manifesting itself in the relationship between the Protestant kings.

62 Hay may have thought that Catherine’s death presented a unique opportunity to raise the issue of the Huguenots with Henri, given her strong commitment to Protestantism and support of the Huguenots. Henri, however, did not appreciate Hay’s efforts. Anzolo Badoer, Venetian Ambassador in France, wrote the Doge and Senate on 13 April 1604 that “The Scottish gentleman (Hay) sent here by the King of England has been highly favoured, and has dined twice with the King, and been out hunting with him. At his last audience, in his master’s name, he recommended to the King the Calvinists. This disgusted his Majesty; and the Envoy’s present was reduced to a jewel worth six hundred crowns. This mission has given his Majesty much anxiety, as the German Princes threaten to conclude a league with England. The King of England is credited with intending to call both Calvinists and Puritans by the name of Protestant” (Horatio F. Brown, ed., 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 [London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1900], Vol. 10, 143).

63 The King of Denmarkes welcome, A2r-v.

64 Robarts promoted the Protestant cause throughout his works. For example, in 1588, he wrote and published a prayer that England might defeat her enemies (the Spanish Armada), characterizing the English as the servants of God who “professe thy woord and Gospell” and asking God to grant “successe and prosperous victorie to this noble Realme of England . . . that they may suppresse the sleightes of Antechrist, with all the force and power of forraine enemies, and papistical practises” (A1r). William Welby, known for his stock of religious and anti-Rome works, published Englands Farevell.
While Christian sojourned in Britain, James discussed the need to form a Protestant Union. In a letter to Christian dated 28 May 1609, James refers to a discussion they had had about religion and politics during the visit. According to James, they had spoken about the injustice of the Pope’s power: “For we are not unmindful of that conversation which we had together (when Your Serene Highness had visited us most lovingly for the sake of honor) concerning that power which the Roman Pontiff most unjustly claims and appropriates for himself.”65 Expressing concern that the Pope’s authority posed so “much danger [that it] therefore threaten[ed] all Christian princes,” they considered how they might check the Pope’s power.66 They concluded that forming a Protestant Union was the obvious way to counter papal power.

However, James and Christian doubted that they could form a workable alliance between the Protestant countries because of in-fighting among different sects of Protestants:

We are not even able to greatly hope and desire that all princes and others, who both protect themselves from his power and rule against Christian liberty and also repudiate superstition (although disagreeing somewhat between themselves about several matters pertaining to their own religion), might be tied and bound together with such a close and firm concord that all would agree that their strengths and wills are most ready to repel his force (if necessity demands).67

65 Meldrum, 98.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., 97.
Despite their disbelief in its feasibility, James advises Christian of the urgency to make it work and assures him that he would help “most eagerly to conform the minds of all of them.”\textsuperscript{68} He argues, moreover, that Christian would be an appropriate leader for such an endeavor, given his influence in Europe. Christian’s clout in the region made him more likely to succeed in “leading them to that concord . . . in order that peace and concord might be established among all the princes of Germany.”\textsuperscript{69}

Acknowledging Christian’s authority, connections, and position as the most powerful Protestant ruler on the Continent, he asserts,

And it does not escape us how great (both for your dignity and also for the communion of religion) is the authority of Your Serene Highness among all of the princes in Germany (who follow the Augustan creed); among them there is almost no one of great name and reputation who does not come in contact with you through kinship or marriage.\textsuperscript{70}

James envisions creating an international religious alliance that would put an end to in-fighting among the sects of Protestantism. He expects, moreover, that the league they created would be long-lived, passing down from generation to generation. This alliance, “a spiritual or celestial relationship,” would operate “also by the law of progeny and relationship or affinity,” such that “our descendents . . . [would] have the same relationships and affinities.”\textsuperscript{71} Ford expresses a similar idea in his poem, considering the relationship between Britain and Denmark to be a “league” that would “From age to age .

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 98.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 98.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 97-8.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
Although James pushed Christian to lead the effort to form the alliance, he said nothing about Christian leading it once it had been formed. Nevertheless, his flattering invitation for Christian to spearhead an effort to establish a Protestant Union played to Christian’s commitment to religious union—as early as age twelve, Christian had discussed the prospects for an international Protestant alliance with delegations from England and Scotland. He was so devoted to combining matters of religion with politics that he took as his “personal motto Regnum firmat pietas or ‘Piety strengthens the realm.’”

If James envisions Christian as the obvious choice for leading a diplomatic endeavor (forming the Protestant Union), the authors of the pamphlets picture him as the ideal candidate to lead a military crusade. The author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome lauds Christian as a man who possesses “the markers of the best Conquerors.” According to him, Christian “expressed an able and enduring body . . . governed by an invincible mind, enriched with all the arts and graces due to his high birth and office . . . a man of great strength, activity, and endurance.” He offers Christian’s performance at the tilt as evidence of his robustness of body and mind: “The Kinges Maiestie of Denmarke ran at the Tilt in person, and diuers other noble personages; where his Maiestie expret an able and induring bodie, how it was gouernd by an inuincible mind, inricht

---

72 Ford, F2r.


74 Ibid., 179.

75 The King of Denmarke Welcome, B2v.

76 Ibid., D3v.
with all the artes and graces due to his high birth and office.”77 Later, he again ties together Christian’s good character and his martial abilities: “in the Tilt-yard at Greenwich . . . the King of Denmarke approued to all judgements, that Maiestie is neuer vnaccompanied with virtue.”78

While Robarts praises Christian’s performance at the tilt, noting that “non exceld . . . the Denmarke King,” it is Christian’s willingness to face danger that he points to as evidence of character traits necessary for a leader.79 Christian demonstrated bravery and courage by disregarding dangers to himself when he journeyed to Britain “nothing regarding the dangers of the seas”80 In addition to presenting Christian as a strong commander, he portrays Britain as a country prepared to be commanded. During Christian’s stay, the British show Christian that they are ready for war. On a tour of the city, Christian visits the office of the ordinance where he witnesses Britain’s “warlike prouision . . . [which] at an houre is ready for any seruice to be commaunded.”81 Later, Christian is given a demonstration in which the British exhibit their ability to use their weapons: “all the Masters of Defence and professors therof, were summoned with their weapons to shew their skill, that the King of Denmarke might see the manner of our fight,

77 Ibid., D3v.
78 Ibid., D3v.
79 In Englands Farewell, Robarts attributes martial abilities to both James and Christian, writing, “Their sport was to run at the ring . . . non exceld his Maiesty, and the Denmarke King” (B3v). However, he was deliberately rewriting the events to praise James. James’s capability was notably lacking at the tilt. Diplomat Dudley Carleton reveals that James embarrassed himself with a poor performance at the tournament. He records Christian’s success and James’s failure: “At a match betwixt our king and him in running at the ring it was his good hap never almost to miss it, and ours had the ill luck scarce ever to come near it, which put him into no small impatiences” (McClure, Vol. 1, 87).
80 Robarts, The Most royall and Honourable entertainement, B1r.
81 Robarts, Englands Farewell, B2v.
and the varietie of weapons practiced for mens defence, as well in priuate quarrels, as their Countries service.”

Robarts implies that the Anglo-Danish union has great military potential, a contention made explicitly by Davies and Ford. Davies argues that the political union makes them indomitable, as they are “Gainst other force inuincible become.” Ford claims the same, asserting that “England with Denmarke . . . [is] strength’ned, so as stronger can be none.”

This valorization of Christian as a military leader and of the alliance between Britain and Denmark as a military force probably pleased the faction at court bent on taking action against Catholic powers on the Continent, especially since they used the occasion of his visit to push for intervention in the Dutch-Spanish conflict. The Netherlands had been battling Spain for independence since Elizabeth’s reign and she had helped them. Since James’s accession, the Dutch had been petitioning him for aid. In 1606, they stepped up their efforts, threatening to turn to other countries for help. The Venetian Ambassador Zorzi Giustinian wrote the Doge, a Catholic, that the Dutch were sending an Embassy “to declare . . . that unless they receive more vigorous help they will be compelled to seek support elsewhere.”

The discovery of a Spanish plot against James’s life during Christian’s visit provided an opportunity to illustrate the need for action (Thomaso Francisco recruited William Neuce to kill James while he was

---

82 Ibid., B4v.

83 Davies, B2v.

84 Ford, F2r.

85 Dudley Carleton, in a letter to John Chamberlain dated 20 August 1606, reports on the ongoing conflict in the Low Countries: “The three armies, both offensive and defensive, do front one another in Friesland, at Bergen, and at Sluys, but those in Freisland make the greatest head” (Lee, Jr., 89).

86 CSP, Venice, Vol. 10, 437.
hunting). On 2 August 1606, Giustinian claimed that Francisco had believed that killing James would draw Britain into the conflict between Spain and the Low Countries: “The opinion is gradually growing that this last conspiracy was not directed against the King’s life, but rather that its object was to corrupt the commander of some fortress in the Low Countries and to take possession of it.”

The Earl of Salisbury had confirmed as much in a letter to Ralph Winwood on 19 July 1606, writing that the original plan did not involve killing James, but aiding Spain in her struggle against the Dutch. Francisco propositioned Neuce, “affirming, that if he could gaine any one to do some Serve for the Archduke, either in delivering into his Hands Sluice, Bergen-op-zome or Flushing, that they should be well rewarded.” According to Giustinian, the revelation of the true

---

87 The Earl of Salisbury described the plot in detail in a letter to Ralph Winwood on 19 July 1606: “it is true, that one Thomaso Francisco Brother to Collonel Jacques, who hath been sometimes Page to the Lord Chancellor Hatton, being lately come into England, had severall Conferences with one Captaine William Neuce, who the last Year carriyed two hundred voluntary Irisinmen into Spaine, and being come thither was suspected to have some extraordinary Design in Hand. . . . Whilst Neuce was in Spaine, he fell acquainted and very inward with Jacques; who having often aggravat Neuce's Discontentment against his Majesty, (for being now cashier’d, and left without any Entertainment at all,) and finding the said Neuce to be a Man fit to undertake any desperate Attempt in respect of his present Necessities, did propose means to him to raise his Fortunes if he would be directed by him; but the Particular of it he deferred to acquaint him wit, till they two should meet in the Low Countries. Hereupon Neuce went to Brussels to meet with Jacques againe, where they had many Conferences; in which Jacques remembred Neuce of his ill usage by his Majesty, telling him still, that if it were his own Case, he would be revenged against his Person if he were the greatest King in Christendom . . . affirming, that if he could gaine any one to do some Serve for the Archduke, either in delivering into his Hands Sluice, Bergen-op-zome or Flushing, that they should be well rewarded . . . Neuce comes over, and afterwards advertiseth Jacques that he is ready . . . A Priest is brought to Ball’s [John Ball, an Irishman, and a Domestick to the Spanish Ambassador here] Chamber, who resolves Neuce that he may do any thing against Hereticks, because they are worse then Turks and Infidells. They proceed on in their Discourse about the taking of any of those Towns abovementioned; but among other Speeches they fall in discours of his Majestie’s hunting, and Thomas asked Neuce, whether he had not a good Horse and a Pistol, and that there was a means to deserve so much Money in England without going beyond the Sea, and so set Neuce on without naming any thing. The next Day Thomaso and Neuce met againe on Tower-hill; they speak againe of Sluice, which is but the Jargor; but Thomas's Intention is against the Kinge a hunting, and says, that a brave spirited Man with a good Horse and a Pistoll, may do it when his Majesty is a hunting at Royston” (Edmund Sawyer, ed., Memorials of Affairs of State [London: W.B. for T. Ward, 1725], Vol. 2, 246-7).


89 Sawyer, 246.
nature of the affair fueled the desire of the British to take action against Spain. James could not spin the situation to his advantage: “Nothing will check the bad impression, however, among the public, which shows so marked a desire for the declaration of war as to seriously alarm the King and Council.”

This popular faction used Christian’s visit to petition for interceding in the Dutch-Spanish conflict. A few weeks after Christian’s departure, Giustinian reported,

And so far have matters gone that at Hampton Court, where the Queen is, a letter has been picked up in which the King is urged to declare war, to leave the chase and turn to arms, and the example of his brother-in-law, the King of Denmark, is cited, who for his prowess at the joust has won golden opinions.

The British, Giustinian contends, were eager for war and, though they admired Christian, they still wanted a British king to be in charge.

Like James and the militant Protestants, the authors of the occasional works did not want a Protestant Union headed by Denmark, instead picturing an alliance led jointly by Britain and Denmark. As Davies puts it, they are “As Nations ciuill, eache alide to eache.” Here each “eache” can refer either to Britain or Denmark, as the line could read either “As Nations ciuill, Britain alide to Denmark” or “As Nations ciuill, Denmark alide to Britain.” Neither Britain nor Denmark takes precedence and both retain their national identities, as indicated by the plural “Nations.” Ford makes the same point when

---
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he asserts that “England with Denmarke, Denmarke eke with vs./ Are firmly now in league.”

Yet the real Britain and Denmark were unequal—Christian was wealthier and more powerful than James. The writers of the poems and pamphlets sought to overcome this inequality by creating a public image of James as Christian’s equal. In order to do so, they employed tropes of the discourse of classical friendship. James and Christian did not fit the traditional Ciceronian model of friendship: two men brought up together who share a common background, set of beliefs, and status. Yet, throughout the pamphlets and poems James and Christian are described in the language of traditional friendship theory with references to good will or amity, likeness of manners, agreement of minds, and the idea that friends are one soul in two bodies. I suggest that the authors of this occasional literature, motivated by factional politics, deliberately misrepresent James and Christian as fulfilling the classical definition of friends in order to deploy the particular political meaning that had become attached to friendship in the early modern period: a radical likeness translating to an equality of position and power.

As Horst Hutter’s study of Greek friendship discourse has shown, friendship had always been considered a political relationship. His book, tellingly titled Politics as

93 Ford, F2r.
94 This will be established later in the chapter.
95 Marcus Tullius Cicero in De Amicitia argues that “kinred maie be without good will: but frendship in no wise can lacke it” (The booke of frendeshipe of Marcus Tullie Cicero, trans. John Harington [London: Thomas Berthelette, 1550], 13v-14r). According to him, “frendshippe is nothyng els but a perfecte agreement with good will and true love” (Ibid., 14r). Ford views James and Christian’s friendship as exemplary, writing that that James entertains Christian “with all the friendship, friendship could haue claimed” (F1r). They are, Ford says, “monarches . . . linkt in amitie,” drawn together by “the princely loue of amitie” (F1r & E4r). Their relationship thereby fulfills the primary condition of friendship—good will. Robarts likewise contends that theirs is a model friendship built on good will, specifically a “Love [which] is the true Lodestone that draweth friends, and moveth the heart to desire the company, which they most honor and esteem off” (Most royall, A4v-B1r). Davies expresses the same sentiment, writing of the “great Good-will” between the Britons and Danes (C1r).
Friendship, shows that “political life was primarily conceived in terms of friendship . . . politics came to be seen as the means for the exercise of friendship.” Friendship discourse flourished in the early modern period because schools placed texts on friendship such as Cicero’s *De amicitia* at the center of their curriculum. In his comprehensive study of friendship in the Renaissance—*One Soul in Bodies Twain*—Laurens Mills demonstrates that knowledge of classical friendship theories was commonplace by the end of the sixteenth century, with classical stories of friends such as Damon and Pythias the subject of stage plays. Recent studies of the use of friendship discourse in the early modern period such as Jeffrey Masten’s *Textual Intercourse* and Laurie Shannon’s *Sovereign Amity* convincingly argue for the particular importance of classical tropes of likeness as a political category. According to Masten, social mobility and class formed an integral part of early modern friendship discourse. Friendship tropes such as twinning, he argues, were employed to create men of the same status. Examining the use of the word “individual” in friendship texts, he argues that they employ the original meaning of “individual” as indivisible, showing that friends were considered indistinguishable from one other. Shannon has argued that people in the early modern period used this logic to extend the idea of the classical friendship trope “one soul in two bodies” to “a friend is to another himself.” Tropes of likeness, then, not only

---


demonstrate that two men share a status, but also produce social and political equality between them.

The authors of the occasional pieces employ classical tropes of likeness in order to claim equality between James and Christian where none had existed. Christian was arguably the wealthiest ruler in Europe and one of the most powerful; James, in comparison, was lesser in both respects.\textsuperscript{99} Christian controlled the Protestant North, ruling over Denmark and the majority of Norway. His position was secured by his personal wealth and his family connections—his marriage to Anna Catherine tied him to the Hohenzollern dynasty in Brandenburg, while his sisters’ marriages tied him to the Wettins in Saxony, all of the Braunschweig duchies, and a host of smaller Protestant territorial states in the Empire.\textsuperscript{100} Moreover, by 1603 Christian had established himself as the most powerful ruler in Northern Europe. For forty years prior, Denmark had attempted to signorize or exercise dominion over Hamburg.\textsuperscript{101} As a free imperial city, Hamburg was subject only to the emperor, Rudolf II, who was strongly opposed to Hamburg recognizing Danish sovereignty. However, Christian had become so powerful that the people of Hamburg declared an oath of allegiance to him despite strong pressure from the emperor not to do so. In other words, the citizens of Hamburg officially recognized Christian rather than the Emperor as the dominant power of Northern Europe, freely subjecting their city to him. In 1603, Christian celebrated his victory with the most

\textsuperscript{99} This will be laid out in more detail later.

\textsuperscript{100} Lockhart, 158-9.

\textsuperscript{101} Signorize means “to rule, reign, have or exercise dominion” (\textit{OED}).
expensive pageant ever held in Northern Europe and published seven commemorative books in three different languages.\textsuperscript{102}

By contrast, James had been famously impoverished as the King of Scotland— in 1589 when he married Anna several diplomats reported that he could not afford to do so.\textsuperscript{103} Thomas Fowler, an English agent at the Scottish court, wrote Elizabeth I’s chief counselor William Cecil, Baron Burleigh, on 20 March 1589, saying, “The Earl Marshal [George Keith, Fourth Earl Marischal] goes next month to Denmark with others about the marriage. I see not how a queen can be here maintained, for there is not enough to maintain the King.”\textsuperscript{104} Christian was concerned enough about the state of Scotland’s finances to instruct the Danish ambassadors who accompanied Anna to Scotland to stay and ensure that Anna received her dowry. When they finally secured the jointure, they

\textsuperscript{102} Mara Wade discusses the importance of Hamburg’s oath of allegiance to Christian. In addition to the “splendid ceremonies, [he printed] . . . seven separate publications in German, Latin, and Low German [which] provide[d] detailed information about the homage of Hamburg to Christian IV” (\textit{Triumphus nuptialis danicus: German court culture and Denmark: the “great wedding” of 1634} [Wiesbaden: Harrossowitz, 1996], 50-1).

\textsuperscript{103} William Asheby, English ambassador in Scotland, wrote William Cecil on 11 August 1589 that there were no funds to support a Queen: “Surelie Scotland was never in wourse state to receave a Quene then at this present, for there is nether house in repaire but all most ruinous and want furniture” (William K. Boyd and Henry W. Meikle, eds., \textit{Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots 1547-1603} [Edinburgh: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1936], Vol. 10, 137); partially quoted by Maureen Meikle, “A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589-1603,” in \textit{The Reign of James VI}, eds. Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch [East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2000], 129). See Meikle’s article for more on the subject.

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{CSP, Scot}, Vol. 10, 128. According to William Asheby, English Ambassador to Scotland, the Scots were not only unprepared to receive Anna, but also unwilling to maintain her financially. He wrote the Secretary of State Walsingham on 31 August 1589: “He [James] knows not which way to turn, having no house ready to receive the Queen, nor his subjects willing to contribute towards her maintenance and that of her train” (Ibid., 150). This is not to say that the Scots did not want Anna as their Queen only that they did not want to further finance James. Robert Bowes informed Cecil that the Scots warmly welcomed Anna to Scotland. Asheby argued that it was an opportunity for Elizabeth to indebt James to her: “His [James’s] only refuse is to her majesty, whose gracious dealing now will bind him more than all that is past” (Ibid., 150).
believed that the lands were far less valuable than promised. After they departed, a
dispute arose over the wording of the marriage contract and it seemed that Anna was
being cheated of lands due to her, resulting in Christian sending further embassies.
When James succeeded to the English throne, he inherited a kingdom with far more
wealth. Considering the financial state of Britain in 1618, the Venetian ambassador
Antonio Foscarini reported that “The royal income comes almost entirely from England
alone.” In addition to being wealthier, England carried more political weight. In
Foscarini’s assessment “a poor King of Scotland” could not compare with “a King of
England who . . . is great and powerful.”

Indeed, James thought that his new position afforded him much greater
significance. Speaking before both houses of Parliament in 1607, he claimed that “All
forreigne Kings that haue sent their Ambassadours to congratulate with me since my
comming, haue saluted me as Monarch of the whole Isle, and with much more respect of
my greatnesse, then if I were King alone of one of these Realmes.”

Writing to Christian shortly after having ascended to the English throne, he assured Christian that
Anna had not only been crowned “equally” with him, but also received “a most ample

105 Robert Bowes wrote Cecil on 16 May 1590, reporting that “The commissioners for Denmark have
viewed this week Falkland, Dunfermline, and Linlithgow, appointed for the Queen’s feoffment. They think
these possessions much under the value they looked for, and the houses in some decay. They press the
feoffment to be as great as that of Margaret, wife of James IV., daughter of Henry VII” (Ibid., 295-6).
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dower . . . which is in accord with her honor and dignity, both as our wife and as your sister.\textsuperscript{110} James asserted that in his new position as King of England he was finally Christian’s equal: Anna’s position as his wife afforded her the same status as being Christian’s sister.

The authors of the occasional works raise the issue of such inequalities, highlighting Christian’s position as one of the most powerful rulers in Europe. The pamphlets note that throughout his stay in Britain, Christian displayed a princely magnificence appropriate to his role. They record, for example, that he arrived in a ship “adorned with rich gold and very excellent workemanship,” accompanied by a train of 314 men (not including sailors), and wearing the newest, most expensive fashions and jewelry.\textsuperscript{111} Ford states that Christian presented himself “Like to a Prince in euery point aright.”\textsuperscript{112} He stresses Christian’s position as “the Danish King, a Prince of high degree,” a King who is “Puissant . . . and strong,/ In all the sinews of approued force.”\textsuperscript{113}

For him, Britain gains in status by having such an important visitor:

\begin{quote}
Nor can it be suppos’d, a Prince so mighty,

so worthy in himselfe, so absolute:

Who hath so large a rule, a charge so weighty,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{110} Meldrum, 21. The letter is dated 6 December 1603.

\textsuperscript{111} Robarts, \textit{The Most royall and Honourable entertainement}, B1r. \textit{The King of Denmarke welcome} reads, “In all and of all sortes that were attendant vpon the King of Denmarke excepting & omitting Saylors . . . the whole number as it was faithfully reported, come to three hundred and fourteene” (A4v); “The apparell which that day he wore, was a Doublet & Hose of a kinde of Bryer-ball coloured Satten, plaine, and onely cut with a byas cutte, the fashion, such as it is at this day most of request in this Kingdome . . . a gray Beuer Hat, with a Hat band of Pearle, and Diamonds set in Gold-smiths worke, and a Iewell of Diamonds, which held vp the right side brimme of his hat: in my conceyte of price not to bee valued” (B2v).

\textsuperscript{112} Ford, F1r.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., F3v & F1v.
would leaue his countrie, but for mere repute.\textsuperscript{114}

Ford gives each superlative weight by making it into an entire clause. He is not just worthy, but “so worthy in himselfe, so absolute”; he is more than just a king, for he “hath so large a rule, a charge so weighty.” By breaking up each line with a caesura and structuring the stanza into a series of clauses, he creates the sense that these clauses are piling on top of one another as the stanza progresses. The rocking lineation (having the caesura in the same place in successive lines) enhances the sense that the stanza is building upon itself. In this way, the form reinforces the content, manufacturing the sensation that Christian bears “a charge so weighty.”

Davies shifts the conversation from Christian’s power and wealth to the history between Denmark, England, and Scotland, referring to the time “of yore” when Denmark did “command this Land [Britain].”\textsuperscript{115} In the tenth century, Canute, a Dane, won dominion over England through violence, running his “sword, through men, to thy Crowne.”\textsuperscript{116} He proceeded to abuse his power and the Danes became “heavy Lords.”\textsuperscript{117} Davies questions whether “That now again is present, which is past,” asking if Denmark is once again dominating England.\textsuperscript{118} The possibility that the past is repeating itself becomes more worrisome when Davies reminds readers that Christian is an “Offspring” of “Canutus.”\textsuperscript{119} Christian might, like Canute had before him, “thy great State

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., F1v.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., A4r.

\textsuperscript{116} Davies, A4v.

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., C3r.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., A4r.

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., A4v.
Signiorize,” a possibility that takes on greater significance when considering that Christian had recently signorized Hamburg.\(^{120}\)

The authors of the occasional works raise concerns over the inequality between James and Christian, of course, in order to counter them. Davies, for example, explicitly states that present is different from the past, for the two kings possess commensurate strength: “[James is] as square/ As any Potentate of Christendome.”\(^{121}\) “Square” here meaning “solid, steady, reliable.”\(^{122}\) Davies, Robarts, Ford, and the author of *The King of Denmarkes Welcome* create equality between the kings through tropes of likeness. Robarts begins *Englands Farewell* with a discussion of friendship in which he adopts the idea that “a friend is to another himself: “great Potentates haue, in their inwarde thoughts, preferred the loue of some especiall one in their pleasures to solace with, and in their counsels to participate with in all passions both of body and minde, to be as a second selufe!”\(^{123}\) Having reminded readers that friends are copies of one another (second selves) and thus equals, Robarts makes James and Christian exemplary friends, indeed a pair: “two beloued and famous Kinges,” “two Royall Kings,” “two famous Honours of Estate and Maiestie,” “two KINGS, our dread Soueraigne and his beloued Brother, Christiane.”\(^{124}\) Using epanalepsis, he demonstrates the twinning nature of friendship in a royal “amitie” that joins “Neighbour with Neighbour, Nation with Nation, and Friend

\(^{120}\) Ibid., A4v.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., B2v.

\(^{122}\) *OED*.

\(^{123}\) Robarts, *Englands Farewell*, A4v.

\(^{124}\) Robarts, *The Most royall and Honourable entertaintment*, C1r, C3v & D1v.
with Friend!”125 James and Christian become reflections of one another as the words representing them “Neighbor,” “Nation,” and “Friend” are repeated at the start and finish of each clause in which “with” functions as a mirror.126 Ford achieves a similar effect with rhetorical figures of doubling, as when he uses epanalepsis in “Princes with Princes, brother ioy’d with brother.”127 “Prince” and “Brother” refer to position, so their repetition indicates a shared status. Indeed they have royal parity: “matcht together . . . individually combin’d together.”128 “Individually,” as I have said, could then mean indivisible and indistinguishable.

In accounts of the festivities at Theobalds and of the progress James and Christian made through London, the author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome calls James and Christian a set.129 “The Song at Theobalds” describes James and Christian as a “double flame of Maiesties,” “two Sunnes,” an astronomically dubious image that reappears in the conceit of one of the London pageants for the kings’ progress through the city.130 In the pageant, a fair shepherd courts a coy shepherdess in an arbor. She refuses to love him until she sees “two Sunnes at one time of equall brightnesse: when there were two Maiesties of like splendor, or two Kings in one State, with many such like imagined

125 Robarts, Englands Farewell, A4v.
126 Ford, E4r.
127 Ibid., E4r, & F1r.
128 Ibid., F1r.
129 Indeed, Ben Jonson’s Account of the Entertainment of the Two Kings of Great Britain and Denmark at Theobalds supports such a claim, as it opens with a stanza which describes James and Christian as “Two Kings, the world’s prime honours, whose access/ Shows either’s greatness, yet makes neither less” (Nichols, Vol. 2, 70).
130 The King of Denmarkes welcome, B4v.
impossibilities.”131 The shepherd proclaims her demands fulfilled by the arrival of James and Christian, “appraising those two kings two glorious Suns, two Maesties, and what else she had reputed impossible.”132 Such statements imply the kings’ equality and are reinforced by the author’s choice of words, in particular, “two,” “double,” “equal,” and “like.”

Robarts and Davies create a twinship between James and Christian not only rhetorically, but also visually by showing the two kings dressed alike. Robarts observes that on the progress through London, James and Christian “contented themselves in plaine Suites to be attired: But rich in Jewels, them selues not farre vnlike.”133 All of London beheld “these two famous Kings, and their vnitie.”134 As Davies writes, in “Showes most maiestick, . . . [the] Kings as one appeare[d].”135 According to Robarts and Davies, the kings wore the same clothes in their progress through London, an act tantamount to declaring their equality and a powerful message in an age when clothing not just symbolized but established rank. Sumptuary laws regulated clothing, naming what each rank was allowed to wear, and some clergymen maintained that these laws were based on the laws of God. Bishop John Jewell, in “An Homilee against excess of apparell,” urged parishioners not to flout sumptuary laws, “the godly and necessary lawes made of our Princes,” arguing that such a “detestable abuse, whereby both god is openly

131 Ibid., D2r.

132 Ibid. On the ride through the city, neither king took precedence over the other. James and Christian rode alongside one another: “after him [Prince Henry] on the right hand road the king of Denmarke, and on the left hand our King” (Ibid., C3r).

133 Robarts, The Most royall and Honourable entertainement, D1v, emphasis mine.

134 Ibid., D2r.

135 Davies, B1v.
contemned, and the princes lawes manifestly disobeyed, [causes] . . . great perill of the Realme.”

He maintained that “God hath appoynted euery man his degree and office, within the limittes whereof it behoueth him to keepe him selfe. Therefore all may not looke to weare lyke apparel, but euery one according to his degree, as God hath placed him.”

Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass have shown the seriousness with which clothing was regarded in the period, arguing that no subject existed prior to putting on clothes: clothes fashioned personhood. In other words, there was no divide between the person wearing clothing and the clothes he/she wore. Describing dressing as a form of “deep wearing,” they assert that “investiture, the putting on clothes . . . literally constituted a person as a monarch or a freeman of a guild or a household servant. Investiture was, in other words, the means by which a person was given a form, a shape, a social function a depth.”

By picturing James and Christian as visual copies of one another, Robarts and Davies suggest that they are identical persons. Davies imagines the kings as a “twofold King,” a twinship that translates into the kings being halves of one being: “one King [who] lyues in two.”

The setting for this revelation of the kings as second selves to one another was a progress through London, in full view of the public eye. In fact, nearly every meeting

---

136 John Jewel, The second tome of homilees of such matters as were promised, and intituled in the former part of homilees. Set out by the aucthoritie of the Queenes Maiestie: and to be read in euery parish church agreeably (London: Richarde Jugge and John Cawood, printers to the Queenes Maiestie, 1571), 213.

137 Ibid., 216.


139 Davies, A3v & A3r.
between the kings in every poem and pamphlet occurs in a place open to witnesses, demonstrating and promoting the public nature of their friendship. For example, in the detailed account of the kings’ first meeting in *The King of Denmarkes Welcome*, James and Christian meet and exchange intimacies outdoors with onlookers: “When they were both landed, our King with most louing and tender imbracements, gaue (as it seemed to vs that were there admirers) a most kinde welcome to his dearest brother.”¹⁴⁰ The author intrudes in the narrative through his parenthetical statement, highlighting his involvement in the scene between the two kings. He also suggests that his interpretation of the events represents the view of all the people who witnessed them, telling the story “as it seemed to vs.” Writers consistently construct James and Christian’s relationship as a social one, an important aspect of friendship in classical and early modern friendship theory. It is this public relationship between James and Christian that forms the basis of Britain’s relationship with Denmark.

Disempowering Queen Anna

By using friendship discourse to describe the relationship between James and Christian and, hence, between Britain and Denmark, the authors exclude Anna from the political realm. Having defined the political relationship as a public one between equals, they depict Anna as lesser than the kings and relegate her to private interaction. It is tempting to argue that the authors sideline Anna in response to her religious beliefs. She

¹⁴⁰ *The King of Denmarkes welcome*, B1r.
had supposedly converted to Catholicism in Scotland in 1600.\textsuperscript{141} Moreover, at her first major public appearance in England—her coronation—she refused communion, which was interpreted by many to be a statement of her Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{142} However, the writers of the occasional works do not discuss Anna’s religion and, while the authors of the pamphlets do not list her among the attendees at church, they do explain that she had just given birth and had not yet been churched. Their decision to exclude Anna from the public realm was likely on the basis of gender. Friendship theory, after all, maintained that women could not form friendships with men because they were not (and could not


\textsuperscript{142} Father Robert Abercromby, the self-proclaimed architect of Anna’s conversion, reads Anna’s refusal of communion as a distinct protest against Protestantism: “When they reached the church, it had been decided that before they could be crowned they must receive communion in the heretical fashion. This the King did forthwith, but the Queen refused, stating distinctly that she could not communicate, and rather than receive their communion, would go without the coronation” (William Forbes-Leith, \textit{Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI Now First Printed from the Original Manuscripts in the Secret Archives of the Vatican and Other Collections} [London: Thomas Baker, 1889], 265n.1&2). Abercromby records the event as evidence of Anna’s commitment to Catholicism and her “heroic courage” in publicly proclaiming her devotion. Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, Venetian Secretary in England, notes that her actions not only convinced others of her Catholicism, but also provoked them to marginalize her. On 13 August 1603 he reported to the Doge and Senate that “The King earnestly besought the Queen to take the Sacrament along with him, after the Protestant rite, on his Coronation Day, and that same morning the Archbishops also endeavored to persuade her. They urged that if she did not, she would be living without any religion at all, for no other would be permitted in this kingdom. Her Majesty, after very quietly saying ‘No’ once or twice, declined to make any further answer. After this the old members of the English Council, who are heretics, have set themselves more vigorously and openly than ever to keep the Queen down, and they immediately reject anyone who is recommended by her” (\textit{CSP, Venice}, Vol. 10, 81). Scaramelli, a Catholic, testifies to English Protestants’ (or “heretics’”) fear of a Catholic woman gaining power in England.
be) equal to them. As James’s wife and Christian’s sister, Anna cannot meaningfully participate in their friendship and is thereby excluded from the political realm. The infrequency with which Anna appears in the occasional works suggests her relative insignificance. Ford makes no mention of her at all; Davies names her three times in 480 lines of poetry; the author of The King of Denmarke’s welcome refers to her three times in twenty-eight pages; and Robarts remarks upon her fourteen times in forty-four pages.

When the authors do envision Anna as playing a part in the friendship between the two kings, they picture her as an object rather than a subject. Robarts describes Anna as “the hearts delight of these two royall Kings,” something that provides pleasure to the two kings, joining them in their mutual affection for her. Davies characterizes her as an object of a financial transaction, utilizing the language of credit. She is a literal bond, “a Pledge of theirs [Denmark’s], their deerest bloud/ Our deerest Queen, whence our deere Princes bud.” At the time, “pledge” in the legal sense meant “A person who becomes surety for another,” “A person given or held as security for the fulfillment of a promise, contract,” “Something deposited as security for the fulfillment of a contract, the payment of a debt, or as a guarantee of good faith,” or “A thing given or taken as a sign or token of favour, loyalty, love, etc., or as a guarantee of something to come.”

---

143 See Shannon, esp. 54-90.
144 In 1606, Anna was in the process of establishing herself as a powerful cultural and political force in the realm. These writers, however, deliberately downplay her role.
145 Robarts, The Most royall and Honourable entertainement, C4r.
146 Davies, B2v.
147 OED.
is collateral security for promised future action. The shift in possessives from “theirs/their” in the first line to “our/our” in the second indicates that a transfer has taken place, as does the suggestion that there has been a temporal shift from past to present to future. Anna was “theirs,” “their dearest bloud” and still is “theirs” in the sense that she continues to be “a Pledge of theirs,” but she is also now “ours”—“Our dearest Queen”—and her future lies with us, producing more heirs for our nation—she is the spring “whence our deere Princes bud.” The lines imply, moreover, that the transfer that has occurred is the transfer of a possession; Anna is “a Pledge” from Christian to James. In these representations, Anna has no particular power of her own.

Anna’s subjectivity is limited to private interactions outside the public, political world. For example, the author of The King of Denmarkes Welcome juxtaposes his description of James’s and Christian’s first meeting with that of Anna and Christian. In sharp contrast to the two male friends, the brother and sister meet in private rooms, away from the public gaze. The author highlights the personal rather than political nature of their relationship, indicating a different sort of intimacy between Anna and Christian than that between James and Christian. Christian meets Anna indoors and must walk through a variety of chambers to find her: “from the water stayres, to the great Gate of the Court, and so vp the great Hall and the stayres, into the great Chamber, thence into the presence, and so into the privie Chamber.”\(^\text{148}\) As Christian wends his way through the increasingly exclusive rooms of the palace (each room required entrants to possess a higher rank and greater intimacy with the royal family than the last), his encounter with Anna becomes more secluded and more unknowable. At a certain point, the author may only guess what

\(^{148}\) The King of Denmarkes welcome, B1r.
happens—“from whence [the privy chamber] it may bee supposed the two Kinges went to the Queenes Maisties Chamber.” In a striking contrast, he must now imagine Anna’s and Christian’s meeting, whereas he had witnessed James’s and Christian’s. Having established the private nature of the meeting, he writes that “How euer it was, what loue, what accompliments, what repetitions of naturall affections passed betweene them is not for vulgar minds to imagine, sith none but so great hartes knowe them.” The public is not meant to know or understand their bond. Anna’s and Christian’s relationship exists outside of the public and, hence, political domain. Her role as Christian’s sister is confined to private displays of affection. The author insistently refuses to provide a public account of a private exchange.

By describing James’s and Christian’s relationship as the basis of political relations between Britain and Denmark, the poems and pamphlets intervene in an earlier debate between Anna and James over whose relationship with Christian determined the nature of the Anglo-Danish alliance. Anna contended that her sisterly bond with Christian influenced international affairs, while James maintained that it was his friendship with Christian that did so. Claiming that it was her kinship with Christian that

149 Ibid., B1r.
150 Ibid., B1r.
151 Patricia Fumerton has shown how private spaces were often places for political maneuverings; see “Secret Arts: Elizabeth Miniatures and Sonnets,” *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 67-110. Julie Crawford has noted that Anne Clifford underwent a similar journey when she went to the private rooms of James to discuss her disputed inheritance. Clifford described her experience in her diary, saying, “Upon the 18th being Saturday, I went presently after Dinner to the Queen to the Drawing Chamber where my Lady Derby told the Queen how my Business stood, & that I was to go to the King; so she promised me she would do all the good in it she could. When I had stay’d but a little while there I was sent for out, my Lord & I going through my Lord Buckingham’s Chamber, who brought us into the King, being in the Drawing Chamber” (D. J. H. Clifford, ed., *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford* [Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1990], 45).
had assured good relations between Denmark and Scotland, Anna told James at Linlithgow Palace in 1595 that “her brother, king Christiern IV., for love of her, had ever been his [James’s] sure friend.”152 She advertised her close relationships with her family by wearing ‘C4’ and ‘S’ jewels in honor of her brother Christian and mother Sophie of Mecklenburg as well as by emblazoning the coat of arms of Denmark throughout her places of residence.153 Leeds Barroll and others have seen Anna’s display of her family connections as an oppositional strategy, opening a space for her own source of power separate from James, but it was her Danish heritage that made her a valuable asset to James.154 According to Pauline Croft, James was so eager to highlight Anna’s Danish ancestry he undertook the most expensive single royal architectural work of his reign to

---


153 Anna’s 1607 jewelry inventory records two miniatures of Christian: “A Tablett with yf picture of yf King of Denmarke, with a glasse in it, the one side garnished ouer with Diamondes of diuers sortes & bignes, hauing a romane C crowned in the middle thereof” and “A verie faire rich Tablet of goldsmithes worke set with Diamonds on both sides fullie furnished, with a crowne on the top likewise furnished with Diamondes, hauing the Picture of the Kinge of Denmark in it, vnder a cristall glass” (Diana Scarisbrick “Anne of Denmark’s Jewellery Inventory,” Archaeologica 109 [1991]: 220 & 233). The 1619 inventory of Denmark House includes objects bearing the arms of Denmark located throughout the house, from the Wardrobe to the Gallery: “Another Combe Case of white satten wth the armes of Denmarke,” “double Valences to ye same wth ye armes of Denmarke,” “A Canopy of greene Velvett embrodere wth silver & the armes of Denmarke,” “A paire of small andirons a fireshovell and a paire of tonges all of silver wth the Armes of Denmarke upon the Andirons and fireshovell,” “A Canopy of cromson velvet wth a broad gold lace and the armes of Denmarke on the backe embrodere wth loopes and buttons of gold lace” (M. T. W. Payne, “An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark’s ‘ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcells’ at Denmark House, 1619,” Journal of the History of Collections 13, no. 1 [2001]: 29, 30, 36, 37, & 38). Julie Crawford discusses the importance of recognizing lineal dynasty with regard to a gift that Anne Clifford gave to Anna of a cushion with the arms of Denmark embroidered on it (“The Case of Lady Anne Clifford; or, Did Women Have a Mixed Monarch?”, PMLA 121 no. 5 [2006]: 1685).

154 Foreign diplomats like Giovanni Scaramelli, a Venetian Ambassador, considered Anna’s kinship network to be her greatest asset. In July of 1603, Scaramelli argued that Anna’s value lay in her family’s willingness and ability to support James: “She was the daughter of Frederick II. King of Denmark and of Sophia, daughter of Ulrich Duke of Mecklenburgh, and she had no other dower than the word of her brother, King Christian, and some of the German Princes, her relations, among them Saxony, her brother-in-law, that they would lend their aid when the question of succession to the throne of England arose” (CSP, Venice, Vol. 10, 64).
do so, rebuilding and renaming her London home, Somerset House, as Denmark House.\textsuperscript{155} Croft argues that James did so in order to showcase “the high status of the new Stuart dynasty with its links to Danish royalty.”\textsuperscript{156} But while James acknowledged Anna’s sibling bond with Christian, he insisted that it was his friendship with Christian that allowed for good relations between their countries, declaring that their personal relationship—their “mutual friendship”—would settle debates over issues like trade.\textsuperscript{157}

In James’s view, their friendship set Anglo-Danish policy.

Revisiting Harington: international relations at Theobalds

Reading Harington’s satirical letter to Secretary Barlow in this international context provides an entirely different understanding of it. Harington’s major complaint is that the obsession with international affairs has resulted in a neglect of national issues:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{155} Pauline Croft, \textit{King James} (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 55.
\item\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., 55.
\item\textsuperscript{157} During the later years of Elizabeth’s reign, animosity dominated the relationship between England and Denmark. Embassies arrived bearing complaints from the king to the queen and vice versa. Edward Cheyney describes the embassies as “occasions of bitter controversy that . . . scarcely kept within the bounds of friendly intercourse” (“England and Denmark in the Later Days of Queen Elizabeth,” \textit{The Journal of Modern History} 1 [March 1929]: 15). While they argued over everything from Norwegian and Icelandic fisheries to the English taking Danish ships, the tolls on the Sound were the main source of dispute. The Danish claimed English merchants were not reporting the true value of their cargo to avoid paying the full dues; the English claimed the Danes were overcharging them and being inconsistent in their assessment and collection of dues. When James assumed the throne, English and Danish merchants expected them to negotiate workable trade agreements. Writing of the trade situation, James told Christian that “past disputes . . . can easily be put to rest and thoroughly removed owing to our mutual friendship” (Meldrum, 5, emphasis mine). On another occasion, he maintained that their “fraternal intimacy” would do much to settle the “many controversies [that] have existed between the subjects of this Anglican kingdom of ours and your subjects” (Meldrum, 29). Notably, other courtiers believed that it was James’s relationship with Christian rather than Anna’s that determined Anglo-Danish relations. Venetian ambassador Nicolo Molin wrote on 28 September 1605: “A Danish Ambassador has arrived. . . . The Ambassador is also instructed to touch upon the question of trade between the two countries, which used to be flourishing, but was almost extinct in the late Queen’s reign. The relationship between these two Sovereigns makes it possible that it may now be revived” (CSP, Venice, Vol. 10, 276, emphasis mine).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
“the Gunpowder fright is got out of all our heads, and we are going on, hereabouts, as if
the devil was contriving every man should blow up himself, by wild riot, excess, and
devastation of time and temperance.” He raises the issue of the Gunpowder plot to
argue that domestic matters have been forgotten for the sake of international ones,
specifically the celebrations of the Anglo-Danish alliance. His concern is not the
degradation of the court under James, but the corruption of the court by Christian and the
Danes.

The scandalous behavior at court began with Christian’s arrival: “I came here a
day or two before the Danish King came; and, from the day he did come until this time, I
have been well nigh overwhelmed with carousal and sports of all kinds.” The
transformation of the British court into one that is both foreign and non-Christian, a
“Mahomet’s Paradise,” constitutes the heart of the problem. “The Danes,” Harington
writes, “have again conquered the Britains, for I see no man, or woman either, that can
now command himself or herself.” The Danes have caused the English to behave in an
uncharacteristically shameful manner, having “strangely wrought in our good English
Nobles, for those whom I never could get to taste good liquor now follow the fashion,
and wallow in brutish delights.” The intemperance inspired by the Danes has
figuratively and literally ruined Britain, a destruction in which women play a part as “The
Ladies abandon their sobriety, and are seen to roll about in intoxication.”

158 Harington, 130.
159 Ibid., 126.
160 Ibid., 130.
161 Ibid., 126.
162 Ibid., 126-7.
The first entertainment put on before James and Christian, “Solomon and the Queen of Sheba,” symbolically represents James’s reign—James was known as the British Solomon. The actors and Christian, intoxicated, destroyed the pageant. When the Queen of Sheba offered gifts to James and Christian, she tripped and tipped the basket of food into Christian’s lap. Christian then attempted to dance with the queen, but proved too drunk to do so; he fell down and “humbled himself before her.”\textsuperscript{163} Christian was subsequently “carried to an inner chamber and laid on a bed of state; which was not a little defiled with the presents of the Queen, which has been bestowed upon his garments; such as wine, cream, jelly, beverage, cakes, spices, and other good matters.”\textsuperscript{164} The metaphorical degradation of the British “bed of state” suggested by the failure of the Solomon entertainment thereby becomes actual.

\section*{Transferred Hopes: looking toward Henry, Prince of Wales}

The occasional literature written in honor of Christian’s 1606 state visit imagined a religious union between Britain and Denmark with the potential to establish Protestantism as Europe’s dominant religion. Considering Anglo-Danish relations, the writers of the poems and pamphlets deny Anna political power by presenting James’s and Christian’s friendship rather than Anna’s and Christian’s sibling relationship as the basis of the political alliance between the countries. At the same time, they enhance James’s political capital, picturing him as the equal of a more wealthy and powerful ruler.

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 127-8.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., 128.
Whereas Harington imagines the visit as history repeating itself with Denmark again conquering England, the authors of the occasional works view it as a new phase in Anglo-Danish relations, the beginning of a religio-political league so powerful that it can defeat any opponent. In doing so, they address their contemporaries’ call for intervention on behalf of their fellow Protestants in the Low Countries in the Dutch-Spanish conflict and for James’s effort to create a Protestant Union, showing how both are now possible. Neither possibility came to fruition. James valued his peace treaty with Spain too much to aid the Dutch and Christian did not form a pan-European religious alliance. Moreover, when some German states created a Protestant Union in 1608, British and German loyalties prevented it from becoming a functioning international coalition, limiting its power and potential, an issue I will explore in detail in chapter three. While no formal alliance was established until 1608 and then only between German states, this moment in 1606 forms a crucial, too-often ignored, part of the history leading to the formal establishment of a Protestant Union. Though the 1606 poems and pamphlets represent a dream that never came to be, they are important to understanding James’s public image, Anglo-Danish relations, and the Protestant Union.

A situation soon emerged in Europe that offered a new opportunity to push for an international Protestant alliance: the Cleves and Jülich crisis. In 1609, the Duke of Cleves-Jülich, John William, died childless. Several claimants asserted their rights to the duchy and their dispute quickly became a European-wide conflict. The Habsburg Empire (both the Spanish and Austrian branches) backed the Catholic claimant to the duchy. The recently formed Protestant Union stepped in to support the Protestant heir. James agreed to a temporary defensive alliance with the Protestant Union and sent a small force of
English troops to Jülich to aid the Protestant contender. However, he took no further action, constrained by finances and his desire to pursue pacific policies that would maintain the balance of power in Europe.\textsuperscript{165} Bellicose British Protestants who desired a permanent union with the German states and vigorous military intervention on the Continent were disappointed. In their frustration, they turned to Prince Henry, James’s heir, as their new champion.\textsuperscript{166}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{165} Croft, \textit{King James}, 83.

\textsuperscript{166} Notably, Christian, the soldier-king, established a close relationship with Prince Henry during his trip, showing him marked favor and presenting him with gifts appropriate to a military commander-in-training: “during the whole stay . . . the King of Denmark frequently attended him [Henry]; and at the King’s departure on the 11\textsuperscript{th} of August, was presented by him with his Vice-Admiral and best fighting ship, worth with all her furniture not less than 2500 l. and a rapier and hanger valued at 2000 marks” (Thomas Birch, \textit{The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I. Compiled chiefly from his own Papers, and other Manuscripts, never before published} [London: A. Millar, 1760], 72). Additionally, contemporaries compared Henry with Christian. For example, in his biography of Henry, William Haydone wrote that Henry “was tall and of an high stature, his body strong and well proportioned, his shoulders were broad . . . and withal full of graviety, and Princely majesty, resembling much in shape of his body, and diuers actions the King of Dennemark his Vncle” (\textit{The Trve Picture and Relation of Prince Henry His Noble and Vertuous disposition, Containing Certaine Observations and Proofes of his towrdly and notable Inclination to Vertue, of the Pregnanctie of his Wit, farre above his Age, comprehended in sundry of his witty and pleasant Speaches} [Leyden: William Christian, 1634], 31).
\end{footnotesize}
“VPON WHOSE LIFE MY HOPES DID WHOLE RELYE”:
BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND PRINCE HENRY

In 1634, William Haydone, a former servant of James VI and I’s eldest son and heir, Prince Henry, published a biography of him: *The Trve Pictyre And Relation Of Prince Henry His Noble and Vertuous disposition*. In *The Trve Pictyre*, Haydone includes anecdotes demonstrating Henry’s deep sense of patriotism. For example, he relates an encounter between James and Henry during which

The King ask[ed] him [Henry] whether hee loved Englishmen or Frenchmen better? hee answered, Englishmen. The King demanded the cause thereof, because, said he, I am a king to more noble persones of England, then of Fraunce. Then the King asked him, whether he loued the English or the Germanes better, he answered; the English. Whereunto the King replying, that his Mother was a German, hee answered; Sir, you are the cause thereof.¹

James, in Haydone’s story, puts Henry to the test, questioning his loyalty to England. Henry’s first challenge is a choice between France and England. James is worried that Henry is becoming too close to the French, specifically to the “noble persones . . . of France.” It is only after Henry chooses England over France that James questions him about Germany. When James mentions that Henry has German blood, Henry becomes indignant, asserting that anything about him which is not English is something that has

¹ William Haydone, *The Trve Pictyre And Relation Of Prince Henry His Noble and Vertuous disposition, Containing Certaine Observations and Proofes of his towardly and notable Inclination to Vertue, of the Pregnancie of his Wit, farre above his Age, comprehended in sundry of his witty and pleasant Speaches* (Leyden: William Christian, 1634), B3r-v.
been forced upon him (James is to blame for his “German” blood). In other words, any
“foreignness” is not of his choosing. Shortly after describing this exchange between
James and Henry, Haydone tells another story in which Henry must choose between
France and England. Henry is told that the French king has threatened England: “Some
one report[ed] to him, howe the French King [Henri IV] had saide, that as wel his Bastard
as the Bastard of Normandie might conquere England.”\(^2\) Henry responds by vowing to
defend England, saying, “I will bee at eares with him . . . if he go about any such
matter.”\(^3\) By being “at eares” with him, Henry means that he will be “at variance” with
him.\(^4\) Haydone thus imagines a relationship between Henri IV and Prince Henry that is
distant (Henry learns of the threat through reports) and antagonistic.

Haydone depicts Henry as a prince who views himself first and foremost as an
English prince devoted to his country rather than as a Protestant prince devoted to his
faith. Though his devotion to England and Protestantism need not be in opposition to one
another, his commitment to Protestantism was usually tied to an international agenda—
the spread of Protestantism and the defeat of the Holy Roman Empire—and the tendency
of Protestants on the Continent to see Henry as their champion. Haydone’s image of
Henry as the champion of England is in conflict with the standard image of Henry as the
international champion of Protestantism. It also goes against the real-life Henry. Henry
was a militant Protestant who desired to lead a pan-European coalition to challenge the
Holy Roman Empire and maintained close ties with the French court—he had admired

\(^2\) Ibid., B3v.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) “So to set (persons) by the ears: to put them at variance” \((OED)\).
and been friends with the recently murdered Henri IV, King of France. Why, then, does Haydone draw such a picture of Henry?

Attempting to answer this question involves understanding the representational war fought over Henry’s image. Scholars have long acknowledged that representations of Prince Henry served as a battleground for factional fights in Britain. J. W. Williamson, for example, convincingly demonstrates that while moderate Protestants and Catholics pictured Henry as an agent of peace and religious toleration, militant Protestants depicted him as a vehicle for war and the spread of Protestantism. These competing images of Henry as peacemaker and warrior have been tied to an actual disagreement between James and Henry over foreign policy: James was passionate about maintaining peace and a balance of power in Europe, whereas Henry was keen to go to war on the Continent. The representational battle, however, was more complex than this dichotomy allows and shifted over time.

In this chapter, I hope to show this complexity by examining how two authors co-opted and altered the images of Henry as peace-maker and soldier: George Marcelline in The Triumphs of King James The First (1610) and Jean l’Oiseau de Tourval in The French Herald Svmmoning All Trve Christian Princes to a generall Croisade (1611).


6 See Williamson.

7 Strong, for example, argues that “Henry’s ‘foreign policy’ . . . shows a total commitment to the Pan-European cause in Europe, in which England should manifest its leadership in acts of assertion and not ones of passive mediation” (70). For an in-depth analysis of James’s pacifism, see Malcolm Smuts, “The Making of the Rex Pacificus: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War,” in Royal Subjects, Essays on the Writings of James VI and I, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, 371-87 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002).
Marcelline and Tourval, I want to suggest, wrote these tracts as part of the pamphlet war debating the Oath of Allegiance which had been passed in May of 1606. In participating in the controversy over the Oath of allegiance, these tracts use different aspects of the debate to advocate opposing foreign policies; Marcelline pushes for a policy of diplomacy with the Holy Roman Empire, Tourval for military aggression. They imagine Henry as the lynchpin of their plans: success depends upon Henry’s decision to emulate either James (peace) or Henri IV (war). A peaceful agenda had previously denoted religious toleration, while a policy of military aggression was tied to the spread of Protestantism and the defeat of the Holy Roman Empire. However, Marcelline associates peace with the spread of Protestantism and a strong Protestant stance, while Tourval ties a platform of war to cross-confessional unity and alliance with France. They thus flip the typical connotations of Henry’s images. Examining the stakes lain out by Marcelline and Tourval, and in particular, looking at their contrasting agendas, gives us a clearer sense of why some posthumous representations of Henry, such as Haydone’s, express anti-French sentiment. I suggest that they insist on depicting Henry as a militant Protestant devoted to Britain not as generic panegyric but as a specific response to the shift in Henry’s iconography brought about by this controversy over British foreign policy vis-à-vis France. France, in other words, is at the center of the change in representations of Henry.

******

The Oath of Allegiance required British subjects to reject the pope’s authority to depose the king and testify their own allegiance to that king and sparked an international
controversy that lasted into the 1620s, producing “innumerable books” and giving rise “to a paper warfare in Europe.”

The question of the extent of a king’s power constituted the heart of the debate and at least seven British and two French authors writing in support of the Oath dedicated their texts to Henry as advice to a future king. Marcelline and Tourval’s contributions to the quarrel move past arguments over the oath’s legitimacy to offer specific actions that should be taken by those who support it. They are unique among contributors to the Oath controversy for proposing a plan of action that centers on Prince Henry. Marcelline and Tourval dedicate The Triumphs of King Iames and The French Herald to Prince Henry, offering these works as advice to guide his future actions, and especially his attitude towards France. Henry’s relationship with France was

---


9 The British works include two by Scottish writers—John Barclay, *Ioan. Barclaii Sylvae ad serenissimum & potentissimum Regem, Christianum quartum, Dei gratia Daniae, noruagiae, Gothorum, Vandalorumque Regem, Sleswicksiae, Hostaniae, Stormarchiae, Wagriae, ac Dithmarsae Ducem comitem Oldenburgiae, & Delmenherstiae* (London: Robert Barker, 1606) and George Marcelline, *The Triumphs of King Iames the First, Of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland, King: Defender of the Faith. Published vpon his Maiesties aduertisement to all the Kings, Princes, and Potentates of Christendome, and confirmed by the wonderfull Workes of God, declared in his life. Devoted, Dedicated, and Consecrated to the most excellent Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London: John Budge, 1610)—and five by British clergymen—Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, *The peace of Rome. Proclaimed to all the world, by her famous Cardinall Bellarmine, and the no lesse famous casuist Nauarre. Whereof the one acknowledgeth, and numbers vp aboue three hundred differences of opinion, maintained in the popish church* (London: J. Windet for John Legate, 1609); Thomas Morton, the Bishop of Durham, *The encounter against M. Parsons, by a reviewv of his last sober reckoning, and his exceptions vrged in the treatise of his mitigation. Wherein moreover is inserted: 1. A confession of some Romanists, both concerning the particular falsifications of principall Romanists, as namely, Bellarmine, Suarez, and others: as also concerning the generall fraude of that curch, in corrupting of authors. 2. A confinement of slaunders, which Bellarmine vrged against Protestants. 3. A performance of the challenge, which Mr. Parsons made, for the examining of sixtie Fathers, cited by Coccius for proofe of Purgatorie ... 4. A censure of a late pamphlet, intituled, The patterne of a Protestant, by one once termed the moderate answerer. 5. An handling of his question of mentall equivoication (after his boldnesse with the L. Cooke) vpon occasion of the most memorables, and feyned Yorkshire case of equivoocating; and of his raging against D. Kings sermon* (London: William Stansby for John Bill, 1610); Robert Burhill, church of England clergymen, *Pro Tortura torti, contra Martinum Becanum Iesuitam, responsio Roberti Burhilli Angli* (London: Robert Barker, 1611); John Gordon, Dean of Salisbury, *Anti-Bellarmino-tortor, siue tortus retortus & Iuliano-papismus. Et theses confirmatae doctrina* (London: Richard Field, 1612). The French works include the French divine Edmund Richer’s *A treatise of ecclesiasticall and politike power. Shewing, the church is a monarchicall government, ordained to a supernaturall and spirituall end, tempered with an aristocraticall order* (London: William Stansby for John Budge, 1612) and the French Huguenot translator Jean l’Oiseau de Tourval’s *The French Herald*. 
of particular interest because French Huguenots, a number of which were living in England, wanted him to go to war against the Catholics in France. Marcelline argues for peace and pushes Henry to ally himself only to the Protestants in France, specifically the Huguenots. Tourval advocates war with the Holy Roman Empire and closer ties with all of France. He represents those who believed that Prince Henry, in the words of Henri IV, “promised to produce fruits much more favourable to France, than the stock from which it was raised [Britain].”

Both Marcelline and Tourval had connections to the royal family. Marcelline, a Scottish Protestant, was a writer who sought the patronage of the Stuarts, appealing in succession to Henry and Charles. Tourval was a French Huguenot who had moved to London from Paris in 1603, gaining work as a translator and gaining the patronage of King James. In The Triumphs of King James and The French Herald, Marcelline and Tourval reflect on the relationship between Britain and France, imagining that the two nations will establish an alliance that joins together the leading Christian princes in Europe in order to challenge the pope. However, they differ in two critical ways: in the role they see for religion in their unions and in their proposed methods for contesting papal power. Marcelline wants James to challenge the pope through diplomacy and counsels Henry to work with his father, postponing his military ambitions until he inherits the throne. Importantly, his message is not one of religious tolerance. He argues that this pacific policy is based on the desire to strengthen Protestantism and the belief

10 Williamson, 34.

11 Birch, 89. Monsieur de Puisieux wrote to Monsieur de la Boderie on 20 July 1607, informing him that the King desired “to cultivate that young plant, since it promised to produce fruits much more favourable to France, than the stock from which it was raised” (Ibid.).

12 He dedicates Les trophees du roi Iacques I (1609) and Triumphs (1610) to Henry, then dedicates Epithalamium Gallo-Britannicum or, Great-Britaines (1625) to Charles.
that James will unite the Protestant rulers of Europe through his diplomatic efforts. In contradistinction, Tourval pictures Henry establishing a pan-European alliance through physical combat and, pointedly, encourages him to follow the example of the Catholic convert Henri IV, King of France. For him, a militant Henry is one who leads a cross-confessional alliance that unites Christian leaders across Europe against the Holy Roman Empire. In Tourval’s vision, Catholics and Protestants join together to attack the pope on political rather than religious grounds: the conviction that the pope has overextended his power by sanctioning rebellion against kings. Whereas Marcelline ties Henry’s image as a peace-maker with a desire to make Protestantism stronger, Tourval divorces Henry’s image as a strong military leader from his devout Protestantism. The militant Protestant Henry, then, is not a uniform depiction or a presumed fact; it is, instead, subject to representational side-taking.

Contested Authority: the Oath of Allegiance

In May of 1606, the English Parliament passed the Oath of Allegiance in response to the Gunpowder Plot, the attempt by a group of Catholics to blow up the royal family and Parliament in November of 1605. James claimed that the Gunpowder Plot was the reason for the Oath. Speaking of “the Powder-Traitors,” he writes,

the onely reason they gaue for plotting so heinous an attempt, was the zeale they carried to the Romish Religion . . . the next sitting downe againe of the Parliament, there were Lawes made, setting downe some such orders as were thought fit for preuenting the like mischiefe in time to
come. Amongst which a forme of OATH was framed to be taken by my Subiects, whereby they should make a clear profession of their resolution, faithfully to persist in their obedience vnto mee.\textsuperscript{13}

The Oath required English subjects to acknowledge James as the highest authority in England and to deny the Pope’s authority to depose him, authorize foreign kings to invade his kingdom, or give license to his subjects to bear arms against him. In September of 1606, Pope Paul V issued a papal letter, or “breve,” prohibiting English Catholics from taking the Oath, because it contained “many things contrary to faith and salvation.”\textsuperscript{14} Nevertheless, the English Archpriest George Blackwell swore the oath and urged fellow Catholic priests to do the same.\textsuperscript{15} In 1607, he published a defense of the oath: \textit{Mr. George Blackwel . . . his Approbation and taking of the Oath of Allegiance}. In his apology, Blackwell argues that even if the Pope should excommunicate James, he would hold himself “bound by the Lawe of God to continue his Majesties most loyall and faithfull subiect” and judged that “all good Catholikes ought to concurre with [him] . . . and doe the like.”\textsuperscript{16} The Catholic Church swiftly rejoined with a second papal breve

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13} McIlwain, 71.
\textsuperscript{14} M. A. Tierney, \textit{Dodd’s Church History of England From the Commencement of the Sixteenth Century to the Revolution in 1688} (London: Charles Dolman, 1841), Vol. 4, 74. The full text of the breve can be found in Tierney, Appendix 25, cxl-xlilii. Tierney lists the date as 22 September 1606 (cxl), but the Calendar of State Papers dates the breve to 12 September 1606 (Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., \textit{Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I. 1603-1610} [London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1857], Vol. 8, 330). James, in \textit{Triplici Nodo}, includes translations of the Latin papal letter (McIlwain, 73-5).
\textsuperscript{15} Blackwell addressed English priests on 7 July 1607, explaining “his reasons for taking the oath of allegiance, and his opinion against the power of the Pope to excommunicate the King; [and] urg[ing] them to take the oath” (CSP, Domestic, Vol. 8, 363). Archpriest was Blackwell’s title, signifying that he was “the superior of the Roman Catholic clergy in England from 1598-1623” (\textit{OED}).
\textsuperscript{16} George Blackwell, \textit{Mr. George Blackwel, (Made by Pope Clement 8. Archpriet of England), his Aunsweres vpon sundry his Examinations: Together, with his Approbation and taking of the Oath of Allegiance: And his Letter written to his Assistants, and brethren, moouing them not onely to take the said
reaffirming the first. Cardinal Robert Bellarmine wrote Blackwell a letter admonishing him for his actions and expressing concern that his behavior was “the result of fear or imbecility.” Bellarmine’s letter was made public when Blackwell printed it alongside a second defense of the Oath. Shortly thereafter, the Pope removed Blackwell from office. James then published an apology for the Oath: *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus*. A print war over the Oath ensued.

---

17 Tierney also includes the full text of this breve, dated 23 August 1607, in Appendix 28, cxlvi. James includes an English translation of this breve in *Triplici Nodo* (McIlwain, 81-1).

18 *CSP, Domestic*, Vol. 8, 370.


20 On 22 January 1608, Pope Paul V wrote George Birkett and nominated “him to the Archpresbitership of England, of which George Blackwell is deprived” (*CSP, Domestic*, Vol. 8, 397). The Pope’s first directive to Birkett: “dissuade Catholics from taking the oath of allegiance, or going to Protestant churches” (Ibid., 397).

21 Robert Parsons responded to James in *The judgment of a Catholicke English-man, living in banishment for his religion VWritten to his priuate friend in England. Concerninge a late booke set forth, and entituled; Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus, or, An apologie for the oath of allegiance. Against two breves of Pope Paulus V. to the Catholickes of England; & a letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to M. George Blackwell, Arch-priest. VVherein, the said oath is shewed to be vnlawfull vnto a Catholicke conscience; for so much, as it conteyneth sundry clauses repugnant to his religion* (Saint Omer: English College Press, 1608). Bellarmine also responded, writing under the name of one of his Latin secretaries, he published *Responsio Matthaei Torti Presbyteri et Theologi Papiensis, ad Librum inscriptum, Triplici Nodo Triplex Cuneus* (Cologne, 1608). James then requested Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, to reply to Bellarmine. On 11 November 1608, the newsletter writer John Chamberlain wrote diplomat Dudley Carleton, informing him that Andrewes had no free time because “the King doth so hasten and spurre him on in this business of Bellarmine” (McClure, Vol. 1, 270). Andrewes finally published his reply in 1609: *Tortura Torti: siue, Ad Matthaei Torti librum responsio, qui nuper editus contra Apologiam serenissimi potentiissimique principis, Iacobi, Dei gratia, Magnae Britanniae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Regis, pro Iuramento fidelitatis* (London:
The two issues that dominate the literature written on the Oath are the relative authority of the pope and king and the potential threats to the king posed by the pope’s denunciation of the Oath. Those who supported the Oath typically argue that the pope...

Robert Barker, 1609). Chamberlain thought the book so badly written that he made a joke about it. He told Carleton, “And because you have patience to overlook papers I send you a speech I made since in the assembly of the States General in consequence of this letter, wherein for that which belongs to our English church I helped myself by Tortura Torti; and I know not how to put these novelists to a greater torture than to convince them so manifestly of falsehood” (McClure, Vol. 1, 253). On 30 December 1609, Chamberlain wrote that the Cardinal of Evreux had written a response to Andrewes and James: “The bishop of Ely [Lancelot Andrewes] preached at court . . . I heare that his booke is aunswered as well as the Kings and that the Cardinall of Evreux hath written somewhat sharply against the King but yet qualifies yt somewhat toward the later end” (CSP, Domestic, Vol. 8, 292).

Some of the works published between 1609 and 1611 include: King James, A Proclamation for the due execution of all former Lawes against Recusants, giuing them a day to repaire to their owne dwellings, and not afterwards to come to Court . . . And for the ministering of the Oath of Allegiance, according to the Law (London: Robert Barker, 1610) and A Proclamation, whereby it is commanded, That the Oath of Allegiance be administered according to the Lawes (London: Robert Barker, 1611); Robert Tynley, Two Learned Sermons . . . In the first, are examined diuers passages of that lewde English Libell, written by a Prophane Fugitiue, against the Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance (London: William Hall for Thomas Adams, 1609); William Barlow, An answer to a Catholike English-man (so by himselfe entitvled) who, without a name, passed his censure vpon the apology made by the Right High and Mightie Prince James by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland &c. for the oath of allegiance : which censvre is heere examined and refvted / by the Bishop of Lincoln (London: Thomas Haueland for Mathew Law, 1609); Thomas Ireland, The Oath of Allegiance, Defended by a Sermon preached at a Synode in the Metropolitcall Church of Yorke (London: Nicholas Okes for Edward Aggas, 1610); John Donne, Pseudo-martyr Wherein out of certaine propositions and gradations, this conclusion is euicted. That those which are of the Romane religion in this kingdome, may and ought to take the Oath of allegiance (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1610); Anthony Hoskin’s A Briefe and Cleare Declaration of Syndry Pointes Absolutely dislyked in the lately enacted Oath of Allegiance, proposed to Catholikes of England (Saint Omer: English College Press, 1611); and Richard Sheldon, Certain general reasons, prouing the lawfulness of the Oath of allegiance, written by R. S. priest, to his priuat friend. Whereunto is added, the treatise of that learned man, M. William Barclay, concerning the temporall power of the pope. And with these is ioyned the sermon of M. Theophilus Higgons, preached at Pauls Crosse the third of March last, because it containeth something of like argument (London: Felix Kyngston for John Budge, 1612); and William Warmington, A moderate defence of the Oath of Allegiance vvherein the author proueth the said Oath to be most lawful, notwithstanding the Popes breues prohibiting the same; and solueth the chiefest objections that are usuall made against it; perswading the Catholike to resist souerainge authoritie in refusing it. Together with the oration of Sixtus 5. in the Consistory at Rome, vpon the muther of Henrie 3. the French King by a friar. Whereunto also is annexed strange reports or newes from Rome. By William Warmington Catholike priest, and oblate of the holy congregacion of S. Ambrose (London: Richard Field, 1612).
does not have authority over the king, for the king’s power derives directly from God. For example, in *The Oath of Allegiance, Defended by a Sermon*, Thomas Ireland, a Gray’s Inn lawyer, argues that the Oath “concerneth not so much the Popes, as Gods authority bestowed vpon our King.” Ireland employs the standard rhetoric about the divine right of kings, maintaining that the king is God’s proxy on earth: “the Monarch is divine, as only representing Gods owne power.” When the pope claims that he is a higher authority than the king and passes judgment upon his actions, he not only goes against the express wishes of God but also puts the king’s life at risk. For, as James argues in *Triplici Nodo*, if “the Pope by his owne authoritie may depose me . . . the Pope may dispose of my Kingdomes and Dominions . . . discharge my Subiects of their Allegiance and Obedience to me . . . giue licence to one, or more of my Subiects to beare armes against me . . . giue leaue to my Subiects to offer violence to my Person, or to my gouvernement.” Though worried about his own safety, James is primarily concerned that his subjects would have a choice as to whether or not to obey him.

In 1610, George Marcelline published *The Triumphs of King Iames*, basing it on an earlier French work: *Les trophees du roi Iacques I. de la Grande Bretaigne, France, et Irlande* (1609). *The Triumphs* differs from *Les trophees* in that it refers to events that

---

23 Ireland, A3r. Ireland maintained that “Vnto this allegiance . . . people [are] double-bound by the mouth of the king, and by the oath of God; that is, by the authority of both God and king” (B1v).

24 Ibid., B4r.


have happened since the publication of *Les trophees*; for example, Marcelline discusses Peleterius’s response to James’s apology which was published in 1610.\(^{27}\) He intended *Triumphs* as an addition to the ongoing print war over the Oath of Allegiance, beginning his address to readers by railing against “that *Jacobine* Monke, and that *Proselite* Pellitier.”\(^{28}\) Pellitier, or Peleterius, was a Jesuit who had just published a refutation of James’s apology: *La Religion Catholique sousteneue en tous les points de so doctrine, contre le livre adressé aux Rois . . . par . . . Jacques I*. Marcelline refers to various players in the debate, including the Dominican Nicolas Coeffeteau (he expresses a desire “to make Coeffeteau confesse” for writing against James); the pope (he discusses his “two Breeues”); Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (he mentions the “Letter from the Cardinal *Bellarmine*” as well as the book he published under the pseudonym “Tortus”); Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Ely (whom he calls “that graue and sweete Authour of *Tortura Torti*”); and William Barclay, “our learned *Barcklay,*” the Scottish Catholic who refuted Bellarmine.\(^{29}\) Lamenting that Bellarmine has not been punished for *Responsio Matthaei Torti*, Marcelline complains that “there lackes Tortures for *Tortus*.\(^{30}\) He raises the major

\(^{27}\) McIlwain, lxv.

\(^{28}\) George Marcelline, *The Triumphs of King James the First, Of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland, King; Defender of the Faith. Published vpon his Maiesties advertiseiment to all the Kings, Princes, and Potentates of Christendome, and confirmed by the wonderfull Workes of God, declared in his life. Devoued, Dedicated, and Consecrated to the most excellent Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London: John Budge, 1610), B1r.

\(^{29}\) Marcelline, B2v, F1r. D3r, H1v, H1v-H2r, & P1v. He characterizing Peleterius as far more dangerous than Bellarmine for his “flattering answeres (as with a *Delphian* sword) [threaten] to open the bosome or breast of MY KING, to strike at his heart with a deadly stab, and to give him the lie more courtely, then *Tortus* [Bellarmine] (to his shame) hath done, coueting to impresse lies and falsities in the soules of euery one” (B1v). He refers to the content of Andrewes’s book, using it to bolster his own arguments about James’s clemency: “To how many hath hee giuen pardon, as that graue and sweete Authour of *Tortura Torti* (as truely as learnedly) testifieth vnto vs?” (D3r). He mentions the pope’s breves and Bellarmine’s letter again later, “two Breeues of the Pope, and to a Letter sent from a Cardinall” (H3r).

\(^{30}\) Ibid., B2v.
points of the contention, cataloguing threats to James and arguing that the pope’s actions threaten the institution of monarchy itself. Appealing to “Great-Soueraignes,” he warns them that they can be no longer assured safely, neither in your Pallaces & Cittadels, nor of the faith of your household seruants, or those you put most trust in, if this Article may bee graunted to publique murders, and assassinates, (to wit) That they haue power to dispence, and free your Subiectes from the Oath, whereby they haue vowed faith vnto you, and may cause you to be murdered . . . and then to Cannonize or glorifie him, when the deede is done.31

For Marcelline, the debate is really about a subject’s duty to his monarch, his loyalty to his country. Writing in support of James, Marcelline describes his work as “my Apology.”32 “The full ayme of mine intention,” he claims, is to show the “many rich & strong arguments” in James’s apology while highlighting the flaws of his opponents so that his readers will not “bee perswaded in the contrarie, by . . . [their] deceuing Language, subtle Arguings, Sophistries, and captious arguments.”33 Marcelline presents the Oath as a national matter, arguing that those who view it differently have been tricked by “Sophistries.”

Tourval was already deeply involved in the Oath controversy when he wrote The French Herald, having contributed to it by translating James’s Triplici Nodo into

31 Ibid., F2v. He says that those who write against James are “contentious . . . [and] doe but whet on Choller, and harden bad spirits, as being more apt to moue sedition and disobedience, then to affoorde anie fruitfull edifying” (B3r).

32 Ibid., C1v.

33 Ibid., B3v-B4r.
French. When James recruited him to complete a French version of his apology for the Oath of Allegiance, Tourval not only translated it, but also personally arranged for its printing in Paris. On 2 June 1610, he wrote to the English Secretary of State Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, requesting help for the expenses he incurred in the undertaking, asserting that he had “received no recompense, although his expenses have been great, especially in travelling in vain from city to city abroad, to find a printer for the King’s book, and then staying three months hidden in Paris so as to superintend its printing there and keep it concealed from the Jesuits.” On 24 August 1610, “Monsieur Turvall” received £30 “for his travail and expenses, as well in bringing of letters hither from Paris, as for his pains in translating some small books out of English into French for his Majesty’s service.” He was, in other words, eventually rewarded by James for the risky and expensive venture he undertook on his behalf.

Tourval positions *The French Herald* as part of the Oath controversy, but he broadens the debate to include earlier texts questioning the legality of regicide, identifying both Oath and regicide tracts as part of a larger issue of monarchical


35 Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign Of James I. 1611-1618* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858), Vol. 9, 616. Alison Clarke discusses Tourval’s work for James. For more details, see her article, “Jean Loiseau de Tourval: a Huguenot translator in England, 1603-31,” *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 20 (1958): 36-59. There is also evidence that suggests Tourval tried to publish a pamphlet on the Oath debate himself between 1608 and 1610, but was discouraged from doing so by his friend. Pierre de L’Estoile liked the treatise “toute la conjuration dernière d’Angleterre [the last conspiracy of England],” but recommended that it would be unwise to print it (Clarke, 39). It is unclear whether the conspiracy to which he refers is the Oath of Allegiance or the Spanish plot against James’s life in 1606 which was discussed in chapter one.

36 Frederick Devon, ed., *Issues of The Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out Of His Majesty’s Revenue During The Reign of King James I* (London: John Rodwell, 1836), 111. This is also quoted by Clarke (40).
Beginning with the regicide texts, he considers whether there is an instance in which a person has the right to exert power over a king. He cites the major contributors to the recent phase of this controversy, starting with the Spanish Jesuit Juan Mariana’s *De regis destructione* (1598). Mariana’s defense of the right to rebel against a tyrant spawned a number of treatises on the topic. Tourval names the authors of several of these tracts, including Mariana’s fellow Jesuits Gregorio de Valentia, Francisco de Toledo, Pedro de Ribadeneira, Gabriel Vasquez, and Juan Azor. Placing himself in opposition to those “vnworthy villaine[s],” Tourval argues that a monarch holds his power directly from God and should not be challenged. He characterizes the pope as “the Tyrant . . . [with] vsurped pwer.” In response to these regicide tracts, François Ravaillac assassinated Henri IV on 14 May 1610. Tourval blames Henri’s murder on

---

37 Mathew Lownes entered it in the Stationers’ Register on 12 January 1611: “Master Mathew Lownes Entred for his Copy vnder th[e] handes of master Thomas Wilson and th[e] warden, A booke called, The true Ffrenche Herald or a compl[ain]te and earnest exhortacon, to all truly Christian Princes, vppon th[e] execrable murther and infortunate deathe of Henry ye greate &c.” (Arber, Vol. 3, 204). Tourval attributes the lapse of time between Henry’s death and his book to the utter devastation wrought by his death: “I neuer spoke in the yong daies of your Maiesties raigne; then we could not choose but greatly be amazed at the greatnes, at the suddennes of our blow, and somwhat yield to the fury of the storme; then were we rather to looke to assure our selues then to trouble others, rather to defend then to assaile, and panting vnder the waight of our ruyne, take holde (as it were) for a time, of that hand that had drawen it vpon vs; as not knowing, or rather not seeming, or rather not striving, to knowe our enemies. But now, since there is nothing to be apprehended, since in their lowest degree of weakenes & misery, they had no further end then onely to take him away, esteeming they had gotten enough, if we might but loose him, as to his perpetuall glory they feared him alone, more then all France besides; or els thinking that he being gone, all things would go away after him, & of themselues be turned vpside downe” (E1v-E2r).

38 Ibid., E2v-E3r.


40 Tourval, F2r.

the “parricidious steele” forged by the “doctrine and practice” of writers like Mariana. However, he does not hold the authors of the regicide treatises solely responsible for the king’s murder. He argues that those authors who wrote in opposition to the Oath of Allegiance bear as much responsibility as the authors of the regicide tracts. In other words, he equates writing against the Oath with approving regicide. He rails against anti-Oath authors, particularly Bellarmine, and proclaims his newest work an overt threat to King Louis XIII’s life. Speaking to Louis XIII, Tourval cautions the king, saying, “It is against your selfe directly that this booke is written, against all kings aliue, against al kings yet vnborne.” Claiming that Henri’s assassination justifies James’s fears of “hellish plots,” he warns kings to take action and protect themselves. While Marcelline and Tourval persuasively argue that kings must defend themselves, they encourage them to take different actions to do so and imagine Henry playing a critical role. Marcelline envisions James at the head of a pan-European Protestant alliance, supported by Henry, which challenges the pope through diplomacy. Tourval sees Henry leading a cross-confessional coalition in military action against the Holy Roman Empire.

42Tourval, E2r. He writes, “Mariana was the first who was bold to reduce in art, and precepts, in three set booke, De Regis destructione; And though many, almost as pestilent as he, both of his owne nation and society, both before and after him, haue written vpon that vnhappy subiect, as Ribadeneyra, Toledo, Valencia, Vasquex, Azor, Sa, and other; yet because, with them, he that can worke most mischiefe, is worthy of the highest title, this most vnworthy villaine shall goe in the fore-front, since he without them, and aboue any of them, or rather aboue all them, hath wrought most villany, and kild so great a King” (E2v).

43 Ibid., E4r-v. He also sympathizes with writers who wrote in support of the Oath like William Barclay, the Scottish Catholic jurist who refuted Bellarmine in De potestate Papae an & quantenus in reges & principes seculares ius & imperium habeat: Guil. Barclaii I.C. liber posthumus (London: Eliot's Court Press, 1609).

44 Tourval, E4v.

Marcelline and Pacific Protestantism

Marcelline proposes that endangered kings should band together in a coalition and overthrow “the Tiranny of Antichrist [the pope].” He urges them to accept James as their leader and adhere to his pacific policies. Suggesting that Henry desires a martial course of action, Marcelline advises him to set aside his personal aspirations and follow his father’s example. By embracing his duty to his father and sovereign, Henry will demonstrate his devotion to Britain and help spread Protestantism.

Marcelline dedicated *Triumphs* to Henry, informing him that the book would provide him with counsel. He offers Henry a model on which to base himself: his father, King James. James’s virtues, he argues, should be “a pattern and example” for Henry. He identifies James’s primary virtue as his commitment to the Protestant religion, proclaiming that James’s most significant triumph is his effort on behalf of the reformed faith. “The Kinges most glorious and pompous Title of Triumph,” he argues, “is to bee called DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, because it is apparent, & he shewes himselfe more affectionate, ardent, and zealous to preserue, exalt, proclaime, and communicate it to them, which haue not as yet receiued it, then any other King on the

---

46 Marcelline, E3v.

47 Marcelline dedicates it “To the High, Mighty, and Magnanimous Prince Henry, Eldest Sonne to the King, Prince of Wales,” writing that he gives the “*Trophees & the Honour of My King your Father* . . . vnto your Highnesse, in regarde that a person who is so neere vnto you, hath conquered & won them: And his *Triumphant Triumphes*, are the auguries, harbingers, & vantcurrers of your infallible fortunes to come, euen as your owne Vertues do serue for a pattern and example, to them of My Lord the Duke your Brother” (A2r-v).

48 Ibid., A2r.
Marcelline thus presents his *Triumphs* as, first and foremost, an account of James’s actions on behalf of and his goals for Protestantism.

Marcelline urges Protestant princes to unite under King James and challenge the Holy Roman Empire. “The subiect of this my present labour, and the whole desseign of this discourse,” he avers, is to crown “the victorious head of our James, truely *Triumphant*, ouer *Pagan Idolatrie*, and *Popish Heresie*.”

James’s final triumph over Rome will begin with an international alliance. The nature of this union is, at first, ambiguous. In a lengthy preface entitled “To France,” he argues that his book is a direct appeal to the French as well as the British. He writes “to entreat you (good Frenchmen).” He follows this appeal to the French with one to world leaders in general (the “Monarkes, Soueraignes, Chiefe Iudges of the World, to whom the Iustice of heauen hath giuen absolute power, and Scepters to gouerne the wide Vniuerse”). He proposes that European leaders work out their religious differences and unite their people into a

---

49 Ibid., O3v-O4r. He refers to James as Defender of the Faith several times in *Triumphs*, as when he discusses the Gunpowder Plot: “This is the magnificent furnishment, which the reformed religion hath provided for him, as being due to the Preseruer of her Sacred priuiledges, and to the Guardian of her intire purity. To the end, that he shold be acknowledged through the whole world, for Defender of the Faith, and appeare dreadfull to his enemies, as the ouer-commer of *Monsters*” (C4v-D1r). He argues that the number of times James has been saved from Catholic attempts on his life is proof that God has appointed him to be the champion of reformed religion: “the very blindest will bee enforced to confesse, considering the assistaunce of God in all his actions, and how he hath preserued him from so many dangers, euen by extraordinarie maruels: wherefore (by good right) he deserueth to be accounted, *The King of wonders*” (H3v). Of course, Marcelline interprets defender of the faith to be the Protestant faith. The original title was given to Henry VIII for defending the Roman faith.

50 Ibid., B3v.

51 Ibid., B1v, B3v, & B4r. He later again addresses Frenchmen, saying, “The courteous and Charitable Frenchman, in considering the good and free will, wherewith I march on in this matter, and for his instruction; will amiably correct the Errours of my Penne and the Presse, which manie (in like fauour) haue amended in our Language” (C1r).

52 Ibid., F2r & F3r.
“seam-lesse Garment of our Lord.”\textsuperscript{53} He urges them to hold “a good, free, and lawfull Counsell,” in which they “compound all these dissentions and differences in Religion: as being (at all times) the onely ordinary meanes, to abolish Schisms, disanull Heresies, and to reforme whatsoeuer is amisse in Ecclesiasticall Discipline.”\textsuperscript{54} While Marcelline appears to be advocating the formation of an international, cross-confessional alliance, his ultimate aim, it becomes clear, is to reconcile different sects of Protestants. Ecclesiastical discipline suggests agreement on objectives and the political success of a Protestant alliance.

Marcelline proposes that Protestant rulers convene a “National councel, or one Oecumenical or Vniuersall” that would bring together the various Protestant sects, forming a pan-European Protestant union and bringing about “the very finall cutting off, of all our pretended Romaine Catholiques.”\textsuperscript{55} Moreover, he then specifies that the Frenchmen he addresses are his co-religionists. Appealing to “Religious French-men,” he calls specifically to the Huguenots.\textsuperscript{56} He repeatedly describes the pope as the Anti-Christ, as when he urges all Christian kings to “Cast off the yoak of the Antechrist, who cowardly abuseth the Authority to you committed.”\textsuperscript{57} Offering the pope as a common

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., F2r & F3r.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., F3v.

\textsuperscript{55} Marcelline, M4v. He looks forward to “the dayes [which] are coming, when God will punish the grauen Images of Babylon, that hee will make all her Countrie ashamed, and will cause al the wounds of death to fall in the midst thereof” (O4v).

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., B3v.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., F3r. He also prays for “deliuerance out of the hands of cruell Antichrist,” anticipates “the destruction of Antechrist,” cites “the Tiranny of Antichrist,” and praises “he, who shewes vs Antichrist, by the fiue markes of the Apocalypse: First, \textit{That he is an Idolater}, secondly, \textit{a Murderer}, thirdly, an Empoysoner, fourthly, \textit{a whore}, fiftly, \textit{a Thiefe}; And that it is hee, who shall at length Triumph ouer Pope Paul the fift” (C4r, E2v, E3v). Marcelline looks forward to “the diminishing and fall of the kingdome of Antechrist” (K3v).
threat, he warns that they must stop him or “This Tyraunt . . . [will] gurmundize and deuoure vp all the Estates of Christendome.” After all, the pope has licensed the murder of kings by his refusal to allow Catholics to take the Oath of Allegiance. He warns all “Great-Soueraignes” that they “can be no longer assured safely, neither in your Pallaces & Cittadels, nor of the faith of your household seruants, or those you put most trust in . . . [because the pope has licensed] publique murders, and assassinates.” Protestant princes must respond to this threat, uniting under James “to cleanse the world of all Idolatry, Heresie, Error, and ignorance.”

Marcelline insists that James lead the Protestant alliance, claiming that God has chosen him rather than Henry to do so. He encourages Henry to be patient, telling him to “neuer feare that the victories of MY KING [James] will leaue you nothing to conquer.” However, this particular victory will be James’s, he “whom God hath heer established vpon earth, and hath made choice of at this instant for thy deliuerance out of the handes of cruell Antichrist.” In selecting James, God has appointed a scholar, a

---

58 Ibid. As well as the antichrist, “the Pope himselfe” is a “Tyraunt ouer so many Nations” (F1r). Marcelline frequently refers to the pope as a tyrant, indirectly suggesting that the arguments for regicide against a tyrant apply in the case of the pope. For example, he asserts that “All the world is in a shiuering, so highly is it offended at his Tyranies” (F3r). (Juan Mariana had argued that subjects had a right to rebel against tyrants, inspiring a number of regicide treatises which will be addressed later in the chapter.)

59 Ibid., F2v. Later, he accuses the pope of seating himself “in the Temple of God, aboue God, & all that is called God, to make thyselfe honoured as God. Thou that sayest thou hast power to bind Kings, to tie them in Chaines of Iron, to bereaue (& at thy pleasure) to take away their Crownes, to breake their Scepters, trample on their Crownes, to giue their kingdoms as preyes, or otherwise to dispose of them, to disoblige their subiects from their oath of fidelity and obedience” (P1r).

60 Ibid., G3v. James’s apology, Marcelline contends, “awaketh and exhorteth [all kings], to maintaine and defend themselues altogether with him, against the attentates and vsurpations of the Pope” (F1v).

61 Ibid., M2v-M3r.

62 Ibid., C4r. He repeats the claim that James has been specially chosen by God a number of times. For example, he avers that James has been “called of God, to couer, not onely the members of his owne estate from the Tiranny of Antichrist, but likewise those people that are strangers, and of other Countries” (E3v). Later, he writes that God has determined “the extermination of Antichrists race, by that of Steuart, to
man to whom Marcelline refers as “My Learned King.” He expands upon this epithet at length and argues that James’s “Learning and Knowledge” have prepared him to challenge Rome through diplomacy. Significantly, one of the main lessons that James learned is that the best way to deal with rebellions is to educate the rebels. Rather than attack dissidents, James teaches them: “instruct[ing] stout Rebels, giving them lessons of dutie, and apprehensions, how to liue according to his Lawes.” Above all, his scholarship has taught him the value of peace “And therefore wee see him, not running, like Aratus, with a drawne sword in his hand, vpon the Wals of Rome, and to the Tyrants gate, to take reuenge in his iust displeasure, but seated. . . . Hee is seated, to bee (as yet) peaceable, the Sword hanging but by his side.”

Marcelline acknowledges that Henry has no wish to wage war with words, presenting him as his father’s opposite. Unlike his father, Henry eagerly embraces the sword:

This young Prince is a warrior alreadie, both in gesture and countenance, so that in looking on him, he seemeth vnto vs, that in him we do yet see 

_Aiay_ before _Troy_, crowding among the armed Troops, calling vnto them, 

that he may ioyne body to body with _Hector_, who standes trembling with

---

63 Ibid., N1r.
64 Ibid., D2v.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid., D2v-D3r. Marcelline compares James with the Gunpowder Plotters to highlight his virtues. Whereas the Catholics are underhanded and cruel, James “encounter[s] his enemies alone, the edge of his sworde being rebated, the point broken off, his match not fyred, his powder wet, his Ordinance out of carriage, their mouths empty of fire or Salt-Peter, only to fight against them with the Armes of Iustice” (D2r).
chill-cold feare, to see him seek to determine the difference in the inclosed Field or Lists. Hee can neuer permit, that anie other should step before him in an occasion so remarkable. Honour was all his nouriture, and Greatnesse his pastime (as it was saide of Alexander) and Triumph the ordinary end of al his Actions. 67

In contrasting James the scholar with Henry the soldier, Marcelline evokes what by 1610 had become their standard public images. He also speaks directly to real-life disagreement between Henry and James on foreign policy, specifically on how to establish a pan-European Protestant alliance and what its agenda should be. As discussed in chapter one, James believed that the primary purpose of such a union should be defensive, serving as a deterrent to the pope’s ambitions. His efforts towards achieving it were diplomatic, consisting, in 1606 for example, entirely of discussions (in person and via letter). 68

Henry, on the other hand, believed that a pan-European religious union should be offensive and directly attack Catholic powers. 69 He wanted to establish himself at the head of this alliance, a goal he sought to achieve through military action. After Henry’s death, the Venetian Ambassador Antonio Foscarini reported that Henry “was athirst for glory if ever any prince was. He lent fire to the King in the affairs of Germany, and aspired to be head of the confederate princes who include fourteen of the Hanseatic

67 Ibid., L3v-L4r.

68 See chapter one.

69 For more on the Henry’s policies, especially his enthusiasm for an “anti-Habsburg crusade” and his desire to intervene militarily in Europe, see Strong, esp. 71-85, and Williamson, 139-42.
Henry supposedly planned to join the Protestant princes of Europe in their struggle against the Habsburgs for control of Cleves and Jülich to gain their attention in the hope of one day becoming their leader. Henry was kept apprised of developments on the ground, receiving reports from the commander of the British troops. Upon learning of Henri IV’s death, it was claimed that Prince Henry revealed that he had been about to join him on his march to Cleves. On 15 June 1610, Foscarini recorded a conversation between himself and the secretary of the English Embassy in which he learned “that when the Prince of Wales (Gales) heard of the death of the King he remarked that one of his chief projects, which he never communicated to any one, was now destroyed; for he had resolved to serve under his Most Christian Majesty whenever he marched on Cleves.” The politician Sir Robert Naunton confirms this account, writing to Ralph Winwood of Henry’s “secret design . . . [now] abortive . . . [to join with] Henry the 4th of France.” The princes of the Protestant Union had looked favorably on Henry, preferring his leadership to that of Henri IV. Giovanni Francesco Marchesini, a Venetian resident in Milan, had written the Doge in April of 1610 to say that “though the

70 Horatio Brown, 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. 1610-1613 (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1905), Vol. 12, 450.

71 Sir Edward Cecil, commander of the English forces in Cleves, wrote Henry because he “desired from him an account of the transactions in those parts” (Birch, 198).

72 Horatio Brown, 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. 1607-1610 (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1904), Vol. 11, 506. Thomas Birch offers support of this claim, writing that “The murder of Henri IV of France by Ravaillac on the 4th of May, O. S. 1610, was a severe shock to the Prince, who had always had the highest esteem of the heroic qualities of that monarch, as the latter had a reciprocal regard for his Highness, and such a confidence in him, that one of our historians assures us, that he had seen papers, which make it more than probable, that the Prince was not only acquainted with the secret design of the King’s vast preparations, made by him some time before his death, but likewise engaged in it” (189).

Protestant Princes of Germany wish to lower the House of Austria they have no desire to aggrandize France. They would rather have no head, but if they must have one they would be inclined to the Prince of England [Henry].”\textsuperscript{74} During a key moment in the Cleves and Jülich crisis, then, the German princes imagined Prince Henry as head of the Protestant Union specifically as a way to manage France.

Marcelline argues that Henry must put aside these military ambitions and recognize that he is duty-bound to honor his father. “His [Henry’s] desires,” Marcelline argues, are “impeached by a much stronger desire, and his deuoire retarded by a Naturall dutie, and by an obedience, which in this occasion only is contrary, and contrary to his owne affection.”\textsuperscript{75} In other words, Henry’s responsibility as a son prevents him from developing into the best version of him, retarding his “devoir” or “that which one can do, (one’s) utmost or best.”\textsuperscript{76} Marcelline advises patience, reminding him that there may be a future time when he will engage in military actions: “let it not be imagined, that the execution of great desseignes, are vtterly lost by deference and delay. Deferred, not in regarde of weakenesse or impuissance, but referred to fit season, to do nothing against the order of Nature, or contrarie to the will of his father.”\textsuperscript{77} Again, he emphasizes the importance of honoring his father’s wishes, as he does when he envisions the father and son working in concert:

\textsuperscript{74} CSP, Venice, Vol. 11, 467.

\textsuperscript{75} Marcelline, L3v-L4r.

\textsuperscript{76} OED.

\textsuperscript{77} Marcelline, L3v-L4r. He even offers to follow Henry into battle in the future: “And beleue, that as one of yours, you shall finde me readier to lay hand on my sword for you, then on my pen, and would rather spend my blood then mine Inke, for your honour and seruice, in al, and by all” (A2r).
In fights, the disposition and order must be committed to his [James’s] judgement, and his judgement must bee referred to the execution of your sword, against all Refractaries. Yours shall bee the arme and strength, but his the head and Counsel; Yours the paine and endeouer, his the effect; Yours the Action, but he the Agent: You for him, & he for you, and you and hee ioyntly together, shall win an immortall glory; to the end, that al the world may see you in effect after the same manner, as one figured Caesar, aloft, deposing or treading a Globe vnder him, holding a book in one hand, and a sword in the other: so that it may be saide to you, That for the one & other you are a Caesar.\(^{78}\)

Henry defends James against all “refractories” or people “refusing compliance with the political authority.”\(^{79}\) In Marcelline’s imagination, James and Henry complete one another, functioning in a symbiotic relationship and forming the perfect government.

Henry and James defeat Rome, becoming “one figured Caesar,” by following a pacific policy. James wages war not with swords, but with words. “With his pen onely,” James can defeat “the Tyranies of the Antichrist.”\(^{80}\) Marcelline imagines the final showdown between James and the Pope to be a battle of books. He translates a prophesy that predicts the fall of Rome—“Miserum inde tempus quia linum, ipsum perdet”—as “Miserable in time shall he be, because of linen or a Lyne shall destroy him. By Linnen his Maiesties Booke [Triplici Nodo] is vnderstoode, the Paper whereof is made of olde

\(^{78}\) Ibid., M2v-M3r.

\(^{79}\) OED.

\(^{80}\) Ibid., H3r.
There is no need for military combat because James’s *Apologie* is powerful enough to defeat his enemies. Marcelline reclaims the hard-line Protestant position—the fall of the Roman Empire—for those who promote diplomacy, particularly through the circulation of texts.

Marcelline also associates his pacific policy with a British national agenda, promoting his plan as one that will also ensure safety and peace for Great Britain. Having offered James as a model for Henry, he then depicts him as a king entirely devoted to Britain and devoid of international aspirations:

Yet it cannot be said of *Our King*, seeing hee contents himself with a small circumference, not insulting vpon his Neighbors or Strangers. Neuer did any man hear in him, that ouerbold wish of the Emperor *Maximilian* (by the report of *Phillip de Commines*) to bee a God, *And that his Sonne might be King of France*. His desire, and the chiepest degree of his Title, is to be called King of Great *Brittain*.

Marcelline thus equates James’s diplomatic measures with his commitment to Britain. The “fruitfull desseigne” Marcelline promotes is for “the honour of God, and the safety of the King, for the conversion or confusion of all our papists, and for the quiet of our Countrey.” Importantly, it will help solidify the Union of Great Britain, strengthening the religious unity upon which the Union relies. For Marcelline, “*Scotland* and *England* are in such sort marrieed together at this instant, by mutuall loue in a true, pure, and

---

81 Ibid., E2v.
82 Ibid., O2r.
83 Ibid., N1r, emphasis mine.
sincere Religion, liuing also together in one faith, vnnder one King and Law.’”\textsuperscript{84} However, Henry’s presence in Britain, at least for the present, is crucial for success. “\textit{My Lord the Prince of Wales,}” Marcelline argues, “not only makes \textit{Scotland} happy, but al \textit{Great Britaine}, whereon dependeth their peace and \textit{freedom} from strife (euen as the presence of the \textit{Halcions} do make the Sea calme, & commodious for Nauigation).”\textsuperscript{85} Marcelline advises Henry that by remaining in Britain and choosing a peaceful course of action, he will be placing concern for Britain above his international ambitions. He advocates the formation of a Protestant alliance, led by James, which spreads Protestantism and defeats the Holy Roman Empire through peaceful means. Henry’s role is to support his father, fulfilling his duty as both a son and subject.

Tourval and Militant Cross-Confessionalism

Like Marcelline, Jean l’Oiseau de Tourval used the Oath controversy to advocate forming a pan-European union led by Britain and France, but unlike Marcelline, he proposes that the alliance be cross-confessional. Though a self-described “strong Protestant,” he petitions both Catholic and Protestant countries to unite in a fight against the Pope, whom he blames for the assassination of Henri IV.\textsuperscript{86} He calls upon the people

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., G3r.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., I

\textsuperscript{86} Tourval, Flr. After François Ravaillac assassinated Henri IV, printed works attributing responsibility to Catholics soon appeared along with rebuttals such as the English Jesuit Thomas Owen’s \textit{A Letter of a Catholike Man Beyond the seas, written to his friend in England: Including Another of Peter Coton Priest, of the Society of Iesus, to the Queene Regent of France. Translated out of French into English. Tovching The imputation of the death of Henry the IIII, later K. of France, to Priests, Iesuites, or Catholike doctrine} (Saint Omer: English College Press, 1610). Owen seems to have been Tourval’s English counterpart. He
of Italy (the “true remnant of those old euer-liuing Troians”) as well as of Germany (the “right honest Sycambrians”), France, and Britain (“yonder fortunate Ilands”) to fight “for the publique good of all Christendome.”

They must join together, Tourval asserts, to put downe “the Tyranny of Rome.” Yet the “tyrant” he focuses on is less religious than political, or jurisdictional. Tourval argues that “The matter is of State, not of Religion,” assuring Catholics, in particular the Italians, that they “shall be still as good Catholicks” if they join together and challenge the Pope. He claims that Henri’s death has proven the ineffectiveness of diplomacy. For Tourval, “the sword, the sword must cut the knots of this busines.”

He exhorts Prince Henry to take command of the army, following the example of the murdered Henri IV. Reminding Henry of his French ancestry, he recounts the close relationship between King Henri and Prince Henry and offers Henri as an alternate model to James. He then constructs a narrative in which Henry picks up where Henri left off, leading a cross-confessional army to challenge the pope.
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87 Tourval, G2v, G2r, F2v, & F4r. Julius Caesar identifies the Sycambrians as a race of people living near the Rhine in The Gallic Wars.
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89 Ibid., G4v. He emphasizes that the conflict between the Pope and Henri was not one of religious differences, identifying Henri as a true Catholic and recounting his conversion from Protestantism: “He had wonderful smal meanes when he came to the crown, and no better friend but Dieu & son droît, with his owne sword; he was of a religion contrary to that which was formerly professed in his kingdome: he had not only the bodies, but, which is worse, harts, mindes, and soules, strongly preoccupied, & wholly bent against him: all which oppositions he must needs ouercome one by one: And howbeit in the end he setled his affaires, & was a better Catholique then the Pope himself” (C2v).
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Tourval proposes that Britain lead a “Christian army.”91 Directly addressing James and Henry, he argues that they should head the effort for “Our case, our cause is your owne.”92 He paints a picture of the political scene in Europe prior to the death of Henri IV: James and Henri upholding the rights of kings in defiance of the pope. With Henri dead, there is no one left to stand between James and the pope. Henri had been James’s “strong bullworke, the Rampier of Christendome.”93 Henri’s death has emboldened their mutual enemies and placed James in a precarious position. Tourval cautions James that “Ere it be long, the enemy will giue you a furious, if not treacherous, assault.”94 He argues that the pope had Henri killed in order to prevent him from attacking the Catholic Habsburg Empire. At the time of his assassination, Henri had formed an alliance with the United Provinces of the Netherlands and Protestant Union and was on the verge of joining them in military action against the Habsburgs in the Cleves-Julich crisis. He was murdered “as he was going, as a mighty whirl-wind to ouerthrow al his enemies.”95 Tourval connects the moment of the assassination itself with Henri’s plans to overthrow the Habsburgs: “When he receaued the blow, he was reading a letter from the Arch-duke, who offered him passage for his Army, and to defray all charges through his Country.”96 Henri was killed because when he abandoned pacific

91 Ibid., A2v.
92 Ibid., G2r-v.
93 Ibid., G2r.
94 Ibid., G2r-v.
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policies, he posed a real threat to his enemies. War, in other words, is the only way to defeat the pope.

Like Marcelline, Tourval looks to Prince Henry, “one of the chiepest leaders” in Europe, to command this international coalition. At the time Tourval wrote The French Herald, the new French king, Louis XIII, was nine years of age and too young to rule. (His mother, Marie d’Medici, was ruling France as regent.) Speaking directly to Louis, Tourval writes, “Ah, Sir, I can well tell what we want; nine or ten yeares more & nothing els: & you should haue had them for vs, if that vnhappy wretch [Ravallaic] had not so vntimely preuented the natural death of your healthful father.” Positing the need for a leader, Tourval turns to an appropriately aged prince: the seventeen-year-old Henry Stuart. In May of 1610, Henry had been formally invested as Prince of Wales in a ceremony that officially established him as an adult. Tourval recognizes his new status, reminding Henry of the “many promises, so kindly made to me since you are a man.” He encourages Henry to fulfill these promises by becoming the “Generall” of this “Christian army.”

Recognizing that encouraging Henry to take up arms contravenes James’s irenic policies, Tourval argues that King Henri’s death has dramatically changed the circumstances in Europe. While war is now necessary, James need not become

\[\text{footnotes}\]
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99 Henry was invested on 4 May 1610, and the public celebrations took place from 31 May through 5 June 1610 (David Bergeron, “Creating Entertainments for Prince Henry’s Creation (1610),” Comparative Drama 42, no. 4 [Winter 2008]: 435-6). For more on the investiture, see Williamson, 63-70.
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personally involved in the war, because he can send his son in his stead. Addressing James, he says, “need you not much trouble your selfe; you need not stirre out of your royall Whitehall; There we wil send you the newes of the ruine of your Enemies: Your arms are long enough to chastise them all a farre off; most especially your right Arme . . . [your] sonne.” Employing this image of James and Henry as part of one body, he emphasizes the connection between them at the same time that he envisions them working separately (Henry will be “farre off”). Tourval shows James and Henry in a symbiotic relationship, one which he again proposes when he claims that the roles in which James and Henry are traditionally depicted—scholar and soldier—are not opposing but complementary. Tourval describes James as the “Bright morning-starre of humane learning, holy Oracle of heauenly wisdome, purified light of the finest and most refined iudgements.” He acknowledges that book learning is necessary for princes, but says that scholarly pursuits are suited only to times of peace, for “in peace, [they are] honorable, delightfull, needful.” The exigency of the current situation requires learning to be set aside, since “As times stand now, as vrgent occasions require . . . [Henry is] learned enough for a Prince; and if any Prince in the world euer had lesse need of learning it is [him].” Telling Henry not to “molder any longer among . . . [his] bookes,” Tourval declares that “the quarter is broken, the bloody Trumpet hath sounded; true & mortall warre is open” and urges Henry “to put on . . . Armour.”
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Here Tourval must tread delicately, especially in light of his patronage relationship with James. He flatters James while encouraging Henry to strike out on his own, proposing that Henry act on his father’s behalf, giving himself “wholly to be ruld, as a second wheele, as an inferior Globe, by that first motor, by that heauen of wisedome, by that matchless Father of [his, who] . . . hath learning enough for [them] both.”107 Yet when Tourval expatiates upon Henry’s involvement in the war it becomes clear that he envisions Henry functioning independently from his father: “Wherein, if it be not your selfe (vnder the happy auspices of your glorious father, or rather hee himselfe by you) then I see no Generall in the world, when our Christian Army must come into the field.”108 His parenthetical statement highlights not only that there are multiple sources of authority in England, but also that the power shifts between/among them. Tourval indicates that in any situation, Henry is required for James’s involvement. If Henry were to have his freedom (“to haue himself”), Tourval argues, he would “come to vs.”109 In this configuration, James grants Henry his freedom and Henry, in turn, forms an alliance with the French. The changing language, from “you” to “com[ing] to us,” shifts the focus from Henry to the French and then links Henry to France.

Considering appropriate models for Henry, Tourval turns from King James to his predecessors on the English throne—yet the only English king he names as exemplary is one he identifies as French: Richard I, also known as Richard the Lion-heart or “Coeur de Lion.” While Richard was well-known as the embodiment of chivalric ideals, he was
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also a king of England who spoke little English and spent the majority of his reign living outside of England.¹¹⁰ Tourval beseeches Henry to look at

The noble presidents of your royall Ancestors . . . Do you not among

many heare the mighty voice of that braue Coeur de Lyon, a Frenchman

by father and mother, and the first Prince, orderly born English, since the

conquest? How strongly doth he call vpon you?¹¹¹

Though he describes Richard as having been born English orderly or “according to established order or rule,” he characterizes Richard I as a Frenchman.¹¹² He also refers to Richard only in French (as “Coeur de Lyon”), further emphasizing his connections with France. Like Richard, Henry will undertake “a generall Croisade, for a holy war against the great Enemy of Christendome.”¹¹³ But whereas Richard fought in Jerusalem, Henry will fight in Rome. For Henry, “the holy land is by two third parts nearer then it was then; A most fit, a most holy, a most easy subiect of your conquest . . . And what land now in the world, more *sacer*; more holy-then holy Rome.”¹¹⁴ The Crusades exemplified the concept of a holy war and was the Catholic Church’s battle against infidels.

Significantly, Tourval appropriates the language of the Crusades for Protestantism, pitting Protestants as the heroes fighting for religious truth and Catholics as the infidels.

¹¹⁰ For a recent and comprehensive study of Richard that explores his reputation as the embodiment of chivalry, see Jean Flori, *Richard the Lionheart: King and Knight*, trans. Jean Birrell (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

¹¹¹ Tourval, G1v.

¹¹² *OED*.

¹¹³ Tourval, G1v.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. His choice of “sacer” rather than sacred here is interesting, as he could be referring to either the Latin “sacer” or the French “sacré.” If he means “sacré,” this is another example of Tourval associating Henry with France.
Tourval then offers Henry a series of French kings as exemplars. Defined by their willingness to go to war and martial exploits, these kings are the antithesis of Henry’s father James. Whereas Tourval had imagined James sitting in Whitehall, eschewing action, he praises the kings of France for their willingness to act outside their countries. He envisions James “not stir[ing] out of your royall Whitehall,” but sitting there receiving “newes of the ruine of your Enemies” (F4r).

“The Kings of France,” he argues, “haue sought it [war] in the remotest Affrick, carried it into the very hart of Asia, euer returning victorious, & triumphing ouer their utmost extremeties.” Like these brave and courageous kings, Henri IV inspired “the feare and terror of his Enemies.” Tourval notes that when Henri prepared for war, he “held the whole world at a bay.” He reiterates that Henri wielded great power, emphatically stating that “He that was immediatly to march forth with that fearefull Army, which threatned to stampe all his Enemies to pouder!” Tourval offers the dead King Henri as an alternative to James, describing him as an excellent monarch who thrived without book-knowledge, “a great Captaine & a great King, though not a great Scholler.”

Averring that King Henri was a second father to Prince Henry, Tourval presents him as more than just an alternative model of monarchy. He literally would have been a replacement for James: “They have killed your valorous God-father, who missed to kill
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your selfe; yeah euem him who by mutual agreement was appointed to be your second father by your first, if the vnhappy blow had lighted vpon him."121 Here Tourval refers to a particular arrangement between James and Henri; that if one should die, the other would protect his children. Pietro Contarini, Venetian Ambassador in France, reported a meeting between the British ambassador Sir Thomas Edmondes, the queen regent Marie de Medici, and King Louis XIII. Edmondes, needing to speak of “most important affairs,” began by reminding their majesties of the special nature of the relationship between James and Henri IV. “King Henry and the king of Great Britain,” he said, had such confidence in one another that they “entered upon an agreement that if either of them should perish the survivor should protect the children of the other.”122 However, it is not the close relationship between James and Henri to which Tourval refers, but that between King Henri and Prince Henry. Tourval repeatedly configures Henri as Prince Henry’s father. First, he shows him naming the prince:

And you martial Henry, Henry, doth not your hart rise, at that great name?

Doe you not remember who gaue it you? as though our great HENRY would not grace with it other then great Princes, and such as he fore-knew, would be most worthy of the same.123

Then, he argues that King Henri purposefully guided his education, molding the prince in his own image. He claims that the “innocent plaies” which King Henri had encouraged Prince Henry to engage in were “still . . . sauouring of warre or learning” and deliberately
intended to “recreate and stir vp . . . [his] minde, while . . . [he was] a childe.”124 In April of 1606 when King Henri sent Antoine Lefèvre de la Boderie to Britain as his ambassador, he “gave him direction to pay on all occasions a particular respect to the Prince.”125 Writing to Nicolas Neufville III, better known as Monsieur de Villeroy, the French Secretary of State, La Boderie described Henry as “a Prince, who promises very much, and whose friendship cannot but be one day of advantage, I think it highly proper to cultivate it, and to manage it early by all means.”126 According to ambassadorial reports and exchequer records, King Henri had fostered a special relationship with the prince, sustaining an active correspondence, sending him letters and gifts throughout his youth. These gifts, arms and horses, which would have resulted in the “innocent plaies” that Tourval describes, were training Henry for war. Over the years, King Henri had sent him a riding master, suit of armor, horses, pistols, and a sword.127 This outfitting was a form of molding the prince into his own image.

Likening Prince Henry’s “father-son” relationship with King Henri to that of a subject with his king, Tourval pictures their relationship as having been a political one. Whereas Marcelline had compelled Henry to do his duty to his father James, Tourval entreats him to do his duty to Henri and perform “the greatest, most Christian and most
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124 Ibid.
125 Birch, 67.
127 See La Boderie’s letter to Villeroy in which he discusses the progress the riding master had made with Henry and requests the French court to send “a suit of amour well gilt and enameled, together with pistols and a sword of the same kind: and . . . a couple of horses” (Birch, 69-70). He claims that such gifts “will be a singular favour done to the Prince” (Ibid., 70).
"royall duty that euer was yielded." Prince Henry himself had characterized his relationship with King Henri as that of a son with his father. In 1606, the prince wrote to the French king, "acknowledging the truly paternal affection, which that King had several years before testified for him, and confirmed since from time to time by many obligations and courtesies; the sense of which had raised in his mind a singular respect and reverence for that King." By the time of Henri’s death in 1610, their relationship had grown. According to contemporary reports, Henry reacted to news of the king’s death by taking to his bed for several days, crying "My second father is dead." Tourval uses Henry’s filial feeling for King Henri to create a sense of obligation between Henry and France. Asseverating that the prince had viewed Henri as his father, he urges him to action: “Come & auenge the death of your royall God-father, & withall, remember your owne father was killed so." While this petition attests to the close relationship between the king and the prince, it also places the prince in the position of a French subject, a comparison all the more obvious because it follows a similar plea to the people of France. Earlier in the text, he had addressed the French, writing in “an yron-voyce” for the purpose of “stir[ring] them vp . . . to a bloody anger . . . [and] iust reuenge." They must, he argues, avenge the death of their father, being “not as a Lyonesse, nor as a
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Tygresse, rob’d of their deere yong ones, but as deere children trayterously depriued of
their deerest father.”133 The day King Henri died, “Frenchmen lost their King, Fraunce
her father.”134 Tourval asks Henry to acknowledge that he too is French, at least in part.
Reminding Henry of his French ancestry, he exhorts him to avenge King Henri’s death,
“If yet you haue a drop of French blood.”135 By seeking retribution for King Henri’s
death, Prince Henry plays the part not only of his adoptive son, but also of his subject.

Tourval thus engages in a number of strategies designed to associate Prince Henry
with a foreign policy that strongly favored France: proposing French role models for
him, pointing out his French ancestry, enumerating his obligations to King Henri, and
paralleling his position with that of Henri’s subjects. Tourval’s appropriation of Henry is
critical to his project, for he views the war as one which will enable the French to redeem
their national character, saving it from disgrace.136 He equates a failure to revenge Henri
IV’s death with the end of the French nation:

 For if we be so faint-harted, as to suffer those attempts vpon our Princes,

 without making mercilesse vengeance, to light as quickly vpon the

 Authors heads, we are gone for euer; there are no more French in Fraunce,

133 Ibid.
134 Ibid.
135 Ibid., G2v.

136 He argues that France must revenge the death of King Henri or risk falling into the “contempt . . . [of]
all nations” (D3r). Tourval’s determination to save France from shame is suggested by reiterating the
necessity to do so, as when he later questions “What would so many Nations say, which do so honorably
esteeme of the French name, if they should see vs drinke vp such a shame?”(D3v). Tourval evokes
multiple definitions of “name,” both as group identity and as reputation. However, the content of the
sentence—a concern with how other nations view France—suggests that Tourval is primarily concerned
with reputation; the internal rhyme between “name” and “shame” emphasizes the new characteristic by
which the French will be known if they do not take action. For Tourval, what matters is that Henri was
murdered “before the eyes of al the world” (E1r).
no men, no Monarchy, none of that auncient freedome and franchise, from
whence we deriuie our name; there is no Fraunce in the world.¹³⁷

For him, the King is not merely a symbol of France, but the embodiment of what it means
to be French. Not seeking retribution then “would be the shamfultest and greatest
dishonour that euer happened vnto vs, to cover, darken, kill, & bury for euer, the whole
French name, and what-soever glorious we haue done heretofore.”¹³⁸

Tourval expresses his devotion to France, incorporating the prince into rhetoric
intended to show France in a positive light and to interpolate a defender for it. He
conveys pride in France by describing it as rich (“The Bastille is heaped full with it
[money]”), well populated (“Fraunce ouerfloweth with them [men]”), and both politically
and militarily powerful (“Neuer any King had more or better [friends] . . . Neuer
storehouse was better furnished [with arms and munition], both for quantity and
goodnes”).¹³⁹ He proclaims his loyalty to France, labeling himself the “most humble and
faithfull Subiect” of King Louis XIII, referring to the French as his “deere Countrey
men,” and addressing France in an apostrophe as “oh my deere Country.”¹⁴⁰ Throughout
The French Herald, he consistently uses the possessive adjective “my” only in relation to
France, as in the passage just cited. That is, until he speaks to Prince Henry, whom he
hails as “my most noble, my most braue Prince.”¹⁴¹ Tourval thereby folds Henry into his
insistent French patriotism. Henry, modeling himself after the murdered Henri IV, must

¹³⁷ Ibid., D1r.

¹³⁸ Ibid., E1r.

¹³⁹ Ibid., D3v.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., D2r, C1v, & B3r.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., F4r.
lead a cross-confessional army against the pope to avenge his assassination and save France from disgrace.

Re-visioning Henry: the British funeral elegies

On 6 November 1612, Prince Henry, the eighteen-year-old heir to the throne of Britain, died. The country mourned and authors wrote an unprecedented number of funeral elegies. Over fifty works were published in London alone. The London-born poet Richard Niccols composed a poem that is representative of this phenomenon: The Three Sisters Teares. Shed at the Late Solemne Funerals of the Royall deceased Henry, Prince of Wales. Niccols was part of “The brood of Mars,” the faction of militant Protestants in England who hoped that Henry would lead an army to defeat Rome, overthrowing “The Beast of Rome and all her Pride.”

He responds to the debate over Anglo-French policy with an elegy rife with anti-French sentiment. In crafting Henry’s image as a warrior-prince, Niccols compares him
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with King Edward III; Edward, the Black Prince; and King Henry V: three English royals famous for having gone to war against and defeated France. Indeed, his descriptions of the three focus on this aspect of their careers. Niccols holds Edward III as praiseworthy for his “battailes, [which left] . . . Cressies and Poiteres . . . drown’d in blood,” referring to Edward’s most well-known successes in the Hundred Years’ War, a war he instigated by claiming the throne of France. Early on, he won major battles at Crécy and Poitiers, leading the French to sign the Treaty of Britigny (1360), granting him lands and titles in France. Niccols then turns to Prince Edward, Edward III’s son, who had fought on his father’s behalf in France. He lauds the prince for his “victorious Lane” which caused “blacke daies and bloody fieldes in Fraunce,” subduing the “French King John beneath his valor” and alluding to Edward’s famous victory at Poitiers, when he captured John II, the king of France. Moreover, Niccols envisions Henry as imitating Edward’s example: “If Henry liu’d, for hee againe did rayse/ My plume forgot, which Edward crown’d with praise.” Finally, he looks to Henry V, who came the closest to conquering France and is most remembered for having defeated the French at Agincourt in 1415. He attributes Henry V’s importance to his victories in France, noting that the “fame hee woone” was such “That France did stoope, and [stand] at his mercy.”

Defeating France, in other words, is how English leaders establish their power.

Niccols seems anxious to position Prince Henry within a specifically English and anti-French tradition of leadership, envisioning Henry following in the steps of these
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heroes famous for conquering France. He pictures Henry as the ideal warrior-prince. Henry was a “noble youth to warlike practize giuen,” who inspired the “harts” of his people to “leape as high as heauen.” Both learned (he possessed a “riper judgement” in spite of his “vnripe yeeres”) and physically fit (he rode “a war-like steed,/ Like Ioue-borne Perseus”), Henry possessed the ideal combination of attributes for a future military leader. In an acrostic epitaph, Niccols epitomizes Henry’s mytho-poetic status:

Here lies a Prince, that was the Prince of Youth,
Expert in Arts his age doth seldom know,
Noble his Nature, and the shield of Truth,
Religions stedfast friend, and Errors foe;
In Vertues wayes hee kept as he begun,
Even in that path his Royall Sire had done.

Tellingly, Niccols ties this militant Henry with his commitment to religion. If he had not died, he would have led an army “through the crimson paths of warre,/ Against the sonnes of strumpet Babilon . . . to burie all the Pride of Rome.” Anti-France in this characterization is anti-Rome and the image of Henry as a soldier commanding a cross-confessional army to avenge France is lost in the promotion of Henry as military leader challenging the Holy Roman Empire on behalf of Protestantism.

Niccols connects the image of Henry as a soldier with both Protestantism and anti-French sentiment in response to the representational debate I have traced in this
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chapter. Previously, scholars had identified two images of Henry: the peace-maker who promoted religious tolerance like his father and the warrior who would defeat the Holy Roman Empire and ensure the spread of Protestantism. However, writers participating in the debates over the Oath of Allegiance imagine Henry differently. Marcelline promotes a policy of peace, arguing that Protestant princes should unite under James and challenge the Holy Roman Empire through diplomacy. He imagines Henry demonstrating his allegiance to his father and king by supporting this pacific plan. In his vision, peace leads to the success of the Protestant faith. Tourval envisions Henry as the leader of a cross-confessional army, defeating the Holy Roman Empire in combat. The image of Henry as a warrior thus becomes separated from the Protestant cause. Both men’s visions are tied to the relationship they imagine between Henry and France—whether he will keep France at a distance, embracing only his co-religionists the Huguenots (Marcelline) or develop closer connections with France, embracing both Catholics and Protestants (Tourval). Niccols recognizes France as the critical factor in this change in images of Henry and responds by connecting Henry’s militant Protestantism with anti-French rhetoric.

Contested Henry

In this chapter, I have argued that there was a historically specific reason for British writers to insist on Henry’s dedication to Britain. The British were right to be concerned. At the time of Henry’s death, he was reported to be preparing for military
intervention on the continental mainland. The Venetian Ambassador Antonio Foscarini reported that Prince Henry was on the verge of taking military action when he died:

He has fallen when at the very flower of his high hopes. . . . This death will certainly cause great changes in the course of the world. The foes of this kingdom are freed from a grave apprehension, the friends are deprived of a high hope. His Highness had remarkable decision of character and had acquired weight; he was nearer to taking action than many thought.152

Though it is unclear what Henry was planning, he had promised military aid to France upon learning of King Henri’s assassination. Having learned of Henri’s murder, the prince declared his intention of supporting Louis XIII, saying, “mes armes seront pour lui et contre tous ceux qui lui en voudront [my weapons will be for him and against all those who want to harm him].”153 His use of arms would be for France rather than for Protestantism.

Just before Henry died, he was eagerly preparing for his sister Elizabeth’s wedding to Frederick, Count Palatine. Roy Strong described their marriage as “the apogee of the Prince’s policies,” and contemporaries recorded Henry’s enthusiasm for the match.154 Simonds D’Ewes, for example, writes that,

Frederick, the fifth Prince Elector and Count Palatine of the Rhine, was then newly come over into England to marry the Princess Elizabeth, his [Henry’s] sister, to which match he was a great well-willer, and therefore
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omitted no occasion by which he might express his affection to the said
Elector, or by which he might add the greater honor and solemnity to his
entertainment.155

Upon Henry’s death, many of the people of Britain needed a new hero to replace
the prince. They turned to Elizabeth and Frederick.

---

CHAPTER THREE

A MATTER OF PRECEDENCE:
BRITAIN, GERMANY, AND THE PALATINE MATCH

When Prince Henry, heir to James VI and I, died on 6 November 1612, English Protestants lost their chief champion. The devout Henry had advocated aggression against the Habsburg domination of Europe, maintaining that a pan-European Protestant Union was a necessary counterpoint to their largely Catholic Empire. At that point, the Protestant Union consisted only of German Protestant states who had banded together in 1608 as a defensive measure against the Holy Roman Empire.¹ This confessional alliance eventually included the dukes of Württemberg, Neuburg, and Pfalz-Zweibrücken, and the margraves of Ansbach and Kulmbach, Baden-Durlach, Brandenburg, and Hessen-Kassel. Henry hoped that his sister Elizabeth would marry the leader of the Union, Frederick, Prince Elector and Count Palatine of the Rhine, believing that the marriage would form the foundation of a religious union between England and Germany.²

¹ The German princes formed the Protestant Union in response to Catholic aggression in 1607, when the emperor ordered the Catholic Duke of Bavaria to march into the Imperial City of Donauwörth, technically under the control of the Protestant Duke of Württemberg, and to ban Protestant worship.

² I take “Germany” to mean the German part of the Holy Roman Empire. This was an accepted understanding of “Germany” in the period. For example, Sir Philip Sidney, writing to his brother Robert, discusses Germany as a country alongside France and Spain: “The Countryes fittest for bothe these are those yow are goinge vnto: France aboue all other is moste needfull for vs to marke: especially in the former kinde next is Spaine and the Low Countries then Germany which in my opinion excelles all the other, asmuch in the latter consideracion as the other doe in in the former: yet neyther are voide of neyther. For as Germany (me thinckes) doth notably excell in good Lawes, and well admynistringe of Iustice, Soe are we likewise to consider in yt the many Princes with whome we may haue League” (The Prose Works of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. Albert Feuillerat [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963], Vol. 3, 126). I thank Roger Kuin for this reference.
When Elizabeth wed Frederick on 14 February 1613, their wedding was celebrated in grand style, with festivities in public and at court that cost James alone £93,293. The occasion inspired an outpouring of literary works that frequently depicted their marriage as a metaphor for an international Protestant Union. Scholars have long argued that the entertainments and poems written in celebration of the wedding in 1613 constitute a coherent body of literature promoting Protestant Union, a body to which two later works must be added: Henry Peacham’s *Prince Henry revived* (1615) and Georg Weckherlin’s *Triumphall Shews* (1616). By adding these two later works to the literature on the wedding, this chapter seeks to challenge the belief that the Palatine wedding literature forms a cohesive campaign promoting the Union. Beginning with the wedding literature, I look at how scholars have argued for its cogency as a specialized body of work, identifying common themes. I then turn to the two later works by Peacham and Weckherlin, showing how they both qualify as wedding works and challenge the scholarly consensus that such works share a political vision. Peacham and Weckherlin have completely different visions of an international Protestant Union. In both cases, Princess Elizabeth plays a crucial role in the imagined political alliance and it is by examining their representations of her that we see the critical role played by gender, rank, and genealogy. Returning to the 1613 works written in honor of the wedding, I foreground these concerns in an analysis of one British (Thomas Heywood’s *Marriage Triumph*) and one continental work (Tobias Hübner’s *Beschreibung Der Reiss*), offering a new way to read the wedding literature and the Palatine controversy.
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3 Kevin Curran derived this total from British Library Additional MS 58833, which includes an itemized list of expenses for the wedding (“James I and fictional authority at the Palatine wedding celebrations,” *Renaissance Studies* 20, no. 1 [2006], 51).
Both Peacham’s *Prince Henry revived* and Weckherlin’s *Triumphall Shews* are responses to the Palatine match. As in the wedding literature, Elizabeth and Frederick are representatives of England and Germany, their relationship of a Protestant Union. Peacham and Weckherlin imagine different roles for Elizabeth and Frederick. Focusing on genealogy, rank, and kin, Peacham envisions Elizabeth as the dominant partner; Weckherlin, Frederick. In this, they address an actual conflict between Elizabeth and Frederick, specifically over who would take precedence in public ceremonies. Directed by her father, King James, Elizabeth claimed superiority as a princess, specifically a British princess, which Frederick and the Germans found problematic because they saw her first and foremost as Frederick’s wife. James and Frederick fought for dominance through this disagreement over Elizabeth’s precedence. Peacham and Weckherlin use this conflict to reflect their diverging ideas about Britain and Germany’s roles in an international Protestant Union. Peacham pictures an alliance led by Frederick Henry, Elizabeth and Frederick’s heir. Taking up concerns expressed at the time of the wedding over Frederick’s genealogy, Peacham demonstrates the inferiority of Frederick’s progenitors and current relatives in order to claim him as British. Elizabeth’s superior blood dominates that of the heir, making him, the leader of the Protestant Union, British. In contrast, Weckherlin pictures Frederick, Prince Elector, as the head of a pan-European Protestant Union. He dedicates *Triumphall Shews* to Elizabeth and uses the celebrations of Germanic ancestry, which German readers would have seen as linking being patriotic to Germany with being Protestant, as a defense of Frederick’s genealogy and an assertion of his equality with her. In their different conceptions of the Protestant Union’s leader, they reveal their strong national loyalties: Peacham was English, born in Hertfordshire,
and had close ties to the British royal family, in particular Henry and Elizabeth; Weckherlin was German, born in Stuttgart, and served the Duke of Württemberg as a politician and a poet, first undertaking diplomatic missions and later serving as his secretary interpreter and court historiographer. Their national loyalties reveal international disagreements on how to organize and structure a Protestant Union, a problem crucial to its ultimate failure. This chapter addresses this fundamental problem, in the process demonstrating how the national and gender biases dividing two men’s perceptions of a Protestant royal marriage have significant implications for our understanding of gender, power, and the Protestant Union.

The 1613 Wedding Literature

This wedding literature forms a body of work that is made cohesive through references to contemporary political events and expressions of desire for a pan-European religious alliance. The poems and pamphlets address the death of Prince Henry, offer the happiness of Elizabeth and Frederick’s wedding as a remedy for the sadness of Henry’s passing, proclaim divine sanction for the wedding, present Frederick as a replacement for Henry, and depict the marriage as a symbolic representation of an Anglo-German religious union. The prevalence of the themes speaks to their significance. Henry Peacham even includes them in his *Nuptiall Hymnes*, the only additions he made to an

---

otherwise straightforward translation of Catullus 61. The uniform concern in these texts with Protestantism, religious union, and its representatives is striking, given their authors. They hailed from places as diverse as Gloucestershire (John Taylor), Lincolnshire (Thomas Heywood), Hampshire (George Wither), and Scotland (James Maxwell); held various occupations, including waterman (John Taylor), pamphleteer (Anthony Nixon), playwright (Heywood), poet (Wither), and theologian (Maxwell); and practiced Calvinism to varying degrees of intensity. The Scottish scholar James Maxwell was a strident Calvinist who later supported the Church of England; the English pamphlet-writer Nixon was known for “Rome-baiting,” writing pamphlets such as *Elizae Memoriall: King James his Arrivall, and Romes Downefall* in 1603, and earned a place in Newgate prison for using a forged warrant to arrest a suspected Catholic. They cannot be consistently linked with one political faction at court—indeed, some were in opposing camps. Maxwell supported King James’s policies, “dedicat[ing] his life to promoting James’s Great Britain and the Episcopal church central to its success,” while the English poet George Wither satirized the king, publishing controversial works which landed him

---

5 Virginia Tufte offers a detailed analysis of the changes Peacham made to Catullus (*The poetry of marriage; the epithalamium in Europe and its development in England* [Los Angeles: Tinnon-Brown, 1970], 61). Peacham cuts and abbreviates Catullus, but retains the motif of praising marriage as a means of perpetuating family, state, and community. He omits the chorus of virgins, the *deduction*, and the fescennine verses and abbreviates other sections. He also substitutes Venus for Catullus’s good women and adds Vesper, Cynthia, and Lucina (325).


7 James Maxwell dedicates his epithalamion “To the Right Illvstriovs Hovse of Howards” (*A Monvment of Remembrance, Erected in Albion, in Honor of the Magnificent Departvre from Britannie, and honorable receuuing in Germany, namely at Heidelbergre, of the two most NOble Princes Fredericke, First Prince of the Imperiall bloud, sprung from glorious Charlemaigne, Count Palatine of Rhine, Duke of Bauier, Elector and Arch-sewer of the holy Romane Empire, and Knight of the Renowned order of the Garter & Elizabeth Infanta of Albion, Princesse Palatine, and Duchesse of Bavier, the onely Daughter of our most gratious and Soueraigne Lord Charles-Iames, and of his most Noble and vertuous Wife, Queene Anne* [London: Nicholas Okes for Henry Bell], a1r). Wither attacked the policies of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, Lord Privy Seal, and was probably imprisoned at his instigation. See Allan Pritchard, “Abuses Stript and Whipt and Wither’s Imprisonment,” *Review of English Studies* 14, no. 56 [1963]: 337-45.
in prison on several occasions. Despite such differences, the authors of the wedding literature shared a set of concerns about Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage and a vision of how that marriage might shape the future.

The poems and pamphlets typically begin with the death of one political dream—the world united in Protestantism under the leadership of Prince Henry—and present the wedding as the birth of another: a Protestant alliance led by Frederick and Elizabeth. This theme of death and rebirth manifests itself in several of the poems as a change of seasons, as the death typically associated with winter is exchanged for the rebirth of spring. Peacham refers to Henry’s death as “the wet Winter of our teares,” which will be cured by the “cheerefull Spring” of Elizabeth’s wedding. He makes this connection explicit when he writes that his Muse who was wearing funeral attire (“whilome maskt in sable”) will adorn herself in wedding wear: “Muse . . . strake off this gloomy sorrow, / And a bright saffron roab from Hymen borrow.” A change in attitude accompanies this change of seasons (and clothing), as sorrow becomes happiness. George Wither, in Epithalamia: Or Nyptiall Poems, remarks that the “wofull habits” from Henry’s funeral have been “quite cast off” for the wedding.

---

8 Henry Peacham, The period of mourning Disposed into sixe visions. In memorie of the late prince. Together vth nuptiall hymnes, in honour of this happy marriage betweene the great princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhene, and the most excellent, and abundant president of all virtue and goodnes Elizabeth onely daughter to our soueraigne, his Maiestie. Also the manner of the solemnization of the marriage at White-Hall, on the 14. of February, being Sunday, and St. Valentines day (London: Thomas Snodham for John Helme, 1613), B1r.

9 Ibid., B1r & B2r.

10 George Wither, Epithalamia: or Nyptiall Poems vpon the Most Blessed and Happie Mariage Betweene the High and Mighty Prince Frederick the fift, Count Palatine of the Rhein, Duke of Bauier, &c. and the Most Vertvos, Gracios and Thrice Excellent Princesse, Elizabeth, Sole Daughter to our dread Soueraigne, Iames by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, defender of the Faith, &c. (London: imprinted for Edward Marchant, 1613): “The Sorrowes of the Court I found well cleerd, / Their wofull habits quite cast off” (B1v-B2r).
happy departure from Great Britaine, of the two Paragons of the Christian World.

*Fredericke and Elizabeth*, discusses the remarkable nature of this shift as the mourning for Henry was so great “that Mortall eies did weepe . . . that mortal breasts did grone, / When winds, & waues, could not containe their griefe?”11 Consequently, it was a “wonder” when “wedding ioyes, did weeping woes exile.”12

This “wonder” is attributed to divine forces, who both authors and authorizes the marriage. Augustine Taylor, for example, writes,

> I thinke the Gods (together) haue decreed
> To change our muffled melancholy weed,
> And for our late lamented Funerals,
> Now to erect contented Nuptials;13

John Taylor, in *Triumphall Encomiasticke Verses*, specifies that it is the Christian God who approves the marriage:

> How much we lately were with woes oprest,
> For him* whome Death did late of life bereaue. *Prince Henry
> And in the midst of griefe, and sad vnrest,
> To mirthfull sport he* freely giu’s vs leaue: *God
> And when we all were drench’d in black dispaire,

---


12 Ibid., B3r.

13 Augustine Taylor, *Epithalamium Vpon the All-Desired Nyptials of Frederike the fift, Prince Palatine of Rhene, chiefe Elector, Duke of Bauier, and Arch-Sewer to the Romane Empire. And Elizabeth, The onely daughter of James, by the Grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London: for Samuel Rand to be sold by Edward Marchant, 1613), B3r.
Ioy conquerd griefe, and comfort vanquish’d care.  

Anthony Nixon similarly finds God’s hand in the wedding. In Great Brittaines Generall Ioyes. Londons Glorious Triumphes. Dedicated to the Immortall memorie of the ioyfull Mariage of the two famous and illustrious Princes, Fredericke and Elizabeth, the “sad Funerall . . . now’s transformd to a ioyfull Nuptiall” and their “Nuptiall vnity, [is a] produ’ct from Heauen.” In James Maxwell’s A Monvment of Remembrance, it is not only God who sanctions the marriage, but also the departed Prince Henry. Henry presides over this heavenly affair, encouraging its celebration:

[the] peerelesse Prince Henry seemeth to inuite and adiure all the Worthies of Britannie, by their most ardent loue towards him dead and aliue, to glorifie the day of his deere sisters departure for Germany, that her day may bee as celebrious as euer Gonidla’s was, and more.

His reference to the wedding celebrations of Gunhilda or Cunigunde aligns Elizabeth’s marriage with another famous international alliance and raises expectations for her future. Gunhilda, the daughter of Canute, married Henry, heir to Emperor Conrad II, and, at the time of her wedding, was expected to become the next Empress of the Holy Roman

---

14 John Taylor, Heauens Blessing, and Earths Ioy. or A true relation, of the supposed Sea-fights & Fireworkes, as were accomplished, before the Royall Celebration, of the al-beloved Mariage, of the two peerlesse Paragons of Christendome, Fredericke & Elizabeth (London: Joseph Hunt, 1613), C4v.


16 Maxwell, A3r. During the reign of King Hardacanute his sister Gunilda, “described as being the most beautiful princess of the time,” was sent to Germany to marry the emperor (Emily Bowles, History of England for Catholic Children From the Earliest Times to the Present Day [London: Burns and Lambert, 1850], 70).
Empire.\textsuperscript{17} Likening Elizabeth to Gunhilda, Maxwell suggests that she too may become an empress.

The wedding then represents a divinely ordained transformation from winter to spring, sadness to mirth. This transformation extends to Frederick who has become a replacement for Prince Henry by marrying Henry’s sister: “great Prince Palatine and Prince elector . . . now heauens protector.”\textsuperscript{18} In Allyne’s \textit{Teares of Ioy}, Henry “lies in a timeless tome” and by “dying, did resigne” his place to “Fredricke [who] in his losse, supplies his roome.”\textsuperscript{19} Frederick, having “assum’d his [Henry’s] place” serves as “his other halfe, / Grace of his youth, and glory of his age, / Key of his secret thoughts, his second selfe.”\textsuperscript{20} The mantle of Protestant leadership falls on Frederick as Henry’s “second selfe” and he should rule the Hapsburg Empire with Elizabeth. Allyne paints a picture of the pair seated on “Cesars chaire,” with their son helping them in the capacity of “Arch-sewer.”\textsuperscript{21} Though Henry has died, he is reborn in Frederick.\textsuperscript{22} The idea of Henry, the dream of the ideal Protestant ruler, lives on.

\textsuperscript{17} Maxwell includes a marginal note explaining that “Gonilda the faire, daughter of Canute the Danish King of England, married to Henry the 3. Emperour” (B2r). A later marginal annotation goes into more detail: “William of Malmesberry and Mathew of Westminster in their Histories do make mention of the great magnificence was vsed of the Nobility of England in conueying of Gonilda the faire daughter of the Danish King of England Canute to her ship; it was so great, that they exhausted their whole treasure for costly apparel to themselues, and pretious presents to the Bride at her departure: The Musitians and Minstrels, at feasts and banquets, were always wont to celebrate the stately and Princely pompe thereof in their songs, thinking that they could neuer sufficiently magnifie and extol the same” (B4r).

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., A4v.

\textsuperscript{19} Allyne, B1v.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., B1v.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., B2r. A sewer was “an attendant at a meal who superintended the arrangement of the table, the seating of the guests, and the tasting and serving of the dishes” (\textit{OED}). Addressing Frederick, Allyne writes, “That both together gracing Cesars chaire, / Thy sonne may bee Arch-sewer to his sire” (B2). In other words, Allyne wants Frederick to be Emperor so that when his son inherits his role as Arch-Sewer to the Emperor, he will be serving his father. The title page of James Maxwell’s \textit{A Monvment of}
Elizabeth and Frederick symbolically represent an Anglo-German alliance and, moreover, a Protestant one. Maxwell writes “That of this late Alliance is to bee expected an Union of Northerne Princes”; while Samuel Hutton, in his translation of Maria de Franchis’s *Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage*, begins by saying that “The royall mariage of high consequence: / [is] betwixt a German and the Britaine State.”

Augustine Taylor declares the wedding to be a religious union: So by this marriage, Eccho vnderstands, / ‘Twill make acquainted both the Seas and Lands.” By this joining of lands, “Britaine . . . Hath gained great store of true Christian friends.” John Taylor hopes that their marriage “Christendome to Union brings, / Whose vnitie remoted lands vnites.” Nixon and Wither explicitly express concern over Catholic power in Europe, envisioning the marriage as a means by which Protestants may gain control. Nixon takes a defensive position, envisioning Protestants checking Catholic influence:

And by their match, great Kingdomes are combined:

By it great Britaine, and the Palsgraues Land,

Remembrance proclaims one of Frederick’s titles to be “Elector and Arch-sewer of the holy Romane Empire” (A1r).

22 The fireworks display highlighted the ties between Frederick and Henry because it was “an exactly copy of the one put on at Henry’s creation as Prince of Wales but two years before” (Charles Carlton, *Charles I: the personal monarch*, 2nd ed. [New York: Routledge, 1995], 14). King James even gave Frederick Henry’s star and ribbon of the Garter when inducting him into the Order of the Garter (Carlton, 14).

23 Maxwell, A2v; M. Ioannes Maria de Franchis, *Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage: Betwixt, The High and Mightie Prince, Frederick; Covnt Palatine of Rheine, chiefe Sewer to the sacred Roman Empire, Prince Elector, and Duke of Bavaria, &c. And The most Illustrious Princesse, the Ladie Elizabeth her Grace, sole Daughter to the high and mightie Iames, King of great Britaine, &c.*, trans. Samuel Hutton (London: George Eld for William Blainchard, 1613), B1r.

24 Augustine Taylor, C2r.

25 Ibid., C2v.

26 John Taylor, D1r.
Shall checke the *Popish* pride with fierce Alarne,\textsuperscript{27}

However, Wither pictures Protestants taking the offensive, praying that God will

Make this *Rhyme* and *Thame* an *Ocean*:

That it may with might and wonder,

Whelme the pride of *Tyber* vnder.\textsuperscript{28}

In a marginal note, he clarifies that he means for England and Protestant German princes to join together and take on the Hapsburg Empire, specifying that by Tiber he means Rome as “*Tyber* is the Riuere which runneth by Rome.”\textsuperscript{29} He returns to this point when discussing Frederick and Elizabeth’s legacy. Ideally,

\[
\ldots \text{this will the vniting proue,}\]

\[
\text{Of } \textit{Countries}, \text{ and of } \textit{nations} \text{ by your } \textit{loue}.\]

And that from out your blessed loynes, shall come;

Another terror, to the *Whore of Rome*.\textsuperscript{30}

The wedding literature insists that Prince Henry’s death does not signal the death of continental Protestantism, for Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage anticipates its ultimate triumph.

Though written several years after the wedding, Peacham’s *Prince Henry revived* (1615) and Weckherlin’s *Triumphall Shews* (1616) respond to Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage and share the defining characteristics of the wedding literature, advocating an international Protestant alliance. Peacham and Weckherlin situate the works in a general

\textsuperscript{27} Nixon, A4v.

\textsuperscript{28} Wither, C2v.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., B3r.
tradition of Protestant literature through references to poets such as Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas, Edmund Spenser, and Sir Philip Sidney and in the specific tradition of literature celebrating the Palatine match.\footnote{Peacham cites Du Bartas in his dedication: “neither am I one of those, who haue their wits au bout des doigts, as Du Bartas saith” (A2v). Weckherlin refers to Spenser’s Faerie Queen and Sidney’s Arcadia. For example, he describes the peasants who take part in the tournament as Braggadochio-like: “as for their weapons, they were Braggadocchio-like contented to have staffs, without swords” (L2r). He also finds them to be Dametas-like: “[the men formed] two companies of such Dametas-like gentlemen . . . Some . . . were trimmed with flowers and foxtails, and muffled up like Mopsa was, when she wished to have Dorus a king” (Ibid., L2r). Several scholars have examined Spenser’s influence on Weckherlin’s poetry. Wilhelm Bohm, for example, argues that Weckherlin took Spenser as a model, as is evident in the way he copies Spenser’s ‘To His Book’ from The Shepherd’s Calendar in his prefatory poem to Oden und Gesänge. He also traces the sonnet ‘Traum’ in Welliche Gedichte to Spenser’s The Ruines of Time. See Wilhelm Bohm, “England Einfluss aud Georg Rudolf Weckherlin” (PhD diss, Göttingen, 1893) and Georg Rudolf Weckherlins Gedichte, herausgegeben von Hermann Fischer (Tübingen: University of Tübingen, 1894-5). Most scholars agree with Bohm on these two examples, but have found his other evidence of Spenser’s influence on Weckherlin unconvincing. L. E. Kastner reviews studies of Weckherlin’s sources in “Georg Rudolf Weckherlin’s Models,” MLA 10 (1915): 366-372. Thomas Borgstedt examines the relationship between Spenser’s sonnets and Weckherlin’s (“Georg Rodolf Weckherlins Buhlereyen-Zyklus und sein Vorbild bei Edmund Spenser,” Arcadia 29, no. 3 [1994]: 240-66).}

Peacham employs the same themes as the wedding literature: the joy of Elizabeth’s wedding as a replacement for the sorrow of Henry’s death, God’s authorship of the match, and the marriage as a metaphor for religious union. He begins Prince Henrie revived with a dedicatory poem to Elizabeth, the first line of which recalls the poem he wrote for her marriage, The Period of mourning Disposed into sixe visions. In memorie of the late prince. Together with nuptial hymnes, in honour of this happy marriage betwene the great princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhene, and the most excellent, and aboundant president of all virtue and goodnes Elizabeth onely daughter to our soueraigne, his Maiestie: “Dear Henry's Loss, Eliza's wedding day,/ The last, the first, I sorrowed and song.”\footnote{Peacham, The period of mourning, A3v.} In Nuptial hymnes, it was the physical joining together of Elizabeth and Frederick that Rome feared, their
“Bridall-bed,/ Of none saue Tyber enuyed.”\(^{33}\) Prince Henry revived celebrates the product of their “Bridall-bed”—it is a poem in honor of the birth of their first son, Frederick Henry (born 14 January 1614). For Peacham, he represents their marriage and the union: the literal combining of Britain and Europe, of “the Saxon line . . . Norman Ancestors . . . Scottish Kings . . . Denmarke.”\(^{34}\) Frederick Henry embodies union.

Whereas Peacham implicitly marks his work as part of the wedding literature by picking up its themes and message, Weckherlin explicitly identifies Triumphal Shews as a piece of wedding literature. He prefaces his description of the christening by placing it in a tradition of festivities celebrating Protestantism which he particularly identifies with the Palatine wedding:

Germanie, thou hast neither cause of fear, nor of sorrow. The love and friendship, uniting the most part of thy Princes, doeth fill thee more and more both with security and joy. There are manie evident testimonies of [this love and friendship]. Among them thou doest remember (and wilt remember everlastingly) the extreme admiration and pleasure, thy heart

\(^{33}\) Ibid., F2r. There is an obsession with their “Bridall-bed.” John Donne, in “An Epithalamion, or Marriage Song on the Lady Elizabeth and Count Palatine being Married on St Valentine’s Day,” imagines Elizabeth and Frederick eager to get bed, plagued by feasts and masques that will not end (“Formalities retarding thee” and ever “more delays”); he also pictures them—Elizabeth “Should vanish from her clothes, into her bed” to await the moment when “He [Frederick] comes, and passes through sphere after sphere:/ First her sheets, then her arms, then anywhere” (John Donne: The Major Works including Songs and Sonnets and sermons, ed. John Carey [New York: Oxford University Press], 240-241). M. Ioannes Maria de Franchis says that he “indites, / This heauen-bled bed-league and connubiall rites” (B1r). King James displayed an interest in their bed-room activities, turning up the morning after their marriage to ensure they had consummated it. John Chamberlain, in a letter to Alice Carleton dated 18 February 1613, wrote, “The next morning the King went to visit these young turtles that were coupled on St. Valentine’s day, and did strictly examine him whether he were his true sonne in law, and was sufficiently assured” (McClure, Vol. 1, 424).

\(^{34}\) Henry Peacham, Prince Henrie revived. Or A Poeme Vpon The Bith, And In Honor of the Hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick, First Sonne and Heire apparent to the most Excellent Princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine, And the Mirrour of Ladies, Princesse Elizabeth, his Wife, onely daughter to our Soueraigne Iames King of Great Britaine, &c. (London: William Stansby for John Helme, 1615), C1v.
did felle, to behold the magnificence set forth at Heydelberg, by the
chiefest Electour of thine Empire, to honour the arrivall of his (then new-
comling) royall spouse.\textsuperscript{35}

Elizabeth and Frederick are the representatives of the Protestant Union, their union
symbolizing that of the Protestant princes and offering hope for its future. Looking at
how Peacham and Weckherlin consider rank and precedence in their marriage shows the
critical difference separating their visions of Protestant Union.

The Daughter of James VI & I: Peacham and Elizabeth, the British Princess

Peacham envisions a Protestant Union established in the future by Elizabeth’s
first-born son: Frederick Henry. The wedding texts typically picture Elizabeth as heir to
Henry’s legacy of militant Protestantism.\textsuperscript{36} However, Peacham sees her son, Frederick
Henry, as his natural successor. Elizabeth and Frederick’s primary role in establishing the
Protestant Union is to produce its leader. Moreover, this leader is British. Peacham
argues that as Frederick’s ancestry, while great, is not as great as Elizabeth’s, her British
blood will rule Frederick Henry.

Peacham looks to Frederick Henry rather than Elizabeth to lead the Protestant
Union because he is male. This gender bias becomes evident when examining Peacham’s
patronage career, for though his attempts to secure patronage establish a line of

\textsuperscript{35} Georg Rodolfe Weckherlin, \textit{Triumphall shevvs set forth lately at Stuttgart. Written first in German, and
now in English by G. Rodolfe Weckherlin, secretarie to the Duke of Wirtemberg} (Stuttgart: John-Wyric
Resslin, 1616), A1r.

\textsuperscript{36} For more on the theme of Elizabeth as her brother’s heir, see Barbara Lewalski, \textit{Writing Women in
inheritance from Prince Henry to Princess Elizabeth, his dedications reveal that he does not see Elizabeth as an appropriate replacement for Henry. He had spent his early career seeking preferment at court, in particular the patronage of King James and Prince Henry. He composed three emblem books based on James’s Basilikon Doron (1599) and dedicated them respectively to Henry, James, and again Henry. Though he courted the patronage of both James and Henry, it was Henry who supported him. In Minerua Brittania (1612), Peacham claims to have “by more than ordinary signs, tasted heretofore of [Henry’s] gratious favor.”37 After Henry’s death, Peacham turned to Elizabeth for support, which he claims to have received in Prince Henrie revived. Addressing Elizabeth, he describes how “so peerelesse a Prince, and Princely a Patronesse” “didst erewhile,/ Thy bounteous hand, and sweet supportance daigne/ Vnto my verse.”38 Since Elizabeth succeeded Henry as a patron to Peacham, it is tempting to argue that Peacham saw her as a replacement for her brother. However, there is evidence that Peacham did not regard Elizabeth as a proper surrogate for Henry because of her gender. In Minerua Britanna in 1612, Peacham depicts Henry as a conquering hero and Elizabeth as a blank writing tablet on which one may “write her fate, her date, her banishment,/ Or may she that day-lasting Lillie be.”39 While in 1613 he acknowledges that Henry and Elizabeth are “Most-like” one another, he contends that they are “like fire and water (striuing for praedominancie).”40 Gender lies at the heart of this fundamental difference. Henry is

37 Henry Peacham, Minerua Britanna or A garden of heroical deuises furnished, and adorned with emblemes and impresa's of sundry natures, newly devised, moralized, and published, by Henry Peacham, Mr. of Artes (London: Walter Dight, 1612), A2r.

38 Peacham, Prince Henrie revived, A2r & A4r.

39 Peacham, Minerua Britanna, D3r.

40 Peacham, The period of mourning, A3v.
fire, the element associated with masculinity; Elizabeth water, the female element. In *Nuptiall Hymnes*, Elizabeth is not a ruler, but a treasure: “the Pearl and Mirror of Great Brittany.” Peacham does not see Elizabeth as a successor to Henry, but as a means by which to create one. By fulfilling her wifely duties she will produce,

An hopeful Prince who may restore,

In part, the losse we had before,

*Io Hymen Hymenaus.*

That one day we may liue to see,

*A Frederick Henry* on her knee

Peacham expects Elizabeth and Frederick’s heir rather than either Elizabeth or Frederick to be a substitute for Henry.

In 1614 Elizabeth gave birth to the much anticipated boy and strengthened the belief that he was to replace his uncle by naming him Frederick Henry. That he could succeed Henry was now possible, as the 1614 Parliament had passed an act to install Elizabeth, Frederick, and their heirs into the British line of succession. Moreover, Frederick sought to make it clear that his son was next in line for the British throne after Charles. According to Antonio Foscarini, Venetian ambassador to England, Frederick

---


42 Peacham, *The period of mourning*, G2r.

43 Ibid., F2v.

44 Notably, the only act they passed was for the naturalization and succession of Frederick and his children with Elizabeth (Maija Jansson, *Proceedings in Parliament 1614* [Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988], xxxiv & 443n.26). In his opening speech to the 1614 Parliament, James said that he expected them to inherit the throne. Two of the three extant versions of this speech, Carte 77 and the Jervoise Manuscript, can be found in Jansson (13-19 & 473-476). The third is in William Cobbett, *Cobbett’s Parliamentary History of England* (London: R. Bagshaw, 1806), Vol. 1, 11491-1158.
sent his right-hand man, Hans Meinhard von Schomberg, to request “His Majesty [James] that this child [Frederick Henry] may be called his second son, there being only the prince [Charles], so that the king has promised to give the boy a title in this realm, such as duke of York or some other, so that he will have a position here in any event.” Not only was it possible for Frederick Henry to succeed to the English throne, but it also seemed likely, as Charles was young and reputed to be sickly. When John Ernest, Duke of Saxe-Weimar, visited the British court in 1613, he observed Charles and concluded, “The prince is now thirteen years of age and to all appearance is not of a strong constitution.” James was concerned that if he should suddenly die, Charles would not be in a position to secure the succession. Foscarini reported to the Doge on 16 February 1613 that James was so worried about the succession, he planned to bring Elizabeth back to England after her marriage tour to remain until Charles matured: “The Palatine is intending to leave in the middle of the next month and to return in autumn with the Princess, who would remain here a couple of years until Prince Charles has grown stronger.” Though this plan did not come to fruition, it shows the extent of concern over the succession. The diarist and politician Simonds D’Ewes reported that the country


46 Scholars have tended to take for granted that the concern and uncertainty over succession which plagued the reign of the virgin Queen Elizabeth I were settled when James came to the throne with two sons (an heir and a spare). Prince Henry’s death threw such certainty into turmoil. For more on Charles’s youth and illness, see Walter W. Seton, “The Early Years of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Charles, Duke of Albany [Charles I.] 1593-1605,” Scottish Historical Review 13 (1915/16): 366-79.


48 Horatio F. Brown, ed., 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 (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1905), Vol. 12, 493.
looked to Elizabeth as James’s probable heir, since “at the time of her marriage, by reason of Prince Charles his tender years, that she might have proved the sole inheritrix of three great kingdoms.”

But in 1615 Peacham published *Prince Henrie revived*, in which he presents Frederick Henry as Prince Henry’s heir. He offers the baby as Henry reborn:

> And Royall child, who like another Sunne,
> 
> From Rosie bed arised’st in the East,
> 
> When that great light we saw extinct and done,
> 
> Ah, Henrie, waild of euery gentle brest,
> 
> Dart one sweet smile upon me early ghest:
> 
> And that my Muse with thine owne heigth may flie,
> 
> A feather shed from thy faire Phoenix nest[.]

The metaphorical sameness between uncle and nephew (the royal child *like* another Sun) becomes literal in the final image—Henry (the Phoenix) reincarnated in Frederick Henry. This use of the phoenix imagery also strongly connects him with Elizabeth I and King James in a trajectory of inherited Protestant leadership (from Elizabeth I to James VI and I to Prince Henry to Frederick Henry). Indeed, King James himself saw his grandson in such a light, describing him as a replacement for Henry in his opening speech to Parliament in 1614: “For when it pleased God for my sins and yours to take away my

---


51 In the wedding literature, John Donne depicts Elizabeth and Frederick two phoenixes who become one: And by this act of these two phoenixes Nature again restored is, For since these two, are two no more, There’s but one phoenix still, as was before. (Donne, 241)
son, he has given me now, not long after, a grandson; so that he has showed me now a new favor in eodem genere [in the same genus].” 52 Frederick Henry is “a child for a child and a son for a son.” 53 For Peacham James’s grandson, the one on whom “Europe . . . gins to fixe her eye,” will found and lead the Protestant Union. Through Frederick Henry,

Now Germanie, and Brittaine, shall be one,

In League, in Laws, in Loue, Religion:

Twixt Dane, and English, English and the Scot,

Olde grudges (see) for euer are forgot; 54

Frederick Henry, descended of Germans, Danes, English, and Scots, is himself an embodiment of the harmonious joining of the nations. Combining bloodlines from all over Europe, he is the ultimate example of an international religious union. As such, he is the perfect person to unite the nations, making them “one” in religion, and he does so through diplomacy: leagues, laws, love.

Though this league is international, Peacham establishes British leadership of it by claiming that Frederick’s Henry’s superior British bloodlines determine his character. He acknowledges that Frederick Henry’s progenitors on his father’s side are impressive, noting that his “fathers Pedigree” ties him to “Eleuen Great Casars, twentie crowned Kings” including “Great Charlemaigne.” 55 However, Peacham emphasizes that his mother’s ancestors far outshine his father’s:

52 Jansson, 15.
53 Ibid., 474. Cobbett’s account reads, “codem genere, a son for a son” (1151).
54 Peacham, Prince Henrie revived, B3v.
55 Ibid., C1r.
Yet all these honors, are but common, new,
To those, that by thy Mothers side accrew.
From warlike Britons, and that braue remaine
Of ancient Troie (who once as great did raigne)
Of whom discended, boldly vaunt thy birth,
Aboue the great’st, who ere he be on earth.56

When describing the “Britons” as the “braue remaine Of ancient Troie,” Peacham refers to the myth that Brutus found Britain. In doing so, he shows that Frederick Henry’s ancestors go back to antiquity. Peacham compares Frederick’s antecedents with Elizabeth’s to show Frederick Henry the greater importance of his mother and her relatives (his father’s German line being “common, new” in comparison with his mother’s).

Peacham argues that Henry derives from a greater, more ancient heritage through Elizabeth, an opinion held by several of his contemporaries. Frederick inherited the title of Count Palatine and Prince Elector, becoming one of a select group of princes granted the power of electing and ennobling new emperors.57 As such, he acknowledged no lord between him and the emperor, who claimed to be superior to other European monarchs. However, Frederick and the other electors’ position in respect to these monarchs was ambiguous. Many in Britain considered Frederick’s status significantly below that of a king. In October 1612, the newsletter writer John Chamberlain reported that there were “scandalous speaches of him [Frederick] and the match . . . some wold embase his

56 Ibid., C1r-C1v.
57 Arthur Wilson, The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James the First, Relating To what passed from his first Access to the Crown, till his Death (London: Richard Lownds, 1653), 93.
meanes, and meannes of estate and title to match with such a lady.”\textsuperscript{58} Queen Anna attempted to dissuade Elizabeth from marrying Frederick by warning her that she would drop in status, descending from Princess Elizabeth to “Goodwife Palsgrave” or “Goody Palsgrave,” the humble wife of a count.\textsuperscript{59} Simonds D’Ewes likewise characterized the match as a step up in the world for Frederick, noting that no one in his family had made so great a match in two hundred years. Whereas Elizabeth descended from the first house of Christendom, Mecklenburgh, on Anna’s side, Frederick was from only the second or third family:

I cannot but observe how this match was the greatest that any of the House of Bavaria, being the Prince Elector’s family (which is doubtless the third, if not the second, family of Christendom derived from a masculine extraction of princes, reckoning the house of Mecklenburgh for the first, and the house of Clermont or Bourbon for the second,) did obtain for two hundred years last past.\textsuperscript{60}

For Frederick and his family it was the greatest alliance, D’Ewes adds, “not reckoning the possibility . . . that she might have proved the sole inheritrice of three great kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{58} McClure, Vol. 1, 381-382.

\textsuperscript{59} Roger Coke records: “It would so far advance the Protestant Interest in Germany as to make it more formidable to the Popish Religion; and 'tis certain (for I had it from good Authority) that Queen Ann was averse to it; and to put the Princess out of conceit of it, would usually call her Daughter, Goodwife Palsgrave; to which the Princess would answer, she would rather be the Palsgrave's Wife, than the greatest Papist Queen in Christendom” (A Detection Of The Court and State Of England During The Four Last Reigns And the Inter-Regnum. Consisting of Private Memoirs, &c. With Observations and Reflections. An Appendix, discovering the present State of the Nation. Wherein are many Secrets never before made publick: As also, a more impartial Account of the Civil Wars in England, than has yet been given, 2 Vols. 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. [London: Andrew Bell, 1696], E2v).

\textsuperscript{60} Halliwell, 53.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
Peacham’s adoption of the belief that Frederick is of lesser status than Elizabeth has serious consequences for Anglo-German relations. As Elizabeth’s ancestors are more important than Frederick’s, it is her line which determines Frederick Henry’s make-up. The future leader of the Protestant Union is British, “an Aprill Impe that late did shoot,/ From the warme bosome of its Mother root.”

He is “a new borne Henry, to the Nymphes of Thame.” Elizabeth had represented the “Nymph of Thames” in Tethys Festiuall, the masque commissioned by Anna for the celebrations of Henry’s investiture. This allusion to the masque once again

That Frederick Henry is seen as British and part of the British kinship network becomes crucial when Peacham reflects on the current state of the German nobility who are fighting amongst themselves and destroying Germany. He informs readers that he composed Prince Henrie revived with first-hand knowledge of the situation in Germany, although writing it in the Low Countries and signing the dedication “From Vtretcht.” Peacham had traveled in France, Germany, and the Low Countries with the regiment of Maurice of Nassau, Frederick’s uncle and the leader of the Dutch Republic, and experienced the second round of fighting in the Cleves-Jülich crisis (the territories had

62 Peacham, Prince Henrie revived, C3r.
63 Ibid., B2r.
64 Samuel Daniel, The order and solemnitie of the creation of the High and mightie Prince Henrie, eldest sonne to our sacred soueraigne, Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornewall, Earle of Chester, &c. as it was celebrated in Parliament House, on Munday the fourth of Iunne last past. Together with the ceremonies of the Knights of the Bath, and other matters of speciall regard, incident to the same. Whereunto is annexed the royall maske, presented by the Queene and her ladies, on Wednesday at night following (London: William Stansby for John Budge, 1610), E2v.
65 Henry Peacham, A Most Trve Relation Of the Affaires Of Cleve And Gvlick, As also Of all what hath passed this last summer, since the most Excellent and Victorious Prince, Mavrice of Nassav, tooke the field with his Armie, encamping before Rees in Cleueland: and the losse of Wesel, taken in by the Marques Spinola. Vnto the breaking vp of our Arnie in the beginning of December last past 1614. With the Articles of the Peace, propounded at Santen (London: William Stansby for John Helme, 1615), A3r.
come into dispute when John William, Duke of Cleves-Jülich, died childless). He attributes the delay in publishing *Prince Henrie revived* to the unrest in Germany: “had the way to *Heidelberge* beene free from danger,” he would have published the poem sooner. He thus locates the war in Germany, near Heidelberg where Elizabeth and Frederick live. Taking stock of the situation in Europe, he depicts it primarily as a family matter: “And brother brother with his bloud embrues,” his repetition of the word “brother” emphasizing the familial nature of the conflict. Peacham explains the situation in more detail in the work he published alongside *Prince Henrie revived: A Most Trve Relation Of the Affaires Of Cleve And Gvlick, As also Of all what hath passed this last summer, since the most Excellent and Victorious Prince, Mavrice of Nassav, tooke the field with his Armie, encamping before Rees in Cleueland: and the losse of Wesel, taken in by the Marques Spinola. Vnto the breaking vp of our Armie in the beginning of December last past 1614. With the Articles of the Peace, propounded at Santen.* In *A Most Trve Relation*, he presents the struggle as one between family members: the last male of the house of Cleves has died and relatives are fighting with one another for his lands. According to Peacham, the conflict began as a disagreement

---

66 Cleves bordered the Dutch Republic and was populated mostly by Calvinists and Lutherans. Jülich bordered the Spanish Netherlands was populated mostly by Catholics. Both were territories in northwestern Germany under the rulership of the Duke of Cleves-Jülich. When he died childless, disputes broke out as to who should inherit. The Dutch and Spanish provided military support to different claimants. Though a peace treaty temporarily ended the fighting in 1610, tensions continued and conflict broke out again in 1614. For a detailed account of the disputes over Cleves Jülich and its role in the Thirty Years’ War, see Geoffrey Parker, ed., *The Thirty Years’ War*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), esp. 11-34.

67 Peacham, *A Most Trve Relation Of the Affaires Of Cleve And Gvlick*, A2v-A3r.

68 Ibid., B3r.

69 Peacham published both *A Most Trve Relation* and *Prince Henry revived* with the same printer and he refers to *A Most Trve Relation* in *Prince Henry revived*, suggesting that he intended the texts to be read together.
between two Protestant princes—John Sigismund Hohenzollern, Elector of Brandenburg and Wolfgang Willem, Duke of Newburgh—and religion came into play only as a military strategy. Newburgh sought advantage through new kinship alliances, changing his religion and marrying into a powerful Catholic family:

Newburg seeing his hopes now frustrate, and no likelihood of gaining an absolute possession of the same, growes discontented, changeth his Religion, marieth the Bishop of Collens sister, daughter to the Duke of Baueir, whose banner hee borroweth, and with whose purse hee leuies great troopes.  

Peacham’s view of the conflict sharply contrasts with those of writers such as the English clergyman George Hakewill and T. Wood, who characterize the crisis as a religious war. Hakewill does so in an English translation of César de Plaix’s Anti-Coton, Wood in The protestants and Jesuits vp in armes in Gulicke-land. The former explains that the

---

70 He leaves out the third claimant—the Elector of Saxony. Brandenburg stood for the rights of the Duke’s oldest sister Marie. Though Marie had died, she had been promised that her children would follow her in the line of succession and inherit before her sisters. Brandenburg had married Marie’s eldest daughter, Anna, and sought to inherit based on that promise. Newburgh sought to inherit the land on his mother’s behalf. Unlike Marie, his mother, Anna Magdelena, was living and the second eldest sister of the dead Duke. Newburgh argued that the Duke’s sister should succeed before her niece, as she was “next of blood to the late Duke at his death, and his sister; whereas Anna wife to the Duke of Brandenburg was but his Niece” (Peacham, A Most Trve Relation, B3r).

71 Ibid., B2v-B3r. Peacham may be referring to this connection in Prince Henry revived, when he mentions fighting at the city of Collen, “At Collen bathing (drunke with Christian blood)” (B1v). It is also interesting to note that though Newburgh’s father lamented his son’s religious conversion, he applauded his strategy. A courtier identified only as PAD wrote to William Trumbell on 22 July 1614, saying that “[Philip Ludwig] strongly regretted and detested the apostasy of his son, but, considering that he had thrown himself into the arms of papists to obtain his rights and claims, he avowed all, as if he had done well” (Parker, 30).

72 The full titles of these works are: Anti-Coton, or A refutation of Cottons letter declaratorie: lately directed to the Queene Regent, for the apologizing of the Iesuites doctrine, touching the killing of kings A booke, in which it is proued that the Iesuites are guiltie, and were the authors of the late execrable parricide, commited vpon the person of the French King, Henry the fourth, of happy memorie. To which is added, a supplication of the Vniuersitie of Paris, for the preuenting of the Iesuites opening their schooles among them: in which their king-killing doctrine is also notably discovered, and confuted. Both translated
Catholic Magistrates ruling Jülich have banished Protestants who practice their religion and, having sent over three hundred families into “misery and exile,” they are planning to expel “a great number more.” The latter describes Protestants rising up against the Catholic “tyrants,” proclaiming themselves “God’s soldiers” who fight “in the defense of the Gospel, our country, our brethren, kindred, and friends.” For Peacham, religion is not at the heart of the current crisis in Germany: rather, the crisis is caused by a family unable to settle a disputed inheritance. The greed of the current generation of Germans has rendered them incapable of managing themselves. In contrast, King James has demonstrated remarkable diplomatic savvy, ending strife and bringing peace. Frederick Henry should learn from his example:

But neerest patterne place before thine eie,

Thy Grandsire James, our Royall Mercurie:

Who with his wand all tumult caus’d to cease,

Fulfill’d our wishes, gaue our daies their peace.  

Peacham thus sees a pan-European Protestant Union as a goal for a leader whose superior British blood will allow him to resolve national and international differences.

From Daughter to Wife: Weckherlin and Elizabeth, the Wife of a German Count

---

out of the French, by G.H. Together with the translators animaduersions ypon Cottons letter and The protestants and Iesuites vp in armes in Gulicke-land Also, a true and wonderfull relation of a Dutch maiden (called Eue Fliegen of Meurs in the county of Meurs) who being now (this present yeare) 36 yeares of age, hath fasted for the space of 14 yeares, confirmed by the testimony of persons, both honourable and worshipfull, as well English, as Dutch. Truely translatedi according to the Dutch copy.

73 Hakewill, B2r.

74 Wood, B3r.

75 Peacham, Prince Henry revived, D1r.
Whereas Peacham pictures an international Protestant alliance as the future, Weckherlin sees it as the present. In *Triumphall Shews*, he describes the christening of the Duke of Württemberg’s second son, one of nine “festivities of Protestant Union” celebrated by German courts between 1596 and 1617. The leaders of the Protestant Union used these entertainments—at Kassel in 1596 and 1600, at Stuttgart in 1609, Jägerndorf 1610, Heidelberg 1613, Dessau 1614, Stuttgart 1616, Halle 1616, and Stuttgart 1617—to develop an iconography for the Protestant Union and to provide a pretext for political meetings. Zorzi Giustinian, Venetian Ambassador to Germany, reported to the Doge and Senate that the leaders of the Union at “the christening of the prince of Wirtemberg . . . held various secret councils together concerning the Union and resolved to stand ready to defend themselves.” This occasion offered an opportunity to address the question of British involvement in the Protestant Union, as Frederick and Elizabeth were the guests of honor. Weckherlin emphasizes the importance of their attendance, going so far as to say that Elizabeth’s “blessed presence was the chiefe cause of the shews.” He addresses the political ramifications of Elizabeth’s changing role from British princess to German wife, showing that the success of the Union depends upon her willingness to adopt German customs. A critical issue for Anglo-German relations in general and for Elizabeth in particular was the controversy over precedence. For her, the celebrations of German ancestry, which to an audience of Germans claimed

---

76 See introduction.


78 Weckherlin, :(2r. The printer, Resslin, signed the prefatory material with the signature :(.
patriotism for Protestantism, constitute a defense of her husband’s genealogy and assert his equality with her. As Weckherlin tells Elizabeth in his dedicatory poem, he hopes “That Germanie may England like bee found.”  

Weckherlin stages Elizabeth’s transition from British princess to Electress Palatine, showing this shift’s crucial importance to the success of the Protestant Union. He begins his dedication with her dual state, first addressing her as James’s daughter, then as Frederick’s wife: “To The Most High And Most Excellent Princesse, adorned with Pietie, Beautie and all Vertues, Elisabeth, Onely Davghter To His Most Excellent Maiestie of Great-Britaine; and Wife to the most high, mightie and excellent Prince Frederic.”  

Whilst Weckherlin details the week-long events of the 1616 baptism as they took place, beginning with the arrival of the guests and moving through the christening, the banquet and masque that followed it, the two running-at-the-rings, foot tournament, fireworks, and mock joust, he displays Elizabeth in her new position as Frederick’s wife: as both a member of the German royal family and a representative of the Protestant Union. Weckherlin exploits the nature of the occasion to show her change, as christenings by definition celebrate both familial and religious kinship. “Ladie Anne, the yonger sister of my Prince, conducted by her two brethren Frederic-Achilles and

---

79 Ibid., ):(3v. Weckherlin tailors his account to appeal to English readers, changing the dedicatee from Barbara Sophia (wife to the Duke of Württemberg) to Princess Elizabeth, describing events in terms of English literary references, and adding descriptions of local German customs such as the Kübelstechen, a German custom in which local peasants perform in a mock joust. For more on the Kübelstechen, see Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly, Triumphall Shews: Tournaments at German-speaking Courts in their European Context 1560-1730 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1992), 33. In 1619, Weckherlin published another poem in English, printed by John Wyrich Resslin in Stuttgart, entitled “A Panegyricke to the Lord Hays, Viscount of Doncaster, His Majesties of Great Britaine Ambassadour in Germany, sung by the Rhine,” suggesting that Weckherlin fostered relations between the English and German courts through his literary work (Hermann Fischer, “Weckherlin’s English Poem,” The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art 43 [1893]: 36.)

80 Weckherlin, ):2r.
Magnus," carries her nephew to the altar. There, Elizabeth and Frederick (Electors of Palatine), Joachim-Ernest (Marquis of Brandenburg), Lady Eve-Christine (wife of John-George, another Marquis of Brandenburg), and George-Frederic (Marquis of Baden) join the royal family of Württemberg as godfathers and godmothers. At the altar, the German nobles become one family through the christening. The role of godparent held powerful symbolic importance: “alliances [were forged] just as much by means of the choice of godparents as . . . by means of the choice of mate. . . . The christening provided the opportunity for allies to set up a power bloc and to demonstrate it to the world.” However, the christening was more important than just an opportunity to set up alliances. Christenings specifically incorporate people into one family in a religious capacity, with godparents taking on responsibility for a child’s religious upbringing. These Germans are not just a power bloc, but a family created and bound together by religion, a “Christian assemblie” who attend church together “to heare the word of God.”

Weckherlin depicts Elizabeth in her new position as Frederick’s wife and a leader of the Protestant Union, consistently referring to Elizabeth as Frederick’s wife. For example, on the night of the masque, she is “the Electrices her highnesse.” She has, in other words, married into and become part of Frederick’s family, a movement from royal daughter to wife that is literalized in the text itself as references to Elizabeth as James’s scion disappear. By the final pages of Triumphall Shews Elizabeth has become one of a

81 Ibid., A3r.
82 Ibid., A3r-A3v.
83 Watanabe-O’Kelly, 49.
84 Weckherlin, A2v & A3r.
85 Ibid., A7r.
German pair: “the Princesse Electrice and the Prince Palatine,” “the Princesse and Prince Elector Palatines.”

Weckherlin’s Elizabeth differs markedly from her real-life counterpart, who adamantly refused “to be all Dutch [i.e. German], and to [take on] their fashions” because she had not “been bred to [them]” and did not find it necessary. He offers Elizabeth behavioral models not only in her fictional self, but also in three English ladies: Derby, Winchester, and Pembroke. Lewis-Frederic and Magnus, Dukes of Württemberg, and the Earl of Hohenlohe entered the tournaments lists disguised as the English ladies. They dressed themselves in “borrowed English names” and attire, appearing “right like English ladies, sitting a side as ladies are wont to ride.” Entering the lists to defend the superiority of “Womankind,” their published cartel claims that they take the field to prove that,

1. Womankind doe excel mankind as farre as heaven excelleth earth: And that

---

86 Ibid., L3v & L4r.
87 Carola Oman, *The Winter Queen: Elizabeth of Bohemia*, Revised ed. (London: Phoenix Press, 2000), 138. SP 81 (Germany States) 13/242: “He is verie heavie and so extremelie melancholie as I never saw in my life so great an alteration in anie. I cannot tell what to say to it, but I think he hath so much business at this time as troubles his mind too much, for I find they desire he should bring me to be all dutch and to theyre fashions. I neither have binne bred to or is necessarie in everie thing I shoulde follow, neither will I doe it . . . . I think they doe the Prince wrong, in putting into his head at this time when he is but too malincholie” (Barbara Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993], 55 & 346-347n.59). At the time of the wedding negotiations Frederick’s mother, the Electress Louise Julianna, worried that Elizabeth would refuse to accept German customs “by reason of her great birth” (Oman, 54). The Electress feared that Elizabeth would introduce British customs “which would be of too high a flight” (Oman, 54).
88 The choice of these three ladies—the Countess of Pembroke, Mary Herbert née Talbot; the Countess of Derby, Elizabeth Stanley née de Vere; and the Marchioness of Winchester, Lucy Paulet née Cecil—is not immediately obvious, as they were not politically active and their husbands advanced opposing political agendas (Pembroke was an active supporter of the Protestant Union, while Derby was a suspected and Winchester a confirmed Catholic). Moreover, Lucy Paulet had died and her husband had not remarried, so there was no Marchioness Winchester in 1616.
89 Weckherlin, F4r.
2. Wee ourselves are farre more sufficient, then men can ever bee, to commend
worthily our sexe. And lastly that

3. There bee no power neither in heaven nor on earth able to hinder the
accomplishment of a virtuous Ladies her desire.\textsuperscript{90}

Though they express a clear sense of pride, it does not prevent them from assimilating
into German culture. The women want to witness and participate in local customs
because of “the knot of friendship, where it [Germany] is tyed by vnto our nation
[England],” a knot solidified by Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage.\textsuperscript{91} The English ladies
bring the countries together by taking part in German traditions:

And though neither our state nor our custome doe command vs to vse the
exercise of launces: nevertheless this prayseworthie assemblie, seconded
by our ambitious boldnesse, will vs (wee doe beleeve) to goe into the field
... according to the fashion of this countrie.\textsuperscript{92}

In order to be ambassadors to the German court, they must behave like Germans,
“according to the fashion of this countrie.”

Weckherlin records an important struggle between the British and Palatinate
courts which hinged on the real Elizabeth’s failure to behave as the fictional English
Ladies and thus to accept German tradition. Going “against the custom of the country,”
she took precedence over both her husband and the German nobles at the christening.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., F5v-F61.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., F4v.

\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., F5r-F5v.

\textsuperscript{93} Logan Pearsall Smith, ed., The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907),
Vol. 2, 89.
For example, at the ceremony, Elizabeth is the one on whom all the women attended rather than on the mother of the child, Barbara Sophie, Duchess of Württemberg: “the sermon beeing done, all the Princes and Princesses, waiting on My ladie Elisabeth brought her againe unto her chamber.”\textsuperscript{94} At dinner, the nobles in attendance are described in relation to where she sits:

\begin{quote}
two and twentie princely wights sitting at one table: namely at the higher end My ladie Elisabeths her highnesse allone: one the side at her right hand was the Elector . . . at the Princesses her left hand, on that side sat the widow of Wirtemberg: hard by her the Marquesse of Baden: neare her my soveraine Princesse.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

Elizabeth’s insistence on taking precedence was a major point of contention at the German court. Prior to Elizabeth and Frederick’s departure from England, James had persuaded Frederick to promise to grant Elizabeth precedence, acknowledging her as the highest-ranking individual in all ceremonies and social events.\textsuperscript{96} Frederick soon asked to be released from his promise. The diplomat Sir Henry Wotton wrote James from Heidelberg on 23 April 1616, reporting that Frederick had argued that it was against the custom of the whole country; that all the Electors and Princes found it strange; that it would turn to his own diminution, which he hoped your Majesty would not desire; that Kings’ daughters had been matched before in his race, and with other German princes, but still

\textsuperscript{94} Weckherlin, A3v.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., A3v-A4r.

\textsuperscript{96} Lewalski, \textit{Writing Women}, 55.
placed under their husbands in public feasts; that in the German ground he
did compete with the Kings of Denmark and Sweden; and some other
things of this kind.\footnote{Smith, 89. Frederick claims that his family had made matches of the same quality in the past without granting the wives precedence. However some texts at the time of the wedding refuted such assertions. In \textit{A Monvment of Remembrance}, James Maxwell interpreted the 1613 wedding celebrations in Heidelberg as an acknowledgement of Elizabeth’s rank as being above any woman who had formerly matched with them: “\textit{the Matrons and Maids of Heidelberge shall praise Eliza aboue all the daughters of Emperours and Kings that have beeene married to their Princes in former times, and that the Muses there are to doe as much, some in Poesie, and other some in prose}” (A3v). Within the poem itself, he writes, The three \textit{Mathilda’s} Girles of \textit{Casars} three
Which wedded were to Princes three of \textit{Rhine},
Had not more worth, more grace, more Maiesty
Then lou’d \textit{Eliza Princesse Palatine}:
\textit{Blanch} once a daughter of \textit{South-britanny}
Was not her match, nor \textit{Anne} of \textit{Polony}.
Nor yet \textit{Bohemies} Lady \textit{Ludomille},
Nor \textit{Beatrice} the Girle of \textit{Sicilie},
Nor she of \textit{Bauier}, whome they name \textit{Sybille};
Nor more her Match was \textit{Denmarkes Dorothy}:
From \textit{Hungary} and \textit{Bauier} Ladies two
\textit{Eliza}’s both might t’our \textit{Eliza} bow. (E1r)}

Wotton confirmed the antagonism of the German nobles towards Elizabeth, informing
King James that “others, and particularly (as I conceive) of the old Electress” worked to
prejudice “her dignity.”\footnote{Samuel Rawson Gardiner, ed., \textit{The Fortescue Papers; Consisting Chiefly of Letters Relating to State Affairs, Collected By John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham} (Westminster: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1871), Vol. 2, 90.} Elizabeth asserted her status as James’s royal daughter in the
face of such objections, claiming that in this capacity she outranked the Germans. In a
letter to Ralph Winwood, the secretary of state, she expressed her offense at the idea that
they “would set me in a lower rank than them that have gone before me,” boldly
proclaiming “Neither will I do it.”\footnote{Oman, 138.} In 1616, Edward Sherburn informed Dudley
Carleton that Hans Meinhard von Schomberg, Frederick’s chief man, had “come over, on
a contest between the Palsgrave and Lady Elizabeth, because he [Frederick] does not
wish to allow her the precedency in public assemblies, out of her own Court.”

James insisted that Frederick keep his promise and grant Elizabeth precedence, writing “mais en ce qui concerne sa qualité et l’honneur de sa naissance, elle seroit indigne de vivre si elle quitteroit sa place sans mon sceu et advis [but in the point of the quality and honor of her birth, she would be unworthy to live if she quit her place without my knowledge and advice].”

He stresses the severity of this issue—it is not a mere matter of form, but a matter of honor. Should Elizabeth fail to maintain her status, she would lose her honor and, consequently, any reason for living.

At the same time that James establishes the significance of precedence, he affirms his status as patriarch of a family, which now includes Frederick, and his ultimate right to determine his daughter’s actions. Elizabeth’s compliance in this matter places her in a submissive position in relation to James. James wrote to Elizabeth, thanking her for loyalty to him: “Je vous remercie de tout mon coeur que vous n’avez voulu ceder en ce qui concerne la qualité de vostre naissance sans mon consentement [I thank you with all my heart that you did not want to give way in the matter of the quality of your birth without my consent].”

While this demonstrates James’s power and Elizabeth’s obedience to her father, it also reveals her power: her decisions and actions determine the matter. Ultimately, Elizabeth chooses to maintain her status as a British princess and by playing the obedient daughter, she asserts her rank to overrule her husband’s wishes. Her daughterly obedience is the equivalent of wifely disobedience and demonstrates a

100 Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Of The Reign Of James I. 1611-1618 (Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Lit., 1967), Vol. 9, 370.
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reluctance to leave her natal family and be subsumed into her marital one. James not only supports but also encourages her rebellion against her husband; after all, it benefits him, providing him the upper hand in his relationship with Frederick.

According to Wotton, the issue of precedence reached a crisis point when Elizabeth and Frederick attended the christening of the Duke of Württemberg’s son:

Only of late there fell as (as I have been here informed) in their invitation to the Court of Wirtenberg, much disputation about the placing of her Highness, for that, according to the severity of the German form, both princes and others do sit in public feasts above their wives. But having understood that the Count Palatine did, at that assembly likewise, as always at home, yield my Lady your royal daughter the best place, and yet rather by way of convenience for that time only, than as an example that should stand, I found myself bound in my own zeal, besides my Lady’s commandment, provisionally to sound the Count Palatine about that point; telling him by way of collaudation that I intended to advertise your Majesty what respect he had deferred to your royal name, by maintaining your daughter’s dignity, as well in the Court of Wirtenberg, as in his own palace within our sights, which I assured myself your Majesty would take, though it were a point otherwise of right, as proceeding from his kindness.\(^{103}\)

Frederick exerts a control over his wife that he did not actually have by interpreting the situation in a light favorable to himself: acting “from his kindness,” he grants her

\(^{103}\) Smith, 89.
precedence to honor her father rather than as an acknowledgement of her superiority. He continued to insist that he was Elizabeth’s master, later saying he would never again grant her precedence, “that though indeed he had done it at Wirtenberg, yet he could do it no more.”

Frederick equates Elizabeth’s precedence with her role as British princess, a rejection of her new status as his wife in favor of her old one as James’s daughter. Frederick counters Elizabeth’s “commandment” that she retain her position with a carefully crafted linguistic control over her. The success of his representational strategy, however, may be suggested by his solution to the problem of precedence: after the christening at Württemberg, Frederick no longer attended public events with Elizabeth.

The matter of precedence thus represents a struggle between James and Elizabeth, and Frederick (England and Germany) for dominance. Weckherlin presents the matter in a light favorable to Germany by denying that Elizabeth deserves precedence. He employs Frederick’s interpretive model, arguing that Elizabeth has been granted precedence in order to honor England rather than as an acknowledgement of her superiority. He does recognize her impressive bloodlines in the dedicatory poem:

Thus, though you were blissefully borne
Of Gods of doubly royall blood,
Yet heavens bountie did adorne
Your mind with their farre dearer good;
So that to bee a great Princesse by birth
Is the least praise you doe deserve on earth.
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However, it is her virtues rather than her birth that make her valuable to the Germans: though a “great Princese by birth,” it is her mind which is “farre dearer good.” He employs Frederick’s rhetoric very clearly to state that they have granted her precedence not as an acknowledgement of her superiority, but in order to honor her and England. He argues that the Duke of Württemberg used the occasion of the christening “to give some plaine tokens of the true benevolence, hee beareth vnto all Princes, but especially to honour at his court the matchlesse Ladie Electrice, Princesse of Great-Brittaine.”

Weckherlin claims that this same gesture of honoring Elizabeth and England motivated him to write *Triumphall Shews*: “I shall indevor the more, to honour in German the gallant English Nation whereof (verily) I make more account, then I can vtter (thoug[h] with truth) without getting the name of a flatterer.”

Weckherlin highlights Elizabeth and Frederick’s equality throughout the festivities. Frederick appears in one tournament leading a troupe of ancient German warriors who deliver a challenge to the lists that defends German ancestry:

> Loving children, bretheren, friends & heirs: What’s the reason, that, at your valorous exercises, at your triumphant entries, and brave shews, you must allwayes borrow your inventions of the old Romans, Grecians, or euen of your great foes the Turkes, or of other Poeticall fictions, and of very idle tales? Why doe you thinke your selves so poore in the plentie of examples, your forefathers left for you of their worthines and gallantnesse,

---


107 Ibid., ):(4v.
which are not onely fit to bee imitated, but also to incite your children to ensue in this same race of virtue and valor.\footnote{108}{Ibid., I6r-I6v.}

Whereas Peacham proffers English monarchs as models for Elizabeth and Frederick’s heirs, Weckherlin offers German nobles. Weckherlin goes on to describe a continuous line from the ancient Germans to the present ones, insisting on the strength of their bloodlines: “wee are good and loyall Germanes, issued from the bloud of the very auncient and noble German Nation.”\footnote{109}{Ibid., I7v.} The celebrations assert Frederick’s equality with Elizabeth rather than her precedence, literally spelling it out on the first night of the celebrations. The dance which concludes the masque/ballet honors them equally by having the dancers figure both their names:

Those twelue (beeing three Princes, and other nine courtiers of my Prince [Württemberg]) . . . excellently discharged their daunce, and figuring withall both their highnesses names Elisabeth and Frederich, ended it with many changes of musicke and measure.\footnote{110}{Ibid., A8r-A8v.}

Elizabeth takes her place alongside Frederick as his wife.

Weckherlin not only asserts the importance of German ancestors, but of current members of German nobility. Whereas Peacham depicted Germany torn apart by family infighting, Weckherlin shows it united and magnificent. The entry of George-Frederick, Marquis of Baden and Highburgh, may have been intended as a direct response to the Cleves-Jülich crisis and contemporary concerns over German dissention.\footnote{111}{Smart, 48-49.} He enters
“representing Germany” and leading “the ten Nymphs of her countries [the Electorship Palatinate, Saxony, Austria, Burgundy, Francony, Bavere, Suevy, High Palatine of the Rhine, Westphalia, and Lower Saxony].” Concord, dressed as Alciato’s emblem for unity and described as Germany’s “blessed friend,” accompanies her, carries “the incorruptible shield . . . graven in these two words: Concordia Invicta,” and leads Discord as her prisoner. The conceit of the entry: concord has finally defeated the discord troubling Germany. Moreover, Germans themselves assist Concord to defeat Discord. The Nymphs aiding Concord proclaim themselves to be Germans: “these worthies . . . altogether by this time doe professe themselves Germans.” Weckherlin interprets her actions during the tournament itself as enacting this harmonizing force on the Germans. The tournament follows the entries of the German nobles, who have all appeared in costume and delivered a challenge. When the Germans seek to fight one another in the tournament, Concord encourages them to instead run at the ring:

desire with all their hart to defend their challenge in earnest against some foes . . . Sweet Concord, that now was visibly among them, and else is wont spiritually to abide within them; sembly those beauties did silently bid them to performe it joyfully in jeast (wanting subjects fit for their anger) by the running at the ring.

---

112 Weckherlin, Cr7.

113 Ibid., C7r & D1r. Smart notes that Concord wears a crown, has four faces and four pairs of arms, and bears a sword, a scepter, a pike and a shield, as does Geryon, the emblematic representation of unity in Alciatus’s Emblemata, who has three bodies and holds a sword, scepter, pike and shield in his three pairs of arms (49).
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The audience watching the shows mirrors this coming together of the different peoples of Germany. For example, the crowd at “the tilt-garden” seems to be comprised of “all the people of Germanie.” Concord reigns victorious.

The entry of the Duke of Württemberg as Priam emphasizes the family relationships among the Germans present at the christening. Priam/Württemberg looks at the gathered nobles and courtiers and sees one family:

The Troyan Monarch, having before his sight so manie hardie and gallant nations borne of his blood, felt his great hart pricked with the flames of hot desire, to make them by this occasion rejoyce and boast of their stocke. Priam’s fictional family maps onto the real family of German nobles, a connection Weckherlin makes explicit by identifying characters with their real-life counterparts as when he notes that the “rare Nymph . . . this Goddesse, [is] called by mortall men Barbara-Sophia Duchesse of Wirtemberg” or that “C. Loelius ([is] otherwise called Prince Iohn-August Palatine).” Weckherlin describes this family at the start of Triumphall Shews. When discussing the arrival of the nobles he writes of:

My Prince and his brother Lewis-Frederic . . . Prince Christian of Anhalt and his sonne . . . th’other my Princes his brother, Frederic-Achilles . . . the Marquis of Brandenburg Ioachim-Ernest, and his brother Iohn-George . . . And Magnus, the yongest brother of my Prince . . . the Marquis of

---
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Baden George-Frederic, who brought with him his Ladie [Anne-Auguste]
the Marquess, his yong daughter, and his three sonnes . . . my most
gracious Princesse . . . the Ladie Vrsule Widow of Wirtemberg . . . the
three Ladie Sisters of my Soveraigne [Lady Agnes, Lady Barbara, and
Lady Anne]. ¹¹⁹

From the beginning of *Triumphall Shews*, then, readers understand these Germans in
terms of a kinship network. He reminds readers of these relationships—brother, sister,
wife, son—throughout the shows. When he introduces a noble, he will often tell readers
who they are related to and how they are related to him/her/them, even if he has already
provided this information. Weckherlin identifies these Germans as one family in blood,
but he also describes them as kin established by shared religion.

Peacham and Weckherlin show that the meaning of the Palatine match was not
fixed in 1613, but continued to be debated in the years following. More importantly, they
demonstrate the serious political implications of issues such as rank and precedence.
James and Frederick saw the matter of Elizabeth’s precedence (or lack thereof) as a
public acknowledgement of their own power and influence. While showing the tenuous
position women faced in managing the tension between their relationships with their natal
and marital families, it also reveals this tension as a possible space for their own self-
assertion. Though James urged her to do so, in the end Elizabeth was the one who chose
to fight to retain her status as a British princess. ¹²⁰ Indeed, Elizabeth demonstrated her

¹¹⁹ Ibid., A1v-A2v.

¹²⁰ Elizabeth endeavored to retain her alliances and credit in England. Prior to leaving for Bohemia, she
wrote to Sir Julius Caesar, chancellor of the exchequer “a note signed with [her] owne hand the 10th of this
present month containing the number and prices of rings which, as tokens of my affection, I have bestowed
vppon my friends.” She wished to present her friends with gifts, visible signs of their friendship. As she
leaves her “naturall countrie,” she desired “to leave some small remembrance of . . . [her] amongst . . . [her]
own ambition not only in her desire to retain her status as a princess and her refusal to “be all Dutch,” but also in her desire to become a queen. One account holds that when Frederick was offered the crown of Bohemia, Elizabeth supposedly joked with him “that he should not have married a King’s daughter if he had not the courage to become a king himself . . . [and] remarked that she would rather eat sauerkraut at a King’s table than feast on luxuries in an Elector’s house.”121 As late as 1619, Elizabeth was still thinking about and referring to herself as “a King’s daughter” rather than an Elector’s wife.

Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage symbolically represented the Protestant Union but as a microcosm of the Union, their marriage staged on a smaller scale the larger problems facing it. For example, Elizabeth and Frederick’s fights over precedence extended out to their servants:

The domestic differences which, in the beginning and some good while after, grew by the emulation of servants, seem now to be as well settled as they can be in a Court, and by no means more than by the severing of the nations at their ordinary diet; the English and Scottish eating together and the Allemans apart.122

affectionate frends.” Elizabeth not only wanted to cement her English alliances, but also to keep her credit. She asked Caesar to take care of her bills: “but that any thinge employed for my vse should rest unpaied, doth not well becom my quality, and tharefore being fullie perswaded of your affection towards mee in such sort that you will never suffer my name to come in question for anie debt contracted by me, I do earnestlie intreate you to cause see these billes payed and discharged so sone as may bee for my respect” (L. M. Baker and C. V. Wedgwood, eds., The Letters of Elizabeth Queen of Bohemia [London: The Bodley Head, 1953], 33).
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Their servants emulate them in their disagreements and the solution. As Frederick solved the issue of precedence by not attending public events with Elizabeth, their servants solved their disputes by eating apart from one another. Elizabeth and Frederick’s debate over precedence revealed national loyalties that made union difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Though Peacham and Weckherlin both wanted an international alliance, they did not agree on how such an entity would be structured. These conflicting international viewpoints reveal that domestic German disputes and confessional conflicts were not the only threats to the dream of a pan-European Protestant Union.

Competing Unions: Nationalism in the 1613 Wedding Literature

Returning to the works written for the wedding in 1613 with these matters in mind, it becomes evident that writers were always concerned with and separated by issues of nationalism, gender, and genealogy. National loyalty proves a defining and dividing characteristic, as the British playwright Thomas Heywood presents a vision of union remarkably similar to that of Peacham, the German scholar Tobias Hübner one much like Weckherlin. Notably, Hübner held positions at courts of the leading members of the Protestant Union, advancing to the Privy Council of Dessau in 1613. He also published Beschreibung Der Reiss with Vögelin, a German printer associated with Calvinism. In A Marriage Triumph, Heywood portrays a pan-European religious


124 Vögelin was a university publisher and bookseller who worked in Heidelberg, Leipzig and Ladenburg. He was associated with Calvinist theological works like Pitiscus, Kurzer Anhang des ausfuerlichen Berichts, was die Reformierte Kirchen in Deutschland gleuben oder nicht gleuben (1609). He wrote
alliance led by Britain in which Elizabeth plays a crucial role as a British royal princess; while Hübner, in Beschreibung Der Reiss, pictures a union headed by Germany with Elizabeth in the critical position of Frederick’s wife.

Thomas Heywood, in his epithalamium, A Marriage Triumph, articulates common themes of the wedding poems: Henry’s death, Frederick as Henry’s replacement, and a vision of the marriage as the means by which England may take an active role in ridding the Continent of Catholicism and defeating “the Roman Eagle.”

He begins the epithalamion with the death of Prince Henry, referring to the funeral elegy he had written for Henry and providing a shortened version of it (about sixty lines). He then presents Frederick as a substitute for Henry, with the universal lamentation for Henry transforming into universal approval of Frederick. In the elegy, he had described Henry as lamented by “all sorts, sexes, titles, and estates. . . . the gentle, base, the polished, and the rude. . . . as well the learned clerk, as the ignorant swain.” Whereas the British united in their mourning for Henry’s loss in the elegy, in the epithalamion they unite in their celebration of Frederick’s arrival. He is the one

Whom all our populous united Nation
Attending long, with joyful expectation,
Whom th’ empire of great Britain wished to see,
And th’ Emperor to receive with Majesty.
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Whom the Peers ardently crave to behold,
And the glad Nobles in their arms t’ enfold\textsuperscript{127}

Frederick, as had Henry, inspires the support of all of England, as various classes of people long to embrace him and express their approval of him. He is,

the religious Protestants protector,

the high and mighty Palsgrave of the Rhine,

Duke of Bavaria, and Count Palatine,

With Titles equal, laterally allied

To \textit{Mars} his brood, the Soldiers chiepest pride.\textsuperscript{128}

At the same time that he presents Frederick as a replacement for Henry, he undercuts the notion that Frederick is his equal, slighting his genealogy. Though Frederick’s titles equal that of Mars’s family, he is not a direct relation. His “sideways” relation to Mars’s brood indicates an affine kinship, a tie through marriage. Kinship relationships, in other words, establish Frederick’s position as defender of the faith.

Heywood further undermines the notion that Frederick can truly replace Henry by feminizing him, focusing on his physical appearance. He follows the above lines of poetry with a tribute to Frederick’s physical beauty, “a youth so lovely, that even beasts of Chase,/ Staid by the way, to gaze him in the face.”\textsuperscript{129} In this he echoes contemporary criticisms of Frederick’s youth and praise of his looks. John Chamberlain, for example, believed his youth and physical weakness made him a poor choice to lead the Protestant

\footnotesize
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Union. He described Frederick as “much too young and small timbered to undertake such a task.”¹³⁰ In addition to picking up on such sentiments, Heywood reminds readers of a theme he had established in the preface to the poem: Frederick is young, beautiful, and womanish. Except for the fact that “his habit shewd what sex he bore,” people would mistake him for a woman.¹³¹ Frederick is a boy so young and beautiful he could be mistaken for a girl, “having female beauty in a manly look.”¹³² He equals Elizabeth in appearance, “his parts admired every where,/ His sweet proportion, feature, shape, and face. . . match this Lady in her comely grace.”¹³³ His parts itemized, Frederick is the subject/object of a blazon. Not only does Frederick look feminine, but he plays the female’s part in poetry. He does this again later in the poem, taking on the role of the bride. Traditionally, wedding poems emphasize that the bride belongs to the community by having the community lead her to the ceremony.¹³⁴ In Marriage Triumph, the people lead Frederick rather than Elizabeth, presenting him to James: “with glad shouts, and loud applauses [they] bring [him], Even to the presence of the potent King.”¹³⁵ Heywood’s characterization of James as the potent king highlights his power and position as the royal father welcoming a new son into his family. Rather than Elizabeth marrying out of the Stuarts, Frederick marries into and becomes one of them.

¹³⁰ McClure, Vol. 1, 146.
¹³¹ Heywood, B3r.
¹³² Ibid., B3r.
¹³³ Ibid., C1v.
¹³⁵ Heywood, C4v.
In other words, Heywood presents an international Protestant alliance dominated by Britain. He negotiates the problem of portraying the marriage as one in which Frederick/Germany serves as the dominant force by feminizing him and emphasizing qualities that place him in a position of inferiority to James (his youth and inexperience.) In doing so, he turns praise of and objections to Frederick to Britain’s advantage. Frederick’s beauty and youth grant Britain influence over him, placing him in the position of a nubile maid. Moreover, Heywood presents their union as a same-sex pairing of equals and thereby sidesteps both the traditional gender roles of marriage and the implications such roles have for the power relationship between Britain and the Palatinate. He accomplishes this by describing the relationship of husband and wife to that of brother and sister. Addressing Elizabeth and Frederick, he says:

T’seems when I this couple see,
Thy sister [Artemis] I behold and thee [Apollo],
When you both were nurst long while
By Laton in Delos Isle.

But the fair Sun and Moon
Were there delivered soon,
Just as I see these two grac’t
On Earth: So you in Heaven were plac’t[.]\(^{136}\)

Artemis and Apollo as the Sun and Moon are in a standard, gendered hierarchy; however, the conceptual replacement of husband and wife by brother and sister upsets this hierarchy. In comparing the couple to the sibling gods, Heywood takes the idea of

\(^{136}\) Ibid., D4v.
Frederick as a replacement for Henry and pushes it to its logical conclusion: married siblings. He visualizes their close kinship, mentioning both their shared birth and breast feeding. Heywood characterizes their kinship as sanguine, as something other than the standard, exogamous marriage. In doing so, he employs two strategies Maureen Quilligan identifies for side-stepping the traditional traffic in women in fiction and reality: lesbianism and incest. While Heywood does not mean this literally (Frederick, is after all a boy and not Elizabeth’s brother), his portrayal of a non-standard relationship between Frederick and Elizabeth allows him to destabilize the relationship that would be created by James (Britain) “giving” Elizabeth to Frederick (the Palatine). By skewing the power balance in the marriage, Heywood, at least poetically, ensures Britain’s ability to retain power over the Palatinate.

Like Peacham, Heywood imagines the marriage as the foundation of a British empire led by Elizabeth and Frederick’s heir:

May the Branches spread so far,

Famous both in peace and war,

That the Roman Eagle may

---

137 This may evoke images of Elizabeth I as nursing mother of the Protestant nation. See Helen Hackett, *Virgin mother, maiden queen: Elizabeth I and the cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: MacMillan, 1995).

138 Maureen Quilligan asks us to re-examine our notion of kinship in order to better understand the way in which power functioned in the early modern period, in particular, how aristocratic women may have had access to it through traditional kinship structures. Drawing on the work of anthropologists, she argues that women are more than passive objects of exchange in the marriage market because they retain important connections to their natal families after marriage. Though Quilligan’s main focus is the way in which endogamous family relationship enabled women to assert their own authority (in writing, through tropes of incest), she identifies two other ways to subvert the traffic in women: lesbianism and religious commitment to virginity. See Quilligan, *Incest and Agency in Elizabeth’s England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005). Quilligan focuses on aristocratic women, but Diane Purkiss, in her earlier work on witchcraft, identified incest as a trope employed by lower-class women to demonstrate their status as outsiders to traditional kinship structures. See Purkiss, “Sounds of Silence: Fairies and Incest in Scottish Witchcraft Stories,” in *Languages of Witchcraft: Narrative, Ideology, and Meaning in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Stuart Clark (New York: Macmillan, 2001), 81-98.
Be Instated some blest day,

Despite of Romes proud brags,

Within our English flags,

To revive you after death,

That we may praise Elizabeth. 139

Heywood sees the heirs (“branches”) who defeat the Hapsburg empire (“English flags”

defeat “Romes proud brags”) as being distinctly English, much as Peacham had. 140

However, unlike Peacham, Heywood pictures the heir as a strong female: the

reincarnation of Elizabeth I. The Palatine match is the means by which Elizabeth I will

live forever, keeping alive “England’s once shining star . . . that good Queen

Elizabeth.” 141 Princess Elizabeth is the progenitor an unending line of Queen Elizabeths,

literally granting her endless life:

May that name be raised high,

139 Heywood, E2r.

140 Heywood clarifies that it is Great Britain rather than England who proves victorious against Rome,

writing of the “four great Kingdoms” united:

Whil’st the Flower de Luce we see
With our Lions quartered be,

... By the fair white Unicorn,
The Wild-man, the Greyhound, and
Fierce Dragon, that supporters stand,
With Lions red and white,
Which with the Harp unite:
Then the Falcon join’d with these
May the Roman Eagle seize. (E1v-E2r)

He envisions Great Britain metonymically “unite[d]” as each of the emblems names represents a country

James claimed as sovereign, Flower de Luce (France), Lions (England), Unicorn (Scotland), Wildman and

Greyhound (Wales), Dragon (England/St. George), and Harp (Ireland). The falcon remains a mystery,

though Anne Boleyn and Elizabeth I used the falcon in their crests. Peacham, in The Period of Mourning,

also describes the falcon as something pleasing to the King, “the towring Falcon for the Kings delight”

(C2r).

141 Ibid., E1v.
Nor in the female issue die:

A joyful and glad mother prove,

Protected by the Powers above,

That from the Royal line

Which this day doth combine

With a brave Prince; no fate, no death,

Extinguish may Elizabeth.\(^{142}\)

Heywood acknowledges that the wedding “doth combine” royal bloodlines, but Frederick’s line functions only to allow the reproduction of “female issue,” of multiple Elizabeths. These reincarnations of Elizabeth I lead to the defeat of Rome; they are the great hope of Christendom, as “All Christendom shall flourish in [Elizabeth’s] seed.”\(^{143}\)

Heywood thus imagines the fall of Rome through an international alliance, headed by England and dependent upon the leadership of a re-born Elizabeth I.

Tobias Hübner was a scholar who held positions at the courts of leading members of the Protestant Union and was particularly connected with the courts of Dessau. In Beschreibung Der Reiss, an account of the wedding celebrations offered to Elizabeth and Frederick in Heidelberg, he presents Frederick as a strong leader and visualizes

\(^{142}\) Ibid., E2r.

\(^{143}\) Ibid., A4v. Heywood saw Elizabeth I as the champion of reformed religion. In his chronicle Troia Brittanica, he pictures her giving spiritual and literal birth to the gospel: She did the Gospel quicken, and confound / Rome’s Antichrist” (Troia Brittanica: Or, Great Britaines Troy. A Poem Deuided into XVII. Seueral Cantons, intermixed with many pleasant Poeticall Tales. Concluding with an Vniuersall Chronicle from the Creation, vntill these present Times [London: William Jaggard, 1609], 463). In his play If you know not me, you know nobody, he adapted the story of Elizabeth’s ascension in Book XII of John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments to show Elizabeth triumphing over the evil machinations of her sister Mary’s Catholic counselors to become queen. The play ends with her affirmation of Protestantism to the people of England. Accepting a bible from the Lord Mayor, she says, “Who builds on this, dwel’s in a happy state” (If you know not me, You know no bodie: Or, The Troubles of Queene Elizabeth [London: Nathaniel Butter, 1605], G4r).
Elizabeth’s transition from British princess to German Electress. From the first moment Elizabeth enters Heidelberg she is reminded of Frederick’s worth. Heidelberg had erected a triumphal arch bearing both the Palatine and English coats of arms. The English coat of arms, however, is decorated with leopards, an allusion to a former union between the English royal family and a German noble family: the marriage of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II with Isabel, sister of King Henry III, in 1235. Frederick II gave Henry III three leopards upon marrying Isabel. The leopards represent not only a long-standing bond between Germany and England, but also the strength of Frederick’s bloodlines—Frederick II was Holy Roman Emperor for thirty years in the thirteenth century.

The festivities themselves present Frederick as a conqueror. Whereas Heywood focuses on his youth and femininity, Hübner emphasizes his strength and manliness. He enters the running at the ring disguised as Jason returning from Colchis with the Golden Fleece. He is accompanied by a train including “a very beautiful elaborately-carved carriage, covered completely with gold and silver and drawn by two dragons.”144 The right side of the carriage pictures Jason’s arrival at Colchis, greeted by “a terrible fiery dragon and dreadful, wild, fire-spitting, bronze-footed oxen wanted to prevent their landing and disembarkation.”145 The left side of the carriage depicts Jason valiant, leading the defeated dragon and oxen to fetch the Golden Fleece. Painted below his triumph was the inscription “virtue and chivalric deeds have earned noble treasure.”146
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Elizabeth, a “noble treasure,” functions as something to be claimed and made one’s own and this is exactly what the people of Heidelberg do. When Elizabeth enters Heidelberg, they crown her as a German Electress:

At the end of the market-place, at the entrance to the Upper Street, a fine triumphal arch had been erected by the sheriff, the mayor and the city council of Heidelberg. Below the arch, from a silk ribbon stretched across it, a suspended golden crown was hanging, and when the princess came riding through, it was lowered down on the ribbon onto the roof of her carriage by two young boys, as though to crown her, and was then drawn up again.147

The Germans enact Elizabeth’s transformation from a British princess to a German Electress as they crown her. At the same time, they show her that she must become one of them because her royalty depends upon their acceptance of her—it is their decision whether or not to lower the crown.

Royal Women and Fictional Unions

The occasional works written in celebration of Elizabeth and Frederick’s wedding constituted a major literary event. Peacham and Weckherlin took the opportunities afforded them by later occurrences, the birth of Elizabeth and Frederick’s heir in 1614 and their first public appearance in Germany after the wedding in 1616, to offer their own contributions to the wedding literature. Following the example provided by authors in

147 Ibid., 85.
their epithalamia in 1613, Peacham and Weckherlin picture Elizabeth and Frederick’s marriage as a model for an Anglo-German Protestant Union. However, affected by their different national and gender biases, they present incompatible visions of how such an alliance would function. In their explicit renderings of the problems posed by competing national loyalties they reveal what had been implicit in the earlier wedding literature. Not every wedding piece written by an Englishman follows the specific trajectory of Heywood or Peacham, or the German works of Weckherlin or Hübner. Yet, they all exhibit concern with nation, gender, and rank which trouble the belief that these works as a cogent Protestant propaganda campaign. Authors may have agitated for religious union, but they violently disagreed about the shape that union would take and the roles Britain and Germany would play in it, foreshadowing the ultimate failure of an Anglo-German Protestant coalition.

While this provides a more nuanced understanding of the wedding literature, it also affords us a new look at representations of Elizabeth. Scholars from Elizabeth Benger to Georgianna Ziegler have seen Elizabeth as a reborn Elizabeth I. In their studies of Elizabeth Stuart, they have found and cited comparisons made between her and her godmother from her youth throughout her married life. Benger, for example, records an eye-witness account of Elizabeth preparing for war which describes her as Elizabeth I reborn:

That great lady, who, the tears trickling down her cheeks, was mild, courteous, and affable, yet with a proper degree of state, like another Queen Elizabeth, the Phoenix of the world. Gone is that sweet princess, with her now more than princely consort, towards the place where his
army attendeth, shewing herself like that virago of Tilbury, another Queen Elizabeth; for so she now is.\textsuperscript{148}

While such work has provided valuable insights into representations of Elizabeth Stuart and the literary afterlife of Elizabeth I, it has offered a skewed vision of Elizabeth Stuart’s image. Once she married Frederick, she no longer fit the model provided by her namesake, the virgin queen, and there were authors, such as Peacham and Weckherlin, who considered how marriage changed her role. Examining such representations offers a very different, more complicated understanding of Elizabeth’s public image as an amalgam of competing obligations created by being the daughter of James I, British princess, wife of a German count, and figurehead of the Protestant Union.

In 1619, Elizabeth’s mother, Anna of Denmark, died. The Scottish theologian James Maxwell eulogized Anna in a collection of poems entitled Carolanna, That is to say, A Poeme in Honovr of Ovr King Charles-Iames, Qveene Anne, and Prince Charles: But principally in honour of the immortall memory of our late noble & good Queene. In the central poem of the collection, “Carolanna,” he compares Anna with historical queens from the time of Mary, the mother of Jesus and “The Queene of Women,” to Elizabeth I and argues that, with the exception of Mary, Anna outranks them all:

\begin{quote}
For birth, them all, saue one, for worths account,
None of them was her match; and as for race
How farre she them excelles: Eliza’s grace
That now adornes high-Dutchland, and the Rhine,
\end{quote}

Maxwell transitions from discussing Anna’s ancestry to her children, specifically Princess Elizabeth, implicitly suggesting that the most important connection between mother and daughter is their right to precedence. However, Carolanna offers a far more significant parallel between Elizabeth and Anna: their roles as queens of union. For where writers consistently imagined Elizabeth as queen of the Protestant Union, they depicted Anna as queen of the Union of Great Britain. It is to posthumous representations of Anna that explore her role as “The first of Queens . . . [a] Union-Crowne to weere” that I now turn.

---

149 James Maxwell, Carolanna, that is to say, A poeme in honour of our King, Charles Iames. Queene Anne, and Prince Charles but principally in honour of the immortall memory of our late noble & good Queen of Albion and Vnion, herein celebrated vnder the names of Dianna and Cimbrina, by allusion vnto her princely name and nation. Begun to be penned on her fatall day of Mars the second of March last; ended on the octaue, the next Mars day: and now published to summon all rankes and degrees in Christendome, especially in the northerne kingdomes, of Britannie, Denmark, & Germanie, to celebrate her anniuersarie on the next second day of March, and to applaud her third coronation to be in heauen, at the next festiuall time of S. Iames, and S. Anne, and all Britanes to solemnize the memoriall theref on S. Annes day every yeare for euer. By Iames Anne-Son antiquarie and Maister of Arts (London: Edward Alde, 1619), C1v &C2v.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE “FIRST, CROWNE-VNITED” QUEEN:
ANNA OF DENMARK AND THE UNION OF GREAT BRITAIN

Anna of Denmark died on 2 March 1619. Less than two weeks later, the Venetian ambassador Antonio Donato reported that “Her Majesty’s death does not make the slightest difference in the government of these Kingdoms.”\(^1\) The previous year Piero Contarini, another Venetian ambassador, had claimed that Anna was no longer politically important. He wrote the Doge that “The queen is unhappy because the king rarely sees her and many years have passed since he saw much of her. She possesses little authority in the court and cannot influence the king’s favour.”\(^2\) Literary scholars and historians have read Anna’s funeral in light of the ambassadors’ remarks, interpreting it as the culmination of Anna’s declining significance to the governance of Britain.\(^3\) This critical consensus has resulted in a neglect of posthumous representations of Anna, a lacuna this chapter seeks to fill. At the time of Anna’s death, five works were published to commemorate her life: Patrick Hannay’s *Two Elegies On the late death of our Soueraigne Queene Anne with Epitaphes*; James Maxwell’s *Carolanna, That is to say, A Poem in Honor of Our King, Charles-James, Queen Anne, and Prince Charles, but*

\(^1\) Allen B. Hinds, ed., *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. 1617-1619* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1909), Vol. 15, 494-5.

\(^2\) Ibid., 420.

\(^3\) For example, Clare McManus argues that “Anna’s distance from the courtly mainstream is confirmed by her funeral, delayed by financial crisis for a month longer than tradition dictated . . . the circumstances of Anna’s death and its aftermath seem only to confirm her loss of power” (*Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court 1590-1619* [New York: Manchester University Press, 2002], 202-3). I disagree with such assessments of the funeral. Contarini’s account is unreliable, containing egregious errors. For example, he identifies Elizabeth’s dead sister Mary rather than Elizabeth as the wife of Frederick, Count Palatine: “The second child is the Princess Mary, married to the Palatine” (*CSP, Venice*, Vol. 15, 421). There is also strong evidence that suggests the funeral was meant to showcase Anna’s importance—see the introduction for more details.
principally in honor of the immortal memory of our late noble and good Queen; William Slatyer’s ΘΡΗΩΔΙΑ . . . Elegies and Epitaphs [in honor of Queen Anne]; a collection published by the University of Oxford, Academiæ Oxoniensis Fvnebria Sacra. Æternae Memoriae Serenissimæ Reginæ ANNÆ; and a print, The Scala Coeli of the Gracious Queen Anne. It is clear that the authors of these works were deeply invested in political controversies and used their texts to participate in ongoing conversations over domestic and international political policy. In his Two Elegies, Hannay took the opportunity offered by Anna’s death to intervene in the newly revived debate over James’s project to establish a Union of Great Britain, and, at the same time, to advise Prince Charles.

---

4 Hannay’s poem is the only one in the Stationers’ Register. On 15 May 1619, Nicholas Okes entered “his Copy under the hands of Master Doctor Featly and Master Adames warden, Two Elegies on the Death of the Queene, made by Patricke Hanna[y]” (Arber, Vol. 3, 648). While this dissertation focuses on printed works available for public consumption, it is worth noting that there were other poems written in honor of Anna’s death. These works, which circulated in manuscript, include elegies written by William Swaddon, the Archdeacon of Worcester, and King James. On 23 August 1619, Swaddon, the Archdeacon of Worcester, sent “verses written by himself on the Queen’s funeral” to Sir Julius Caesar (Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Regin of James I. 1619-1623 [London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858], Vol. 10, 72). John Nichols identified these verses as being “some Latin verses, printed on a broadside, and inserted between pp. 344-345 of Camden’s Remains, third edition” (The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, Vol. 3, 545). I have encountered two versions of King James’s poem:

1

Thee to invite the great God sent His star,  
Whose friends and nearest kin good princes are,  
Who, though they run the race of men and die,  
Death serves but to refine their majesty.  
So did my Queen from hence her court remove,  
And left off earth to be enthroned above.  
She’s changed, not dead, for sure no good prince dies,  
But, as the sun, sets, only for to rise.

2

Thee to invite to heaven god sent his star  
Whose nearest friends and kin good princes are  
So though they run the race of men & die  
Death serves but to refine their Majesty  
So did my Queen from hence her Court remove  
And left the earth to be enthron’d above  
Thus she is changed, not dead: no good prince dies  
But like the day-star only sets to rise.

Version 1 can be found in David Harris Willson, King James VI and I (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956), 403-404; Version 2 in David Bergeron, Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 142. Scholarship on James’s poem has focused on its concern with mortality. David Bergeron argues that “the poem reveals James merely trying to rationalize the problem of death—any prince’s death, including his own” (142). Antonia Fraser argues that “King James was additionally reminded by the death of Anne of Denmark in 1619 of those long fingers which must in the end touch all mortals . . . he was cast into a great melancholy by her death in spite of spinning some consoling verses” (King James VI of Scotland, I of England [London: Book Club Associates, 1974], 177).
Dedicating *Two Elegies* to Charles, he looked to him as both a potential patron and a “king-in-training.” Hannay uses his paean to Anna to provide Charles with a role model for his kingship. He imagines an idealized Union with Anna at its head. A powerful Protestant queen, Anna successfully unifies England and Scotland by acknowledging them to be separate, but equal. Hannay offers Charles a vision of government in which a functional Union is established by incorporating rather than eliminating English and Scottish national identities.

As a Scottish poet who had followed James to England in 1603, Hannay had a vested interest in the success of James’s union project and supported it through his poetry. His friend John Marshall describes his poems as contributions to the state. Marshall claims that where Hannay’s “fathers father Donald well was knowne! To th’ English by his sword,” Patrick is known “To them by [his] pen.”

Marshall’s characterization clearly distinguishes Hannay from his ancestors, known for their hostility to England. His “fathers father” Donald Sorby had engaged in border warfare, earning a reputation for antagonism toward the English. Indeed, some have speculated that Sorby was killed at the battle of Flodden in 1513 when King James IV led a Scottish army to invade England. By positioning Patrick Hannay as the polar opposite of his grandfather, Marshall identifies him as sympathetic to the English. Marshall also suggests that Hannay supported the union, asserting that he has responded to “*times changing*” by helping to make “*peace*” between the English and Scottish with his poems.

---


6 A Mr. M’Kerlie contends that Donald Sorby died at Flodden, however, David Laing disagrees, arguing that it was more likely that he established himself in later battles over the border. See David Laing, ed., *The Poetical Works of Patrick Hannay* (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1966), 48.
Hannay was concerned with reaching a wide readership and examining issues affecting women. When he published his collected works in 1622, he did not attempt to establish himself as an “Author” along the lines of Ben Jonson, who printed his oeuvre in an expensive, impressive folio. Instead, he made his works available in an unpretentious quarto and, while the signatures show that they were printed as one complete book, each piece was published with its own title-page, ready to be sold separately. Hannay, then, intended his poems and treatise to reach a large number of readers, more concerned with being read than with establishing himself as a literary figure of importance. The readership he hoped to reach was usually comprised of women—he dedicates most of his works to women and takes as his subject matter the complex and difficult choices women are forced to make by societal constraints and kinship obligations. His first known work, for example, *A Happy Husband*, is an advice manual counseling women on how to choose a mate.⁷ Dedicating it to Lady Margaret Home, daughter of Alexander Earl

---

⁷ There is an entry in 1614 in the Stationers’ Register which Edward Arber identifies as Hannay’s book: On 1 July 1614, Laurence Lile “Entred for his Coppie vnder the handes of master Tavernor and master warden sfield a Poeme called the Husbande [by Patrick Hannay]” (Arber, Vol. 3, 252). However, the extant copies of the book date from 1619 and there is an entry dated 20 January 1619 in which John Beale “Entred for his Copie vnder the handes of Master Doctor Featlie and master Gylmyn warden A booke Called Direction for a Maid to Choose her Mate, by Patrick Hannay gent[leman]” (Ibid., 297b). The content of the book suggests it is a direct response to Thomas Overbury’s poem, *A Wife*. Robert Carr, Overbury’s friend, had decided to pursue the married Francis Howard, Countess of Essex, a match Overbury felt ill-advised. Consequently, he wrote and circulated *A Wife* in manuscript, warning Carr against marriage with Howard and recommending qualities which he should seek in a wife. The Carr-Howard match was the biggest scandal of James’s reign, beginning with Howard’s annulling her marriage to Robert Devereux on the basis of his impotence, continuing with Overbury’s murder in the Tower of London, and ending with the trial, imprisonment, and conviction of Carr and Howard for his death. Alastair Bellany covers the events in depth in *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1666* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Hannay’s poem offers a corresponding advice manual for women. One author, who identifies himself only as R. S., offers a commendatory verse to Hannay’s poem entitled, “To Overburies Widow, wife of this Husband”; William Jewell offers a commendatory poem that praises Hannay for hauing “brought to life/ A Husband fit for Overburies Wife” (Laing, 163-4). As the book is a response to the Overbury scandal, the date of 1614 for its original composition makes far more sense than 1619. However, the 1619 printing is the first edition (the title page to *A Happy Husband* in Hannay’s 1622 collected works claims that it is the “second edition”). I have found no reason why Hannay’s work would be delayed in publication for five years, if we assume a 1614
Home, he offers the book “To Women in Generall.” He dedicated *Philomela or The Nightingale*, a poem based on Ovid’s tale in *The Metamorphoses*, to Frances Stuart (née Howard), Countess of Lennox, the likely author of the pseudonymously published *Esther Hath Hangd a Haman*, a defense of women responding to Joseph Swetnam’s *The Arraignment of Lewd, Idle, Inconstant, and Froward Women*. Hannay dedicated his heroic poem *Sheretine and Mariana* to Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, a powerful courtier known for her patronage of the arts and her close connection with Queen Anna (she was a member of her bedchamber). He narrates both poems from the perspective of a female protagonist, a fact which has garnered him the only recent critical attention he has received: *Sheretine and Mariana* earned him recognition as a minor poet for its “peculiarity . . . of being written in the first person, the story being told throughout by the heroine.” Hannay bases both poems on stories in which the structure and rules of society leave women with impossible decisions. In *Philomela*, he speaks as the eponymous heroine, telling the horrible tale of her rape by Tereus, King of Thrace, and the revenge she and her sister Progne wreak on him. He adopts the voice of Mariana in *Sheretine and Mariana*, an epic poem set in the time of Solyman the Magnificent, fourth emperor of the Turks. Mariana becomes engaged to Sheretine, but her ambitious parents force her to break her promise and marry Turian, a man of higher social standing.

---

8 The Homes family had patronized Hannay. He recognizes their contributions to his career in the dedicatory epistle, writing “in remembrance of those not to be requited favours, which haue wholly obliged me to your House” (Laing, 159).


Sheretine dies when he learns of her marriage, convinced she has betrayed him; Mariana dies of a broken heart upon hearing that Sheretine is dead. In both *Philomela* and *Sheretine and Mariana*, Hannay paints a sympathetic look at the difficulties faced by his women and, in the case of Philomela, offers an example of a woman who claims some measure of control over her life.

Hannay’s *Two Elegies*, which endorses the Great Britain project through an image of Anna as a powerful unifying force, fits comfortably at the beginning of his literary career, demonstrating early on his interest in the lives of women. His decision to write about Anna in a poem dedicated to Charles also follows the trajectory of his patronage career. He had initially established himself at court by seeking the patronage of Anna and her ladies, in particular Lucy Russell to whom he acknowledged an “obligation of gratitude.”¹¹ When Anna died, Hannay turned his attention to Charles, proffering his *Two Elegies* to the future king. Writing “To the most Noble Prince Charles,” he argues that since Anna has died, Charles is “solely left for our reliefe.”¹² Hannay did gain the patronage of James, but only several years after publishing *Two Elegies*, and moreover he came to James’s attention not as a writer, but as a soldier. James rewarded Hannay for serving under Sir Andrew Gray as part of the small force he had sent to aid Elizabeth and Frederick during the Bohemian Crisis.¹³ James conferred upon him “a clerk’s place of

---

¹¹ Laing, 76.


¹³ In 1622, Hannay dedicated his *Songs and Sonnets* to Gray, “Colonell of a foot regiment, and Generall of the Artillerie to the high and mightie Prince Fredericke King of Bohemia.” He thanked Gray for having watched over him during the war, directing “these labours . . . to you for offering or for shield, Since you so fatherly did me affect,/ When first you did conduct me to the field” (Laing, 225).
the Privy Council in Ireland” in recognition “of the well deserving of our servant.”14
The Privy Council of Ireland opposed his appointment, but James died before he could rectify the situation. Charles then took up Hannay’s cause. Writing Lord Viscount Falkland on 28 May 1625, he insisted that Hannay be invested “with all rights and privileges of that place.”15 Charles described Hannay as “an able and well-deserving man [who had] . . . done our late dear father good and acceptable service beyond the seas with great charge and danger of his life.”16 However, Charles did not endorse Hannay solely on the basis of his effort in the Bohemian crisis. Remembering Hannay’s earlier connection with Anna, Charles showed him favor for having “been recommended unto to us by our dear mother.”17

In *Two Elegies*, Hannay offers Charles a portrait of his mother as a powerful force, governing the body politic and crucial to its functioning. Hannay envisions the kingdom collapsing without Anna, a collapse which occurs when the people see her hearse. He thereby demonstrates the symbolic significance of the funeral itself. This contradicts the modern scholarly view that the funeral signified Anna’s unimportance. Hannay portrays her as having an important role in British political, as well as cultural, life. Indeed, I use the word ‘British’ here deliberately as the unification of England and Scotland as Great Britain was a major point of contention during James’s reign. Britain or, rather, James’s project of the Union of Great Britain was a controversial subject

---

15 Ibid., 43.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
throughout his tenure, one which regained vitality in 1617, the year in which the king
made his first progress to his native Scotland after succeeding to the English crown and
when he attempted to institute measures that would bring Scotland’s Kirk in line with the
Church of England’s practices.¹⁸

Nationalism proved to be a major obstacle to Union, as both the Scots and English
viewed themselves as belonging to different nations. In 1607, for example, Scottish
sailors complained to the Scottish Privy Council that the flag which combined the
English and Scottish arms was “verie prejudiciall to the fredome and dignitie of this
Estate, and will gif occasioun of reprotche to this natioun quhairevie the said flage sal
happin to be wore,” since the English arms obscured the Scottish.¹⁹ English nationalism
frequently emerged in conjunction with anti-Scottish sentiment and was so prevalent that
the would-be perpetrators of the 1605 Gunpowder Plot seized upon it and employed it in
their defense. They offered the flood of Scottish into England as their motive for the
attack, asserting that they were “against . . . all strangers.”²⁰ Such feelings persisted late
into James’s reign. In 1617, Thomas Percy, an Englishmen and one of the plotters, tried
to stop his daughter Lucy from marrying the Scottish Lord Hay, stating that “he would
not have her dancing Scottish jigs.”²¹ Such national loyalties (and hostilities) suggest

¹⁸ Brian Levack summarizes James’s project as the creation of a national state, “renaming as well as uniting
their laws, parliaments, councils, churches, and economies, mutual naturalization of subjects of both
countries and fostering a ‘union of love’ between them” (The Formation of the British State: England,

¹⁹ David Masson, ed., The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, 1604-1607 (Edinburgh: H. M. General
Register House, 1885), Vol. 7, 498.

²⁰ Lori Anne Ferrell, Government by Polemic: James I, the King’s Preachers, and the Rhetorics of

²¹ Jenny Wormald, “Gunpowder, Treason, and Scots,” The Journal of British Studies 24, no. 2 (April
1985): 161. Notably, this is the same Scottish Lord Hay who had married the English heiress Honora
Denny in 1607, a married that itself represented a union of Scotland and England. Scholars have
that Anglo-Scottish Union should be viewed as a matter of foreign relations. Scholars
usually have approached the project of the Union of Great Britain as an internal matter
because James had united the crowns of England and Scotland. Andrew Nicholls, in The
Jacobean Union (1999), acknowledges the national differences dividing England and
Scotland, but categorizes the Anglo-Scottish union as an internal issue. For example, he
argues that James worked for “a sustained peace in Europe” because it would help him
“in entrenching his dynasty and pursuing such domestic objectives as Anglo-Scottish
union.”22 Yet the Union of Great Britain was a matter of international concern. In
particular, it served as a locus of competing national identities, specifically those between
England and Scotland. In other words, Nicholls’s chapter entitled “Britain and Early
Stuart Foreign Policy” should be “Britain as Early Stuart Foreign Policy.”

Most historians have offered 1608 as the end point to James’s official effort to
establish the Union of Great Britain—indeed the historian Bruce Galloway’s book on the
Union is revealingly titled, The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608 (1986).23 In
his biography of James, however, Alan Stewart suggests that James renewed his work on
behalf of Union in 1617 when he traveled to Scotland.24 Building on Stewart’s work, I

traditionally read the masque composed for the occasion by Thomas Campion—Lord Hayes Masque—as a
promotion of James’s Union project. Honora died in 1614 and Hay subsequently pursued Lucy Percy.

22 Andrew D. Nicholls, The Jacobean Union: A Reconsideration of British Civil Policies Under the Early
Stuarts (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999), 121, my emphasis.

23 For more on the Union of Great Britain, see: Bruce Galloway, The Union of England and Scotland
1603-1608 (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1986); Brian P. Levack, The Formation of the British
“The Anglo-Scottish Union 1603-1643: a success?,” in Religion, culture and society in early modern
Britain: Essays in honour of Patrick Collinson, eds. Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (New York:
Cambridge University Press, 1994), 238-256; and, Maurice Lee, Jr., The ‘Inevitable’ Union and Other

285-6.
would add that Hannay used the occasion of Anna’s funeral to enter the debate over Union, a debate which had been revived by James’s recent efforts in Scotland. Indeed, he manipulated Anna’s posthumous image in order to intervene in the controversy of the Union of Great Britain by examining her role as the “first, Crowne-vnited” Queen.\(^\text{25}\) He portrays her as the ruler he always needed her to be: a Protestant champion who unifies England and Scotland. While Hannay supports Union, he promotes a very different vision of Union than did James.

After declaring himself King of Britain, James had insisted that England and Scotland form a shared national “British” consciousness. James, I will discuss in detail later, focused his efforts in 1617 on religious unity as the foundation of such a British identity. Unlike James, Hannay advocates a Union in which English and Scottish national identities remain. He does not include religious unity in his vision, but rather focuses on the form the government of Union will take, advocating a government in which England and Scotland operate in a partnership, quasi-independently of one another. Hannay’s “The first Elegie” offers a meditation of the nature of union and government, demonstrating the benefits of union and the destructive consequences of division. “The second Elegie,” a lament on Anna’s death characterized by direct political allegory, is in fact a metaphorical consideration of the Union of Great Britain in which Hannay admits that James has failed to establish Union but claims that James and Anna have laid the groundwork for Charles—his new patron as well as, tellingly, the offspring of their union—to achieve Union in his reign.

\(^{25}\) Hannay, D3r.
“The first Elegie”: Anna as head of the body politic

In “The first Elegie,” Hannay considers Anna’s life and what it means to the people of England and Scotland. He opens by claiming that he and his countrymen have been struck so hard with grief that they do not know how to react. Asserting that “Who doe grieue most, least signe of griefe doe show,” he imagines a future when they vent their “smothred griefe.” Eventually they express their grief to their children. But when their “of-spring” hear their laments, they find it disingenuous, considering it to be fictional because it is either by “some Poets pen” or reflective of a national identity that no longer exists. He fears that the next generation of children born in England and Scotland might not recognize themselves as English or Scottish, but “thinke . . . that they are of the same stones all sprung,/ Which backward Pyrrha and Ducalyon flung.” He alludes to a Greco-Roman creation myth in which all people derive from the same couple: Deucalion, son of Prometheus and Pronoia, and Pyrrha, daughter of Epimetheus and Pandora. Hannay is almost certainly citing Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, a new edition of which had been printed in 1618. According to the myth, Zeus flooded the earth and the only humans to survive were Deucalion and Pyrrha. The two lived through the flood by climbing into a chest and floating until the waters subsided and they ran ashore. Despairing at being the sole surviving humans, they “wept. Then they thought it good to pray vnto the heauenly God, and to seeke his ayde by the sacred Oracles.” Following

---

26 Ibid., A4r.
27 Ibid.
28 Ouids Metamorphosis Translated Grammatically, and also according to the propriety of our English tongue, so farre as Grammar and the verse will well beare. Written chiefly for the good of Schooles, to be
the divine instruction they received, they repopulated the earth by throwing stones over
their shoulders; when the stones hit the earth, they became people.\textsuperscript{29} In referring to this
myth, Hannay evokes the fear that Union would negate national identities, as people
would not make national distinctions between England and Scotland, believing “that they
are of the same \textit{Stones} all sprung.” Rather than identify themselves as Scottish or
English, they would see themselves as British. Hannay focuses his concern on future
generations because they are the people most affected by the shift to ‘British’
nationalism. For those born before 1603, the “anti-nati,” were denied full rights as
subjects in both England and Scotland, having only those rights of the country in which
they were born. However, all born after 1603, the “post-nati,” were granted full rights as
citizens of England and Scotland.

The English Parliament’s 1607 debates over naturalization brought the issues of
national identity fueling the Union debate into focus. Thomas Wentworth, an English
lawyer and politician, objected to a union with Scotland because it would be practically
difficult and ideologically unsound.\textsuperscript{30} On 17 February 1607, he gave “A long and learned
Dispute touching the general Part of the Union (Naturalization),” in which he described
England and Scotland as distinct nations, asserting that “They acknowledge no Crown, no
King, no Sovereignty, but that of \textit{Scotland}; we none, but that of \textit{England}.”\textsuperscript{31} In


\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. Wentworth, a man of Lincoln’s Inn whose life was devoted to “Parliament, Puritanism, and the
law,” spoke out against crown policy throughout his career and strongly opposed the Union with Scotland.
\textit{DNB}, Vol. 58, 139-40).
Wentworth’s estimation, neither the Scottish nor the English wanted to acknowledge the sovereignty of a foreign king. For him, national loyalty erected an insurmountable obstacle to Union.

Considering the Union, another English lawyer and politician, Nicholas Fuller, who believed in maintaining parliamentary liberties, thought that merging the two legal systems would reduce these liberties and subjugate the English common law. Addressing Parliament, he likened England and Scotland to two swarms of bees, and argued that “It shall not be good to mingle Two Swarms of Bees under one Hive.”

In nature, each swarm would have its own hive. The bee metaphor thus suggests that Union, like two swarms of bees in one hive, is unnatural. According to the apiarist Charles Butler in *The Feminine Monarchie Or A Treatise Concerning Bees* (1609): “as they of the same hive liue in inviolable peace one with another; so haue they no entercourse, no friendship or society with others, but are rather at perpetual distance, & deadlock feud with them.”

Applying such knowledge to Fuller’s metaphor implies that England and Scotland are natural enemies. At the same time, the metaphor alludes to the antagonistic history between the countries and indicates that it cannot be disregarded.

---

32 *Journal of the House of Commons*, 335. Indeed, I wonder if this was not a clever twist on the common fear that England would be swarmed by Scots. James employed this language in a speech before both houses of Parliament in 1607, claiming that is was a misperception “That this Vnion will be the Crisis to the ouerthrow of England, and setting vp of Scotland: England will then bee overwhelmed by the swarming of Scots, who if the Vnion were effecte, would raigne and rule all” (Johann P. Sommerville, ed., *King James VI and I Political Writings* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994], 164).

33 Charles Butler, *The Feminine Monarchie Or A Treatise Concerning Bees, And The Dve Ordering Of Them Wherein The truth found out by experience and diligent observation, discovereth the idle and fond concepts, which many have written anent this subiect* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1609), H8v.

34 James maintained that the people had already moved past the history: “Those confining places which were the Borders of the two Kingdomes, where heretofore much blood was shed, and many of your ancestours lost their liues; yea, that lay waste and desolate, and were habitationes but for runagates, are now becomes the Nauell or Vmbilick of both Kingdomes, planted and peopled with Ciuilitie and riches . . .
Union can be achieved only by conquest, subjugating one country to another. He warns against “The King [James] . . . make[ing] Parcel of One Kingdom Part of another, being distinct Kingdoms.”

Wentworth and Fuller, like many of their fellow countrymen, exhibit a particular concern over Union with Scotland, fearing that since James was Scottish, he would subjugate England to Scotland.

During the Parliamentary debates in England, national prejudice emerged, sometimes in blatant and unexpected ways. In February of 1607, Sir Christopher Pigott, a knight of the shire for the County of Buckinghamshire, made a speech in the Lower House “in which he accused Scots of being false.”

During his tirade, he uttered, in the words of the *Journal of the House of Commons*, “Invective against the Scotts and Scottish Nation, using many Words of Scandal and Obloquy, ill beseeming such an Audience, not pertinent to the Matter in hand, and very unseasonable for the Time and Occasion.”

When James addressed both houses of Parliament on 31 March 1607, he acknowledged that many shared Pigott’s point of view: “I know there are many Piggots amongst them,

where there was nothing before heard nor seene in those parts but bloodshed, oppressions, complaints and outcries, they now liue euery man peaceably” (Sommerville, 169).

---

35 *Journal of the House of Commons*, 335. Nicholas Fuller was a lawyer (Gray’s Inn) and politician who objected to the Union on legal grounds, concerned that the integration of the legal systems would limit the powers of the English parliament and wreak havoc with the courts. Stephen Wright described him as “a radical puritan M.P.” (“Nicholas Fuller and the Liberties of the Subject,” *Parliamentary History* 25, pt. 2 [2006], 176).

36 *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1938), Vol. 17, 59.

37 *Journal of the House of Commons*, 333. According to Thomas Birch, the English did not immediately punish Piggott, in consequence of which Ramsey, a Scot in James’s bedchamber, spoke to James and “Made complaint of this outrage in the name of his countrymen” (81). James, infuriated, demanded justice: “[he] told them, that he was a Scot himself, and that nothing could be applied to the nation in general, in which he had not his share, he added, that he would have them to know, that he not only loved the Scots, but that one of the most express commands, which he would give the Prince his son, who was then present, should be, to do the same” (Ibid., 82). The Scots “universally triumphed” at James’s expression of partiality for Scotland, behaving “as if they had gained a victory” (Ibid., 83).
I meane a number of seditious and discontented particular persons.”

Tensions continued to escalate throughout England, furthered by the anti-Scottish sentiment pervading popular culture. Stage plays and ballads insulted the Scottish. A ballad entitled “Let bare-footed beggars still walk in the street,” extant in a number of manuscripts from the period, rehearses standard complaints against the people of Scotland, depicting them as poverty stricken beggars who are being shown unwarranted favor by the king. In particular, the ballad refers to James’s creation of knights:

Too many Scottsh beggars in England doe dwell,

by Hobbie and Jockie and Jenny and Nell;

A page at the first, of a page grewe a knight,

a Lord and a vicounte, an Eirle (by this light)

by begging, by begging.

For this ballad-writer, the undeserved promotion of begging Scotsmen demonstrates the unfairness with which Englishmen were being treated. It also suggests that Englishmen

38 Sommerville, 173.


41 Rollins, 377.
fear that James might take away their titles and lands to give them to the Scotsmen, a fear
the ballad explicitly expresses in the following stanza when it warns Englishmen that
they may “forfeite . . . [their] landes.”42 By claiming that the Scottish are infringing upon
the English (and potentially taking what is rightfully theirs), the ballad taps into English
nationalism. Moreover, it addresses a standard argument against Union: that it would
lead to the end of an English national identity. Indeed, when James began styling himself
King of Great Britain, members of the House of Commons had objected to the change in name, claiming that “the contracted name of Brittaine will bring in oblivion the names of
England and Scotland.”43 In his notes on the session, Francis Bacon recorded the
objection under the heading “The matter of honour and reputation.”44

Those who envisioned a working form of Union addressed the issue of national
color, often approaching the issue from opposing standpoints. While some advocated
giving up English and Scottish nationalities in favor of adopting a British one, others
insisted that English and Scottish identities be retained. In his Union tract, A Discovrse
Plainely Proving the euident vtilitie and vrgent necessitie of the desired happie Vnion of

---

42 Ibid., 378. James denied that he would take land from the English to give it to the Scots: “Some thinke
that I will draw the Scottish Nation hither, talking idlely of transporting of Trees out of a barren ground into
a better, and of lean cavell out of bad pasture into a more fertile soil. Can any man displant you, vnlesse
you will? Or can any man thinke that Scotland is so strong to pull you out of your houses?” (Sommerville,
165). In contrast, the writer Francis Osborne, in Traditional Memoirs (1658), claimed that James had taken
from the English to give to the Scots: “Now by this time [shortly after the Gunpowder Plot in 1605] the
nation grew feele, and over-opprest with impositions, monopolies, aydes, privy-seales, concealments,
pretermitted customes, &c. besides all forfeitures upon penall statutes, with a multitude of tricks, more to
cheat the English subject, (the most, if not all, unheard of in Queene Elizabeth’s days,) which were spent
upon the Scots: By whom nothing was unasked, and to whom nothing was denied; who, for want of
honester trafique, did extract gold out of the faults of the English, whose pardons they beg’d, and sold at
intolerable rates” (Walter Scott, ed., Secret history of the court of James the First [Edinburgh: Ballantyne,
1811], Vol. 1, 194-5).

43 Galloway, 29.

44 Ibid. Galloway includes the text of Bacon’s notes from the 27 April 1604 meeting of the House of
Commons as an appendix to his second chapter “The First Year of Union: March 1603-July 1604” (28-9).
the two famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland (1604), John Thornborough, the Bishop of Bristol, defends the union by taking the former approach. He begins by rehearsing common objections to union such as “The glorie and good acceptation of the English name and nation, will be in forreine parts obscured.” Here the second clause calls attention to the scope of the problem: England will cease to be recognized as a separate governing body. Revealingly, Thornborough categorizes the issue as a “matter of State forreine.” He recognizes that Union is a matter of international relations, of European politics. Rather than defend Union by claiming that England will retain its separate identity, he asserts that England will rightfully be subsumed into Britain, returning the country to its original state “for diuers his Maiesties most noble Progenitors, haue heretofore bene entitled (as Chronicles tell vs) Kings of all Britaine.”

Whereas Thornborough promotes Union as a reversion to an older (and, therefore, more legitimate) concept of the British nation, the Worcestershire landowner John Bachler finds Union acceptable only if England both retains its national character and rules the government. On 14 April 1608, John Bachler envisioned Anna as the solution to Anglo-Scottish tension. He claimed that “if her Majesty [Anna] had a son in England he would be King, whereby Scotsmen should not domineer any more in this land.”

---

45 John Thornborough, A Discourse Plainely Proving the euident vtilitie and vrgent necessitie of the desired happie Union of the two famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland: by way of answer to certain obiections against the same (London: Richard Field for Thomas Chard, 1604), a2r.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid., B3r.

48 Journal of the House of Commons, 177. This John Bachler may be the man who prosecuted Thomas Harris for the theft of his father’s grave-clothes in the county of Worcester in 1606. There in an entry in the County records on 2 June 1606 for the “Recognizance of John Bachler for his appearance to prosecute Thomas Harris for taking a sheet and a linen cloth out of the grave of John Bachler, late father of the said John” (Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections. The Manuscripts of the Corporations of Berwick-On-Tweed, Burford and Lostwithiel, Counties of Wilts and
the one hand, he touches upon English concerns over Charles’s Scottish birth and affiliations. In his “Relation of England” in 1618, the Venetian Ambassador Antonio Foscarini noted that “Having been born in Scotland and his attendants being mostly Scots, he [Charles] is naturally more inclined to that nation, a matter which is very distasteful to the English.”\textsuperscript{49} On the other hand, Bachler offers Anna as the means by which to gain an English heir to the throne, placing her in a position of central importance in Anglo-Scottish relations.

While these interlocutors envision Union as a process of choosing either one national identity (British) or two (English and Scottish), Hannay views it as a matter of forming a British identity from existing English and Scottish national characteristics. For Hannay, the words “English” and “Scottish” are important markers, denoting particular histories and cultures. For example, in “The second Elegie,” he expresses astonishment that “\textit{English eyes}” should cry for a woman who had been sired by Danes, as Denmark had once “vanquish’d \textit{England}.”\textsuperscript{50} Moreover, he responds to attacks on the Scottish, presenting Scotland as England’s “equall.”\textsuperscript{51} He depicts Scotland as a woman so desirable and worthy that Neptune, the god of the seas, woos her, “striue[ing] to please [her]/ With all the \textit{loue}-alurements of the Seas.”\textsuperscript{52} She ignores Neptune, leaving him “in


\textsuperscript{49} \textit{CSP, Venice}, Vol. 15, 393.

\textsuperscript{50} Hannay, C3v.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., C1v.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., C2r.
discontent to mourn.\textsuperscript{53} For a new British identity to succeed, England, like Neptune, must recognize Scotland’s value. English and Scottish traits must be incorporated into a British national character. “\textit{Britaines now vnited-Diademe}” comprises both “kingdoms ornaments.”\textsuperscript{54} In “The first Elegie,” Anna’s image served as his exemplar, associating her with iconic figures favored by Elizabeth I and James VI and I: Cynthia and Solomon. Early on, he refers to Anna as “our \textit{Cynthia},” a goddess typically identified with Elizabeth (as in Ben Jonson’s \textit{Cynthia’s Revels}). But, he also describes Anna as a Cedar tree, lamenting, “O! since that Cedar fell.”\textsuperscript{55} The cedar tree was generally associated with James since it was considered to be the king of trees and, more importantly, associated with Solomon, one of James’s models. Not only does Hannay offer Anna’s image as a metaphor for political union by affiliating her with both Elizabeth and James, but he also presents her as the ideal leader of such a union.

Hannay compares England to the divine and Scotland to the earthly in a metaphor in which he sets Anna as the mediator between the two realms. Such a metaphor was not unusual. England had been described as the Promised Land, a heaven on earth in comparison to Scotland. A servant to James, Roger Aston, said that upon hearing the news that he was king of England, James reacted “like a poor man bereft wandering forty years in the wilderness and barren soil and now arrived as to the land of promise.”\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., C2v & C3r.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., B3r. Graham Parry discusses the cedar, arguing that cedar imagery abounds in panegyrics to James. Joshua Sylvester, for example, in his 1605 translation of Du Bartas’s \textit{Devine Weekes and Workes}, addresses James as “Great, Royall Cedar of Mount Libanon” (\textit{The Golden Age restor’d: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42} [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981], 26).

\textsuperscript{56} Willson, 171.
Hannay sets up the metaphor by positioning Anna as the goddess Cynthia who had fostered a beneficial relationship between the divine and earthly worlds:

our Cynthia left this spheare,

The world wears blacke, because she moues not here,

*Her* influence that made *it* freshly flourish,

Leaues *it* to fade, and will no more *it* nourish.

Astrologically, it is simple: Cynthia is the moon and thus as “influence” over people.²⁷ Yet, Cynthia had been a representative of England as well as the divine. According to the *OED*, a common meaning of the word “influence” in this period was “The inflowing, immission, or infusion (*into* a person or thing) of any kind of divine, spiritual, moral, immaterial, or secret power or principle; that which thus flows in or is infused.” It was also, of course, about the political power of influence. Her influence enables a productive and healthy interaction between the heavens (England) and the earth (Scotland).

Hannay then highlights another positive vision of Union, this time turning to the metaphor of the body politic, a familiar metaphor of political rule. Surprisingly, he pictured Anna as the soul of the body of England and Scotland. This in itself is anomalous and interventionist, since James frequently used the metaphor to assert his position as head of the political body of Britain. Addressing the English Parliament on 19 March 1604, he referred to himself as the leader of “the whole isle,” saying, “I am the

²⁷ Anne Lake Prescott pointed this out to me.
Head, and it is my Body.”

Having depicted Anna rather than James as the soul, Hannay asks how the body can now function without it:

... How can it [the world] then subsist?

Can that be sayd to be, which disposest

Of soule, wants vigor? this Queene was the soule,

Whose faculties worlds frailties did controule;

Corrected the ill humors, and maintain’d

In it, a wholesome concord, while she raign’d.

He insists upon the importance Anna had a ruler, emphasizing the ability she had to unify the country. She had established “concord” by exercising her influence over the country, controlling and correcting it. He accentuates Anna’s strength by directly contrasting her abilities (“faculties”) with the weaknesses (“frailties”) of those over whom she ruled.

James specifically identified his natural body as the political body of Union: “this Union . . . [is] naturally derived from the Right and Title of the precedent Princes of both Kingdomes, concurring in our Person, alike lineally descended from the blood of both.”

---

58 Sommerville, 136. Hannay’s use of the metaphor stands out as particularly unique given how it was used in elegies on the death of Prince Henry, the other figure at court typically imagined in opposition to James. For example, John Davies of Hereford imagines Henry as the heart of the body politic:

And, looke how when the Heart is sicke, the HEAD
And all the Members, of the griefe haue part,
But neuer die, vntill the HEART be dead;
So, HEAD and Members die with this our HEART!

(John Davies of Hereford, The Mvses-Teares For The Losse Of Their Hope; Heroick and Ne’re-Too-Mvch praised. Henry, Prince of Wales, &c. Together with Times Sobs for the vntimely death of his Glory in that his Darling: and, lastly, his Epitaphs. Consecrated To the high and mighty Prince, Frederick the fift, Count-palatine of Ryen. &c. Where-vnto is added, Consolatory Straines to wrest Natvre from her bent in immoderate mourning; most loyally, and humbly wisht to the King and Queenes most excellent Maiesties [London: G. Eld for John Wright, 1613], B3v).

59 Hannay, Av4-B1r.

Hannay then not only re-purposes James’s tropes of rule, putting Anna in the position of power, but also deliberately replaces James’s body with Anna’s as the metaphorical body of Britain.

While Hannay’s decision to present Anna as a replacement for James is radical, it is not a direct insult to James, for James had set a precedent for viewing Anna in these terms. James had interpreted Anna’s role as his queen consort to be political. He had considered running the country in his absence to be part of her duties. He appointed her his substitute whenever he was unavailable, from hunting holidays in 1605 to his state visit to Scotland in 1617. In January of 1605, James instructed the Privy Council that “During his absence for necessary recreation, they are to assemble weekly at the Queen’s Court, to transact business.” Later that same month, the diplomat Dudley Carleton wrote the Secretary of State Ralph Winwood that “The Lords of the Councill are tyed to Attendance at the Queen’s Court, and they have a Letter from the King to be more diligent in his affairs.” Within three years, James was complaining that the Privy Council was ruling the country with Anna as they had with Elizabeth, chiding his

---

61 James may have advised his sons that they should never allow their wives “to meddle with the Politicke gouernment of the Commonweale” in Basilicon Doron, but he did not practice what he preached (Sommerville, 42).

62 CSP, Venice, Vol. 8, 186. In a letter to the Privy Council dated 9 January 1605, James wrote that “considering now that in such a kingdom as this there must both foreign and domestical occasions daily rise which are fit to be considered of and despatched, some by our Council in general, some by a fewer number of them . . . we think it meet . . . that you shall assemble yourselves, in our absence, once every week, besides the Sunday after the sermon, in such places as our dearest wife shall keep her court” (G.P.V. Akrigg, ed., Letters of King James VI & I [Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984], 247). Viscount Cranborne writes of her influence in March of 1605, informing Sir Thomas Lake that she was “pressing the King for suits for other men’s advantage” (CSP, Domestic, Vol. 8, 203). Dudley Carleton wrote on 2 May 1606 that the king was granting Anna’s requests: “The king hath a purpose to give some new honors upon the queen’s delivery” (Maurice Lee, Jr., ed., Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters [New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972], 82).

Secretary of State Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury: “My littil Beagill, Ye and youre fellowis thaire are so proude nou that ye have gottin the gyding againe of a Feminine Courte in the olde fashion, as I know not hou to deale with you.”

She continued to run the government with these officers when James was absent. In 1617 when James travelled to Scotland, he appointed Anna one of the team of six people responsible for governing England. In a letter to the Doge dated 19 January 1617, Giovanni Battista Lionello, the Venetian Secretary in England, reported that “A council of six persons will be set up for the governance of England, comprising the queen, the prince, the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord Chancellor, the lord Treasurer and the earl of Worcester.” The letter-writer John Chamberlain later noted that “The Council remain[ed] chiefly with the Queen.”

---

64 Patrick Walker, ed., *Letters to King James the Sixth from the Queen, Prince Henry, Prince Charles, the Princess Elizabeth and her husband Frederick King of Bohemia, and from their son Prince Frederick Henry* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1835), xlix. According to Dudley Carleton, James expressed concern over Anna’s influence with his councilors as early as January of 1605: “the Lords of the Council are tyed to attendance at the Queen’s Court, and they have a letter from the King to be more diligent in his affairs” (Sawyer, 44; also quoted by Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 26).

65 Allen B. Hind, ed., *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. 1615-1617* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1908), Vol. 14, 412. Lionello claimed that James insisted on handling all foreign affairs, requiring ambassadors to send him messages regarding “serious matters.” He wrote, “The ambassadors will remain here, and for more serious matters they will send couriers daily, but it must needs be very difficult and prejudicial to all negotiations to communicate by letter with the king 300 miles away” (Ibid., 412). He later complained that James was neglecting international matters: “This absence of the king from England, taking him so far away from all the ministers of princes has so enfeebled all foreign negotiations that your Excellencies must not expect any news from these parts. . . . The councillors here attend solely to the private affairs of the kingdom” (Ibid., 495).

Hannay slights James when he envisions the country collapsing without Anna, implying that James cannot control the country without her. Without the head, the body becomes ill:

But now (she gone) the world seems out of frame,
Subord’nate passions now as Princes clave
Signorie [dominion] ore the soule, which doe torment
The whole with anguish; make the heart to faint,
Whose sad infection generalls so spred[.].67

In Anna’s absence, the hierarchy collapses. Subjects take on the role of royalty and vie with one another for power, destroying the polity with “infection.” The subordinates are always both present and in conflict with one another, thus demonstrating the significant role played by Anna in keeping them in check.

Hannay ends the poem with a vision of the body politic imploding following Anna’s death, a catastrophe inspired by the sight of Anna’s actual body. The people of England and Scotland who form the metaphorical body experience “a sad reuerent feare . . . [when they] see her sorrow-suted-Hearse.”68

---

67 Hannay, B1r. In this passage, Hannay evokes John Gordon’s vision of the destruction caused by humoral imbalance: “For when the heat of the hart is withdrawn from the cold moistnesse of the lungs and humiditie of the liuer: or when the lights, and the liuer doe withdraw their refreshing from the heart, then the kingdome of the inward man is brought to confusion, and desolation, by the diuision of the subiects in withdrawing the commodities one from another which should be common to both. Ye see now what I meane; that if the people of the South withdrawe the commoditie of their heat from the North; and on the other part, if these of the North withdraw the refreshing of the heat of the South: There is no doubt, I say, but if such diuision were suffered by Reason our king, it would bring forth ere it were long such a distemperature amongst his subiects, that in the end in place of vnion, there should be nothing but miserable desolation and confusion, which is the fruite of Diuision” (EnΩnikon or A Sermon of the Vnion of Great Brittannie, in antiquitie of language, name, religion, and Kingdome: Preached by John Gordovn Deane of Sarvm, the 28 day of October 1604, in presence of the Kings Maiestie at Whitehall [London: Georgii Bishop, 1604], B4r-v).

68 Hannay, B3v. Anna’s hearse was particularly notable. Chamberlain described the “hearse [as] . . . the fairest and stateliest that I think was ever seen there” (McClure, Vol. 2, 237-8). Nathaniel Brent praised the
corpse of the actual body upon which it was based, it self-destructs, unable to sustain the
collapse in systems of meaning. The body fills up with tears and “when its full, it can no
more containe, . . . [it] drowne[s].” The body is stereotypically female humoral: leaky
with an overabundance of water. In this Hannay offers a subtle criticism of James, for it
is when the leadership of the island reverts to him that the body becomes disorderly. To
highlight the contrast, he juxtaposes the chaos following Anna’s death with a vision of
the harmony that she had established. In the poem which follows “The first Elegie,” “On
the Queen,” Hannay presents Anna’s body as the literal embodiment of balance: “Her
body, reason, passions, thoughts did gree,/ To make her life the Art to saile this Sea.”
Her “plyant passions! . . . so well obayd” her reason that she remained free from the “life-
inuading leaks” of “vaine doubts.”

Having painted a portrait of Anna as an exemplary leader, Hannay presents
Charles as her heir, the one in whom “Her courage, worth, and loue, doth live.” He
argues that while

Others may goods not goodnesse offspring leave.

But she bequeth’d her goodnes, for her merit,

Obtain’d her issue should that wealth inherit.
That Hannay should present Charles as Anna’s heir is revealing, both in his choice of Charles and in his insistence that virtues rather than goods were her true valuables. At the time of Anna’s death, in fact, her estate was contested. She had verbally willed everything to Charles, but James insisted that he was the rightful inheritor. Anna’s estate was substantial—Sir Thomas Edmondes estimated it to be worth at £200,000, while John Chamberlain reported that rumors valued her jewels alone at £400,000. The three extant accounts of her will—by Edmondes, Chamberlain, and Sir Edward Harwood—agree that she left the entirety of her estate to Charles along with the responsibility for discharging her debts and caring for her servants. James ignored her nuncupative will, taking over her estate and disposing it as he wished, granting money and property to his favorite: George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. By arguing that Anna’s true worth had lain in her character and the virtues she had passed on to Charles, Hannay informs Charles that he did “win” the estate debate while subtly chiding James for having failed to recognize what was truly valuable.

Catholics versus Protestants: Anna’s disputed religious identity

---

74 CSP, Domestic, Vol. 10, 21; McClure, Vol. 2, 224. Chamberlain wrote Dudley Carleton that he had heard multiple reports with numbers “you [may] find of hard belief,” as they claim her jewels alone were worth £400,000, adding £97,000 yearly income from estates, £90,000 in plate, 80,000 Jacobus pieces in coin, and a collection of cloth and linen “for quantity and quality beyond any Prince in Europe” (McClure, Vol. 2, 224-5).

75 On 6 March 1619, Chamberlain recorded that “she made none other then a nuncupative will, or by word of mouth, giving all she had to the Prince with charge to pay her debts and reward her servants” (Ibid., 219). Sir Thomas Edmondes wrote on 17 March 1619, “[The Queen] answered yea to a question whether the Prince should inherit all, after paying her debts and relieving her servants” (CSP Domestic, Vol. 10, 25). Sir Edward Harwood claimed that “The Queen signed a suit for payment of her debts, but no will; she verbally left all to the Prince” (Ibid., 25). Chamberlain raised doubts that James would honor her will, given that it was verbal and her estate was large: “the manner of her will was rather in answering questions and saying yeah to any thing that was demanded of her, then in disposing ought of herself: so that it is doubted by some already how far it will stand good and firm” (McClure, Vol. 2, 219).
Far more significant than the dispute over Anna’s estate was the fight between Catholics and Protestants for control over her posthumous representation. When Anna died, members of both religions were quick to claim Anna as their own, asserting control over her image in public protests and mourning. Anna’s actual religious affiliation remains ambiguous, though it seems likely that she converted to Catholicism in Scotland in 1600, under the tutelage of the Jesuit priest Father Robert Abercromby. Whether or not she converted, her high valuation of rank and friendship rather than faith determined her political agenda. Though she supported Catholic marriages for her children, she considered Catholic royals to be the only marital prospects with the appropriate status, as we saw in the preceding chapter in the case of her opposition to the Elector Palatine, a mere count, marrying Elizabeth. At the same time, Anna built her court with members of the Pembroke Protestant faction and consistently opposed the Catholic Howard faction.

76 Father Robert Abercomby, a Jesuit openly working in Scotland from 1588, records Anna’s conversion to Catholicism in 1600. According to Abercomby, Anna was exposed to Catholicism in her youth; while being educated at the house of a Catholic princess, likely a granddaughter of Charles V, she heard a priest say daily mass. This youthful exposure to Catholicism blossomed into fascination in Scotland under the tutelage of Abercomby. Abercomby claims that Anna took the sacrament nine times between her conversion and the succession to the English throne, and remained a practicing Catholic in England. Though she supported Catholic marriages for her children, she considered Catholic royals to be the only marital prospects with the appropriate status, as we saw in the preceding chapter in the case of her opposition to the Elector Palatine, a mere count, marrying Elizabeth. At the same time, Anna built her court with members of the Pembroke Protestant faction and consistently opposed the Catholic Howard faction.

77 This is my reading of Anna’s involvement in politics, which partially accords with Leeds Barroll’s analysis in its emphasis on the importance of kinship and friendship to Anna. Lewalski claims that Anna advocated a pro-Catholic, pro-Spanish policy, while Barroll and Louis Roper maintain that she positioned herself in the anti-Howard camp, a group notably anti-Spanish and pro-Protestant. Barroll, citing the kin and friendship ties of members of her court to the Pembroke faction such as her Lord Chamberlain, Sir Robert Sidney, Sir Philip Sidney’s younger brother and Pembroke’s uncle and the first lady of her Bed Chamber, the countess of Bedford, friends with and a relative of members of the Essex circle, concludes “the Queen cannot have considered supporting any other side but that including Pembroke and Montgomery” (Leeds Barroll, Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001], 135). Louis Roper, examining Anna’s political involvement in England, notes that “the leaders of Anna’s circle—the countess of Bedford, Penelope Rich, the earls of Pembroke and Southampton, Sandys, Rudyerd, George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury— . . . generally styled themselves standard-bearers for international Protestantism” (“Unmasquing the Connections between Jacobean Politics and Policy: The Circle of Anna of Denmark and the Beginning of the English Empire 1614-18,” in “High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations, eds. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves [New York: Palgrave, 2003], 50). For Lewalski see Writing Women, 21.
(for example, she promoted the career of George Villiers in order to supplant Robert Carr, the Howards’ man). What matters for the purposes of this chapter, however, is not whether Anna was a Catholic or promoted Catholic policies, but rather the representational battle her contemporaries fought over her religious identity.

Catholics claimed that Anna died an adherent to Catholicism and insisted on their own public ceremonies in acknowledgment of it. As Anna’s servants, they had enjoyed the right to freedom of worship. As a condition of the marriage contract, the Danes had negotiated that Anna

may have the religion and divine worship of her choice, as may her servants; and, furthermore, [that] she may keep her own preacher at the expense of his majesty of Scotland and may take the said preacher wherever her grace desires; and, when or as often as her priest dies, [that] she may have the freedom to appoint another in place of the deceased, selecting whichever priest she may wish irrespective of where he comes from.

---

78 The Protestant Pembroke faction sought to remove Robert Carr from power and replace him with George Villiers, their candidate. They requested Anna’s aid in establishing Villiers at court. According to George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, her support was necessary because James had a policy not to appoint anyone without Anna’s recommendation on the premise “That if the Queen afterwards being ill intreated, should complain of this Dear one, he might make his answer, It is long of your self, for you were the Party that commended him unto me” (John Rushworth, Historical Collections Of Private Passages of State. Weighty Matters in Law. Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments. Beginning The Sixteenth Year of King James, Anno 1618. And ending the Fifth Year of King Charles, Anno 1629. Digested in Order of Time, And now Published [London: Thomas Newcomb for George Thomason, 1659], 460). James established Anna as a power broker, placing her in the position of culling candidates. Anna eventually asked James to grant Villiers a position in his Bedchamber. James installed Villiers as a “Gentleman of the Chamber” immediately upon her request, performing the ceremony, tellingly, “in the Queen’s Bed-chamber” (Ibid., 461).

79 Stevenson, 83.
Anna did not openly practice the Catholic faith, perhaps because the language of the final contract limited her freedom of worship to Lutheranism, the religion practiced in Denmark: “Anne and all her ministers are to have free profession and exercise of their religion, in meetings and in the administration of the sacraments in the vernacular and according to the custom of Denmark.”80 Though Anna did not practice the Catholic faith publicly, she was believed to have practiced it privately and her refusal to receive communion at her English coronation ceremony was seen as tacit acknowledgement of her beliefs. When she died, Antonio Donato, the Venetian ambassador, claimed that “at the end of her days, at the age of 44, she had nothing but to lament her sins and to show herself, as she was always believed to be, very religious and sincere in the worship of the true [Roman Catholic] God.”81 Anna’s French servant Piero reported that the queen supported the Catholic faith until her death. Sir Gerard Herbert, a kinsmen of the Earl of Pembroke, wrote Dudley Carleton 16 August 1619, “Piero has confessed that the late Queen intended to build a monastery in France, and had paid 4,000l. towards it.”82

Catholics wanted to memorialize Anna in public ceremonies which proclaimed her Catholicism. A group of Catholic women refused to honor Protestant services, insisting that they mourn Anna as a Catholic. Chamberlain recorded the protest, writing, “Anotherpeeceofdifficultie thereis,thatsomeCatholique ladies nominated for mourners geve out that they will not staine their profession with going to our church or service upon any shew of solemnitie, a straunge boldnes and such as wold not have bene

80 Stevenson, 85.
81 CSP, Venice, Vol. 15, 494-5.
82 CSP, Domestic, Vol. 10, 71.
so easilie digested in some times.”83 It was illegal to openly practice Catholicism and Catholics had been repressed and persecuted under Elizabeth I. Implicit in Chamberlain’s description of the event is a critique of James’s religious tolerance and a suggestion that Catholics are taking advantage of James by behaving with “strange boldness.” Anna may have inspired these Catholic women, despite having supported the Protestant faction at court. She demonstrated boldness in her dealings with James, insisting that her relationship with God was above that of her relationship with the king. In 1618, Foscarini noted that “She [Anna] claims that her greatness comes not from the king but from God alone and her motto runs, My power is from the Most High.”84

At the same time that Catholics proclaimed her one of their own, Anna’s death enabled Protestants to fashion her as the Protestant queen they had always needed her to be. Some known Protestants claimed that Anna had died a good Christian, implying that she had died a Protestant, while others straightforwardly asserted that she had repudiated Catholic beliefs on her deathbed. In a letter to Dudley Carleton dated 6 March 1619, John Chamberlain maintained that Anna “made a very Christian confession and excellent end.”85 King James himself wrote Anna’s brother, Christian IV, King of Denmark, assuring him that,

> Many tokens of both her love and her virtue remain after her life, whence a great desire for her remains in us. But in death itself her sanctity and piety were manifest, which brought us some comfort in her death,


84 CSP, Venice, Vol. 15, 392.

certainly in so long an illness as this one, which completely destroyed her
strength divine goodness did so much to prepare her spirit for the better
life, and before she said farewell to these troubles, she sufficiently
persuaded those who were standing by that she had obtained a taste of it. 86

One of the Queen’s Scottish attendants explained how Anna “convinced those who stood
by” of her devotion to the Protestant faith, making the true “Christian confession”
Chamberlain alluded to:

I do, scho answeres, and withal, scho sayes, I renounce the mediation of al
santes, and my awin mereits, and does only rely upone my Saviour Chryst,
who hes redeemed my saull with his bloode. This being saide, gaif a great
satisfactioun to the Bishops, and to the few number that hard hir. 87

Anna’s servant creates an image of the dying queen surrounded by those closest to her,
confessing her devotion to the true religion in a fading voice, loud enough to be heard
only by a few of those present. In this account, however weak her voice, her profession
of faith was strong; she clearly renounced Catholicism, rejecting the saints and good
works and accepting that only the grace of God might save her.

On 6 March 1619, Sir Edward Harwood confirmed that Anna “gave a good
account of her faith, free from all Popery; the Prince and most of the Council were with
her when she died.” 88 In Harwood’s account, Anna dies, leaving her son with the
Council and suggesting that Charles has inherited his mother’s political position. Like

86 Ronald M. Meldrum, Translation and Facsimiles of the Original Latin Letters of King James I of
England (VI of Scotland), to his Royal Brother-in-Law, King Christian IV of Denmark (Harvester Press,
1977), 197.

87 Miscellany of the Abbotsford Club, 81.

Anna, Charles will be a force for promoting a Protestant agenda and, until he inherits the throne from James, as a substitute for his father, ruling with the Council in his absence as his mother had. Anna’s funeral could only have heightened the implied transfer of power from mother to son: James did not attend the funeral and Charles supplied his place, preceding Anna’s hearse.89

At the same time that individuals privately attested to Anna’s Protestantism, the court and city publicly proclaimed it; they mourned her in Protestant services, the only religious services that could be held legally. The court staged an elaborate procession through London. In a letter to Carleton on 14 April 1619, Chamberlain claimed that “the number of mourners . . . [far exceeded that which] was bestowed upon Queen Elizabeth.”90 One month later he reported that the procession was “remarqueable for the number . . . there beeing 280 poore women besides an army of meane followes that were servants to the Lordes and others of the traine . . . the number of Lordes and Ladies were very great.”91 The lords and ladies who appeared in places of prominence in the procession, according to “The Accompte of the funeral of our Late Soveraigne Ladie,” included the “Countesse of Arrundell [Aletheia Howard]” as chief mourner and the “Countesse of Northumberland; Co[untess of] Shrewsbury, Dowager; Duke of Lenox; Lord Marquis Burlingham; Lord Marquis Hamilton; Earle of Nottingeham; Earle of Oxford; and Earl of Pembroke Lo[rd] Chamberlaine” as “Assistants to the Corpse.”92

89 McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 204. Chamberlain noted that “The Prince came after the archbishop of Caunterburie (who was to make the sermon) and next before the corps, that was drawne by sixe horses” (McClure, Vol. 2, 237).

90 Ibid., 232.

91 Ibid., 237.

92 National Archives of the United Kingdom manuscript AO 3/1187, fol. 60.
Like the court, the city of London held a public service to commemorate Anna. On 31 May 1619, citizens gathered at Paul’s Cross to mourn the queen: “Paul’s Cross mourned being hanged with black cloth and scutcheons of the Queen’s arms, and all our aldermen and officers of this town came thither in black.”

Hannay places himself squarely within this debate, preceding a description of Anna’s final moments and her ascent to heaven with a reference to the ambiguity surrounding Anna’s religious affiliation—it is something which “may well be ghet.”

Hannay himself was a devout Protestant, as is evident in the book he published just months before *Two Elegies: A Happy Husband*. In the book, he instructs women on how to choose a proper husband, urging them to select spouses who believe in “true religion” rather than “superstition”:

> Religion true, loues God, and quiets vs,

> And rests in a Soule, free and generous:

> Where superstition is a franticke error,

> A weake minds sicknes, & the owne Soules terror

Let thy Mate be a man, whose setled faith

---

93 The city of London did not participate in the state funeral and petitioned the king to hold their own service. On 31 May 1619, Sir Gerard Herbert related the strange affair to Dudley Carleton: “The City of London sent the King a charter, showing that it was their right to have mourning at a royal funeral, which had been neglected at that of the Queen, on which mourning for all the City officers and servants, nearly 120 in number, was sent, and they held a special service at St. Paul’s Cross” (*CSP, Domestic*, Vol. 10, 49). Chamberlain likewise mentions that the city had been “forgotten or neglected at the funerall” and that the King allowed them to have their service “to please them” (McClure, Vol. 2, 241).

94 Ibid.

95 Hannay, B3r.

96 *A Happy Husband* is entered in the Stationers’ Register on 20 January 1619 and *Two Elegies* on 15 May 1619.
In true Religion sure foundation hath.\textsuperscript{97}

In his elegies, as in \textit{A happy Husband}, Hannay asserts the importance of rejecting superstition in favor of “true Religion.” Like the accounts of his contemporaries, he claims that Anna’s death provides evidence of that she died a true believer:

since the \textit{End} doth crowne the \textit{actions} still,

How liued she, who dying, dy’d so well!

For askt, if she did willing hence depart,

Sayd, (rapt with heauenly \textit{ioy}) WITH ALL MY HART.\textsuperscript{98}

Death serves as the moment of truth, revealing Anna to be a believer who has been touched by heaven. But more than that, he claims it was not what she practiced while living that ultimately matters, but what she professed on her deathbed: “[Anna] fell so right at last.”\textsuperscript{99} He thus deftly maneuvers around evidence of her Catholicism by relying on her deathbed profession. Though her dying confession is not specifically Protestant, Hannay does specify that she rejects superstition: “\textit{Faith, Hope, and Loue possest her heart and minde,} Leauing no place for fearefull thoughts to finde.”\textsuperscript{100} Praising Anna’s virtues, he claims that if works mattered, Anna’s actions would have guaranteed her a place in Heaven:

but had he [Soloman] liued in our \textit{times},

\textsuperscript{97} Patrick Hannay, \textit{A happy husband or, Directions for a maide to choose her mate As also, a wiuues behauioir towards her husband after marriage. By Patricke Hannay, Gent. To which is adioyned the Good wife, together with an exquisite discourse of epitaphs, including the choystest thereof, ancient or moderne. By R.B. Gent.} (London: John Beale for Richard Redmer, 1619), B7r.

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., B3r.

\textsuperscript{99} Hannay, \textit{Two Elegies}, B3r.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid.
He might haue found one, so deuoid of crimes,

That her owne merits (if merits could saue)

Might iustly (as of due) salvation craue.\(^{101}\)

However, as merits cannot save, Anna attains heaven through the grace of God. That she has received such grace becomes evident in her ascent to heaven: a legion of angels accompanies her and, when she arrives, another legion of angels heralds her arrival. Hannay goes so far as to say that Anna has not only received grace, but also given it. Her presence is itself a form of grace: “The Heauens . . . [are] grac’t with her.”\(^{102}\) At one point, he imagines Anna sitting on a throne prepared for her by Christ:

\textit{Troupes of white Angels did her bed impaile,  
To tend the soules flight from the fleshly gaile,  
\textit{It to conduct vnto that heauenly throne,  
Which Christ prepar’d, with glore to crowne her on.}\(^{103}\)

She is one of the elect. While living she was “Gods daughter, and heauens heire” and now that she has died, “\textit{We know, since parted hence, He [God] crownes her there.}”\(^{104}\)

Hannay’s depiction of Anna as a Protestant was critical not only to the fight for representational control of her posthumous image, but also to the debate over the Union of Great Britain in which religion played a major role. As the Scottish lawyer John Russell puts it in \textit{A treatise of the happie and blessed Unioun}, “Unioun in religioun

---

\(^{101}\) Ibid., B2r.  
\(^{102}\) Ibid., A4v. Hannay writes that “nought but Heauen alone of her could reaue vs,” imagining her in heaven, “entertaind, with glory crownd,/ While troupes of Angels her arriuall sound” (Ibid., A4v & B3r).  
\(^{103}\) Ibid., B3r.  
\(^{104}\) Ibid., D4r.
inferris the unioun of kingdoms, distractioun in religioun distractioun in kingdoms.”

Rhetoric surrounding the Union equated Protestants with Pro-Unionists and Catholics with anti-Unionists. Since Hannay favored Union and viewed Anna as a key player in its establishment, he had to show her as a Protestant. From the beginning of the debates, pro-Unionists argued that constituting Union was necessary to the ascendance of Protestantism. John Gordon, Scottish cleric and scholar, argued that the future of Protestantism depended upon forming Union:

Let all men remember by the foresaid examples, that the Vnion of kingdoms hath beene always the furtherance and standing of true Religion; but diuision of kingdoms hath beene the ouerthrow of true Religion, and advauncing of Idolatrie; let all those that loue God, perseuerance in true Religion, prosperitie of their naturall King, and standing of the Commonwealth of this Iland, (which is the common mother of vs all) be carefull of the performance of Gods worke, and put to their helping hand for the furtherance thereof.

If the success of Union was inextricably tied to the further triumph of Protestantism, its failure was linked to the destructive intervention of Catholics. The Church of Scotland minister Robert Pont, for example, identified those who worked against Union as “our adversaries the champions of the papall superstition.” Should the “plots and devises of

---


106 Gordon, G2v.

the Romish prelacy” succeed, the country would be weaker.\textsuperscript{108} Pont, of course, is promoting his own agenda rather than James’s (he had openly opposed James on occasion, as in 1591 when he informed the king that “there is a judgment above yours and that is God’s putt in the hand of the ministrie”).\textsuperscript{109} Pont believed in promoting the church above all else and considered unity critical to the advancement of Protestantism. For him, Union guaranteed the strength of the country and its ability to defend the Protestant religion against the threat of Catholics, “For the distraction of religion commonly followeth the separation of kingdoms, and contrarywise the uniting of them doth confirme it, and make it more defensible against all assaults of the adversary.”\textsuperscript{110} Russell, a devout Protestant, builds upon this idea of the strength that comes of Union, envisioning success in terms of offense as well as defense. He argues that Union would enable Britain to defeat all enemies of Protestantism:

I say farder: qhat greater confirmatioun is requisite to prove the stay of this unioun, and suiet harmonie of all the nations and florising kingdomes in Europe in thair harmonicall agreement amangis thameselffis for repressing and ouerthrawing the Paip of Rome, the Turkis, Infidellis and Mahumetanes . . . the Paip of Rome and his felloueris, qha nevir ceasit nor daylie ceasis fra thair cruell machinationes againes all gude Christianes, and fra thair bloodie murthiris and massacres of many thousand persones.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{111} Russell, 111.
The success of the Union and the triumph of the Protestant religion are one and the same. James considered religious uniformity to be at the heart of the Union project.

When he revived it in 1616, he focused on bringing the Scottish Kirk into line with the Church of England. Thomas Murray, a Scot who had followed James to England, had a personal investment in Union as a devout Protestant with a close relationship with the heir to the throne (he served as Prince Charles’s tutor and, in 1617, became his secretary). Murray followed developments in the Union project and in 1616 wrote of James’s renewed efforts on behalf of the “Great union between the Scotch and English.”112 James addressed the issue of the Union in a speech to the Star Chamber in 1616. Condemning the “foolish Querke of some Judges, who held that the Parliament of England, could not vnite Scotland and England by the name of Great Britaine, but that it would make an alteration of the Lawes,” he maintained that no English law would be altered.113 Instead, James planned to impose English laws on Scotland: “For my intention was alwayes to effect vnion by vniting Scotland to England; and not England to Scotland.”114 Specifying that these laws included those of both the government and the church, he held up the Church of England as the true church of God. James averred, the Church of ENGLAND, which I say in my Conscience, of any Church that euer I read or knew of, present or past, is most pure, and neerest the Primitiue and Apostolicall Church in Doctrine and Discipline, and is

112 CSP, Domestic, Vol. 9, 473.
113 Sommerville, 208-9.
114 Ibid., 209.
Believing that the differences between the Church of England and the Scottish Kirk posed the main obstacle to Union, he adopted measures to align the Kirk with the Church of England. Specifically, he pushed the Scottish to begin kneeling while receiving communion, observing holy days dedicated to Christ [Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday (Pentecost)], and offering episcopal confirmation, private baptism, and private communion to the unwell. The Scottish strongly opposed adopting these practices, especially those which they considered to be Catholic: kneeling to receive communion and observing holy days. While holy days were somewhat controversial because of their similarity to Catholic saints’ days, kneeling to receive communion was far more problematic as many believed it indicated an acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Scottish rejected these articles not only because of their supposed popery, but also because they were “English” practices. Chamberlain reported that “Our churchmen and ceremonies are not so well allowed of [by the people of Scotland].”

---

115 Ibid., 210.

116 Alan Stewart, 285.

117 Ibid., 285-6. The Register of the Scottish Privy Council lists the holy days as “Christmas Day, quhilk wes the day of the birthe of Christ, upoun Goode Fryday, quhilk wes the day of his Passioun, upoun Easter or Pashe Day, quhilk wes the day of his Resurrectioun, and upoun the Day of Ascensioun, and upoun Witsonday” (David Masson, ed., The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland: 1616-1619 [Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1894], Vol. 11, 296).

118 Levack, 125.


120 McClure, Vol. 2, 82, my emphasis.
James planned to address these points of contention, which eventually became known as the ‘five articles of Perth,’ during his visit to Scotland in 1617. Nathaniel Brent, ecclesiastical lawyer in the employ of the diplomat Dudley Carleton, wrote Carleton on 14 January 1617, saying, “The King is so set on his journey to Scotland that he calls those traitors who oppose it. His object is to establish the English hierarchy in Scotland, which the Scots’ dislike.”\(^{121}\) Junior secretary of state Thomas Lake wrote the senior secretary Ralph Winwood on 12 May 1617, informing him that James had already begun taking steps to achieve the integration of the churches: “Certain great officers and Bishops of Scotland have been with the King, and had conference with the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln on church matters.”\(^ {122}\) However, James encountered fierce resistance to his plans. In a letter to Carleton dated 21 June 1617, Chamberlain related an incident which demonstrated the strength with which the Scots opposed the changes: one of the Scottish elders refused to kneel to receive communion with the king. Chamberlain wrote, “yt seemes they are very averse from our customs, insomuch that one of theyre bishops deane of the chappell there to the King, refused to receve the communion with him kneeling.”\(^{123}\)

\(^{121}\) CSP, Domestic, Vol. 9, 424. Brent writes again that people oppose James travelling to Scotland on 8 February 1617: “All dislike the Scotch journey; but the King was so angry with Buckingham for proposing a delay that he was glad to get out of the way” (Ibid., 432). On 22 February 1617, Sir Horace de Vere informed Carleton that “The King still intends to go to Scotland, though those about him would be glad if he would change his mind” (Ibid., 436). Chamberlain wrote Carleton in March of 1617 that “The journey to Scotland [is] disliked by both nations, and very costly” (Ibid., 447).

\(^{122}\) Ibid., 466.

\(^{123}\) McClure, Vol. 2, 82. Chamberlain’s full account reads, “The universitie or schoole of Edingbourgh have set out goode verses (as I heare) in gratulation and applause of the Kings return thether. Our churchmen and ceremonies are not so well allowed of, the rather by an accident that fell out at the buriall of one of the guard who died there and was buried after the English manner and the Deane of Powles (Valentine Cary) preaching desired all the assemblie to recommend with him the soule of theyre deceased brother into the handes of Almighty God, which was so yll taken that he was driven to retract yt openly and to confesse he did yt in a kind of civilitie rather than according to the perfect rule of Divinitie: another exception was
While James was having private meetings with church officials, a campaign was being fought in the pulpit and press. James took his chaplain Robert Wilkinson, who supported the Union, to Scotland with him to help garner public support for the reforms. Wilkinson not only preached on the benefits of Union, but also published his sermon: *Barwickbridge: or England and Scotland Covpled. In a Sermon tending to peace and vnitie Preached before the King at Saint Andrewes in Scotland* (1617). Wilkinson argued that a Union between the two kingdoms was God’s will, asking, “[if] God (by whom Kings raigne) hath thus deuolued it for our good: and if God haue coupled vs, who then shal put asunder what God hath ioyned together?” He insisted that they should “all agree in vniformitie,” asserting that they should, at the very least, have “one Gospell, one Faith, one God” if not also “one government.”

A public debate over the merits of the articles of Perth ensued, becoming a more general question of conformity and James’s authority over the church. In 1617, Lincolnshire ministers re-published a book of objections to ceremonies such as kneeling at communion: *An Abridgement of that Booke which the Ministers of Linolne Diocesse Deliuere to his Maiestie vpon the first of December 1605 Being the First Part of An*

---


125 Robert Wilkinson, *Barwick bridge: or England and Scotland coupled In a sermon tending to peace and vnitie. Preached before the King at Saint Andrewes in Scotland. Anno Domini. 1617. Iulij 13. By Robert Wilkinson Dr. in Diuinitie, and chaplainpe to his Maiestie* (London: Edward Griffin for William Aspley, 1617), F4r. See Ferrell for a discussion of Wilkinson’s use of marital images and language. She compares *Barwickbridge* with a sermon he gave at the wedding of Honora Denny to James Hay in 1606.

126 Wilkinson, C1r.
Apologie for Themselves and their Brethren that Refuse the Subscription and Conformity which is required. Thomas Morton, the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, responded to these ministers in A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England. John Buckeridge, the Bishop of Rochester, focused on the question of kneeling. He preached before James on Psalm 96, verse 6: “O come, let us worship, and fall downe and kneele, (or wepe) before the Lord.”  

Whereas James had argued in favor of kneeling because it was a thing indifferent, Buckeridge claimed that kneeling was not a thing indifferent, but necessary because a man “owes homage to his Creator.”

He subsequently published A Sermon Preached before His Maiestie At Whitehall, March 22. 1617. being Passion-Sunday, Touching Prostration, and Kneeling in the worship of God (1618).

Thomas Murray reported that the efforts of James and his ministers had limited success in Scotland. In a letter to Sir Francis Bacon, he stated that James had “tried, with some success, to conform church matters to those of England.”

However, the majority of people in Scotland refused to accept the five articles. In January of 1618, James began instituting them by royal proclamation, starting with the observance of holy days. According to the Register of the Scottish Privy Council, James issued a proclamation on 22 January 1618 that following

the example of the Kirk quhen the same wes in gritest puritie and most free of corruptioun and errour, thair salbe ane universall cessationoun and

---

127 John Buckeridge, A sermon preached before His Maiestie at Whitehall, March 22. 1617. being Passion-Sunday, touching prostration, and kneeling in the worship of God. To which is added a discourse concerning kneeling at the Communion. By John, Bishop of Rochester (London: John Bill, 1618), A2v.

128 Ibid., A4r.

129 CSP, Domestic, Vol. 9, 473.
abstinence throughout this haill kingdome frome all kind of husbandrie
and handie labour upoun the holie dayis following,—to witt, upoun
Christmas Day, quhilk wes the day of the birthe of Christ, upoun Goode
Fryday, quhilk wes the day of his Passioun, upoun Easter or Pashe Day,
quhilk wes the day of his Resurrectioun, and upoun the Day of
Ascensioun, and upoun Witsonday.130

On 11 July 1619, Brent reported continuing problems over the articles, recording
“Disturbances in Scotland about baptism, the cross, and the manner of receiving the
communion.”131 Though the Scottish Parliament eventually ratified the articles in July of
1621, they did so only after great pressure from James.132 Moreover, the people of
Scotland continued to oppose the articles and on 10 December 1638, the general
assembly of the Scottish church, in the midst of annulling all assemblies held since 1606,
specifically addressed the five articles of Perth, declaring them “to have been abjured and
to bee removed.”133 James’s insistence on religious unity did not set the foundation upon
which he might build the Union of Great Britain, but rather inspired controversy and
antipathy.

“The second Elegie”: a different conception of the Union of Great Britain

130 Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 11, 296.
131 CSP, Domestic, Vol. 10, 60.
132 Laura Stewart, 1013.
133 Ibid.
Where James focused on religious uniformity, Hannay emphasized the type of government which should be formed. Though he clearly felt that the ruler’s Protestantism was a necessary component of this government, he does not discuss religious beliefs or practices in detail. Instead, he offers a way in which a leader might successfully rule over a Union of Scotland and England: allowing both countries to participate equally in their own government. For him, relative autonomy rather than religious uniformity offered a more solid base for Union. Hannay viewed James’s efforts as misguided and sought to recommend a different approach to Charles.

Hannay opens “The second Elegie” by pointing to James’s failure to establish a formal Union of Great Britain. Employing metonymy and personification, he represents countries by their famous rivers: the Thames, for example, is England. Different rivers come to pay tribute to Anna, as “Each Countrey now contributes to the Thames,/ Which a support of euery currant clames.” The Forth, one of Scotland’s major rivers, symbolizes Scotland. Hannay includes the Forth as one of the foreign nations, describing her as a “grieuing-stranger-Queene.” Employing the primary definition of stranger—“One who belongs to another country”—he establishes England and Scotland as separate nations. The initial reaction to Forth’s arrival in England defines their relationship as antagonistic. Neptune sees the Forth travelling through his seas toward the Thames and believes her to be an aggressor. Having concluded that the Forth has come to attack the

---

134 Hannay, Two Elegies, C1r.
135 Ibid., C2r.
136 OED.
Thames, he sounds the alarm, calling for his fellow sea gods to take up arms and prevent
the Forth from reaching the Thames:

Great Nephtuns selfe doth feare inuasiue wrong,

Seeing her strange waues throw his waters throng.

And causeth Triton to sound an alarme,

To warne the Sea-Gods in all haste to arme,

Who brining billowes in braue battell-ray,

Doe meane Forth’s fury with their force to stay

Here, Hannay depicts union as violent and violating. England and Scotland, “old foes,”
continue to be antagonistic. As god of the seas, Neptune represents the international
community, and his actions suggest that in spite of James’s efforts to unify England and
Scotland (or perhaps because of the difficulty he encountered when trying to do so), the
world still considers them separate, hostile nations. It is not until Neptune sees the Forth
“all wrapt in woe,” that he changes his defensive guard into a protective one and escorts
her to the Thames. When they meet, their behavior belies the image of them as
adversaries and strangers:

---

137 Hannay, Two Elegies, C1v.

138 Ibid., C3r. Hannay spends a number of lines detailing the history between England and Scotland:
. . . those two kingdoms try
All open power, and priuate policie;
Yet still increased discord; others force,
Made separation greater, su’d diuorce.
How did one teare the other, spare no toile,
To bath in blood the neighbours fertill soile;
Wrath, discord, malice, enuy, rapiny, strife,
Thefts, rapes, and murderous mischiewes were so rife,
None liu’d secure. (Ibid., C2v)

139 Ibid., C1v. The verse reads,
But when they see her thus all wrapt in woe,
And the sad cause of her iust sorrow know [Anna’s death];
\textit{Her sister [the Thames] her [the Forth] receiues with kind imbrace,}

Their liquid armes clasping, they interlace

In loue so straight, they cannot be vntwinde,

\textit{They seeme both one, in body and in minde.}\textsuperscript{140}

Hannay employs the language of weaving, figuratively describing the Thames and Forth as strings of thread which have been woven together (interlaced) in such a way that they cannot be untwisted (untwined). The weave of the Thames and Forth creates a new entity (one, in body and in mind), suggesting the formation of a successful union. Yet this is a union that only “seeme[s]” to exist and his use of the word “interlace” rather than “interweave” implies “a simpler and less elaborate arrangement.”\textsuperscript{141}

Occasioned by Anna’s death, their union is emotional, provisional, and of a finite duration—after they have mourned Anna’s passing, his story implies, the Forth will return home. Hannay emphasizes the failure to establish a lasting union in the line immediately following those quoted above, “O happy union! labour’d long in vaine.”\textsuperscript{142}

He enacts the process of creating a short-term union in the poem by changing the names with which he identifies England and Scotland. At the beginning of the poem, he refers them as separate countries—the Thames and Forth. However, when he envisions the countries grieving over Anna, he sees them unified in their shared emotional state and

---

\textit{They lay not their defensiue armes aside,}

But as a guard, her through their gulfes do guide. (Ibid., C1v-C2r)

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., C2r.

\textsuperscript{141} OED.

\textsuperscript{142} Hannay, \textit{Two Elegies}, C2r.
calls them Britain: “The sighes and groanes, of Brittaines blest-rest sheres.”  

England and Scotland form Britain as a union of equals—England and Scotland “walke . . . hand in hand with equall pace.”  But this unity does not last and Britain reverts back to Thames and Forth: “Thames trembles, Forth doth feuerise for feare.”  He imagines the cycle repeating in the future, ending the poem with the Thames and Forth vowing to meet annually to mourn for Anna: “The Forth and Thames losing their so lou’d sight./ Vow, yearely to renew their woes, that night.”  However, Hannay offers hope that this annual ritual foreshadows the permanent establishment of union. From this tentative bond, Hannay proposes, Charles, “our hope,” may cultivate a long-lasting union.

Britain will exist for James’s successors: “Brittaines Throne may his [James’s] seed euer raigne.”

Re-thinking Anna

In *Two Elegies*, Hannay does not simply voice standard pro-Union rhetoric. Rather, he shapes it to suggest a different kind of Union and subtly critiques James. By using Anna as the exemplar of a Union alternative to James’s, he figures her as important to the governance of the realm at the time of her death. Moreover, he grants Anna’s

---

143 Ibid., C3v & D1r.
144 Ibid., D1r.
145 Ibid.
146 Ibid., D2r.
147 Ibid., C3v.
148 Ibid., C3v.
posthumous image power by offering her as the model upon which Charles should base his efforts to achieve Union. Anna, the ideal leader of Great Britain, is a Protestant who recognizes England and Scotland as equals and allows them to operate somewhat independently from one another. Notably, Charles did not follow Hannay’s advice, but followed in his father’s footsteps. He imposed a series of reforms on the Scottish Kirk on the basis of his royal authority, attempting to establish complete uniformity between the Kirk and the Church of England. His failure to include the Scottish in the process of instituting the changes ended in disaster. They rebelled, refusing to accept the changes for the way they were imposed as much as for the changes themselves. In 1638, they signed a national covenant to reject Charles’s measures and protect Scottish institutions.

However, Hannay’s advice to Charles that he listen to his people and acknowledge their separate identities ultimately proved prescient. The Treaty that finally established Union in 1707 created a British state which recognized Scotland and England as separate but equal, allowing them to be two independent governing bodies with their own national churches.

Examining the Two Elegies also offers a new understanding of the public image of Anna of Denmark. Until the 1990s, most scholars characterized her as a mentally

149 Levack, 128.

150 Ibid.

151 Ibid., 102.
incompetent spendthrift, notable only for her love of masques, expensive jewelry, and clothing. In his 1956 biography of James, *King James VI & I*, David Willson lamented that Anna was “incurably frivolous and empty-headed,” concluding, “Alas! The King had married a stupid wife.”\(^{152}\) In contrast, Barbara Lewalski (1993) and Leeds Barroll (1996 & 2001) have challenged this view of Anna, arguing that she was an intelligent political player who used her patronage to position herself as a figure of importance. They specifically identified the masques that Anna helped to conceptualize and in which she performed—Samuel Daniel’s *The Vision of Twelve Goddesses* (1604), Ben Jonson’s *The Masque of Blackness* (1605), *The Masque of Beautie* (1608), and *The Masque of Queens* (1609), as well as Daniel’s *Tethys’ Festival* (1610)—as the means through which Anna established herself as a Queen. Having argued that Anna’s masques were her primary source of power, Lewalski and Clare McManus (2002) have nevertheless claimed that her influence over public policy diminished when she stopped producing them in 1613.\(^{153}\) Indeed, to date, scholars studying Anna have concentrated almost exclusively on her masques, reading them to determine her political agenda.

\(^{152}\) Willson, 95.

\(^{153}\) Lewalski implies that Anna held significant influence only at the beginning of James’s reign in England, noting that “her chief contribution to Jacobean culture [was] through her early patronage of Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones, and her participation in the creation and development of the court masque” (28, my emphasis). She further claims that from 1613, Prince Henry and James’s favorite Buckingham took over production of masques, leaving “the Queen’s ladies . . . relegated to the minor roles of dancing partners in the revels. The queen could no longer find a way to register her own worth and claims in such performances, and looked to other venues” (41). Like Lewalski, McManus suggests that Anna’s influence diminished from the point at which James began to dominate court masques and ended with her death: when her court ceased to exist, so did the self image Anna strove so hard to create. She argues that “What is clear is that James disregarded Anna’s desires and broke up the estate to pay for her funeral, his summer progress and gifts for his favorites. In the absence, or perhaps erasure, of female writing, the Queen’s voice was marginalized and the female will elided. James’s appropriation of the role of heir deflected the relationship between the Queen and her son and reasserted Anna’s dependency upon his sovereign power even after death” (204).
While a number of excellent studies of Anna have come from this critical focus, it has been detrimental to creating a complete picture of Anna’s image and its afterlife. Hannay is one of a number of writers who use Anna to achieve their own political ends. For example, Anna appears in 1624 in the merchant and writer John Reynolds’s *Vox Cœli*, a pamphlet arguing against the Spanish Match (James’s ill-fated attempt to arrange a marriage between the Protestant Prince Charles and the Catholic Spanish Infanta). Reynolds imagines a debate in heaven between former English monarchs, including Henry VIII, Mary I, Elizabeth I, Prince Henry, and Queen Anna. Anna stands with the Protestant rulers, openly opposing the match. At one point, she baldly states, “I am against the Match.” She ties her opposition to her commitment to Protestantism, contending that two people of different religions should not marry and supporting her case with scripture, quoting two passages which condemn Israelites who marry outside of their faith: “*Ezra. Ch. 9 [and] Nehem[iah]. Ch. 13.*” Moreover, she demonstrates an astute understanding of the political situation in Europe, clearly articulating the implications of a Spanish Match for the war in the Palatinate. James had been trying to negotiate the return of the Palatinate as part of the marriage contract, but Anna claims that the Spanish cannot be trusted because they disagree among themselves about the conditions of the match which will lead them to “promise his Majesty [James]” one thing,

---

154 John Reynolds, *Vox coeli, or, Nevves from heaven Of a consultation there held by the high and mighty princes, King Hen.8. King Edw.6. Prince Henry. Queene Mary, Queene Elizabeth, and Queene Anne; wherein Spaines ambition and treacheries to most kingdomes and free estates in Europe, are vnmasked and truly represented, but more particularly towards England, and now more especially under the pretended match of Prince Charles, with the Infanta Dona Maria. Whereunto is annexed two letters written by Queene Mary from heaven, the one to Count Gondomar, the ambassadour of Spaine, the other to all the Romane Catholiques of England* (London, 1624), I1v.

155 Ibid., H4r. Anna argues that “As Religion is the powerfullest passion of our Soule, so there is no stronger lincke of Friendship then Conscience, and therefore I hope my Sonne Charles will not consent to match the Infanta of Spain” (H4v).
but do “the contrary.” ¹⁵⁶ In short, in Reynold’s text, Anna emerges as a powerful and politically savvy Protestant queen, much as she had in Hannay’s vision of her. While Reynolds’ representation of Anna clearly needs to be studied in more detail, I raise it here to demonstrate the need for such work to be done, proposing a hitherto unexamined area of critical inquiry: the posthumous legacy of Anna of Denmark.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., G4v.
EPILOGUE

ALL ROADS LEAD TO CHARLES

Prince Charles has lurked in the shadows of this dissertation, occasionally making brief appearances.\(^1\) While representations of King Charles have garnered much attention, those of the prince have received little notice and, only recently, have come into the critical conversation through studies of the Spanish Match.\(^2\) Prior to the collapse of negotiations, Charles had attempted to woo the princess in person, travelling to Spain in disguise with George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham. From the beginning of his daring attempt to win the Infanta to his homecoming without her, printed works poured forth from the presses in Britain. Clare Wikeley has estimated that Charles’s triumphant return from Spain was the subject of at least twenty-five percent of all works printed in 1623.\(^3\) When he came back to Britain without a Catholic bride, the country erupted in celebrations that lasted for days. John Taylor, in *Prince Charles his vvelcome from Spaine*, records that on the day Charles arrived from Spain, “no shops were opened,” as

---


\(^3\) Clare Wikeley, “*Honour Conceal’d; Strangely Reveal’d*: The Fool and the Water-Poet,” in *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*, ed. Alexander Samson (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), 189. Indeed, Charles’s adventure continues to capture the imagination of writers, featuring in works such as Arturo Pérez-Reverte’s *El capitán Alatriste* (1996).
everyone took the day off to participate in the festivities:

The whole day being spent thus in mirth, triumphs, and thanksgivings,

wherein the people of all degrees, from the highest to the lowest, both rich

and poor in London, Westminster, and the Suburbs, to their powers

express their loves: that no so much but the four Elements, Fire, Water,

Aire, and Earth, seemed to applaud the celebration of this happy and

welcome day.⁴

Taylor reports that the British became almost hysterical in their happiness,

burning bonfires that cost one hundred pounds.⁵ He even claims that “two

Watermen at the Tower Wharfe burnt both their Boats in a Bonfire most

merrily.”⁶ Scholars have read the public’s reaction to Charles’s safe return from

Spain in light of Protestant rhetoric, arguing that the British took the opportunity

of the occasion to create for themselves a new Protestant hero: Charles. They

have, moreover, argued that these works were the defining moment in the creation

of Charles’s public image.⁷

The works printed on the occasion of the Spanish Match may have received the

most public attention, but they were not the only representations of Charles available.

⁴ John Taylor, Prince Charles his welcome from Spaine: who landed at Portsmouth on Sunday the fift of
October, and came safely to London on Munday the sxt of the same, 1623. With the triumphs of London for
the same his happy ariuall. And the relation of such townes as are situate in the wayes to take poste-horse
at, from the city of London to Douer: and from Calais through all France and Spaine, to Madrid, to the
Spanish court (London: G. E. for John Wright, 1623), B1v.

⁵ The pricey bonfire, Taylor writes, was “made at Guildhall in London . . . [and] cost one hundred pounds”
(B1v).

⁶ Ibid., C4r. This is, by far, the best ending of any occasional work I have read.

⁷ Jerzy Limon briefly discusses representations of Charles in these printed works in a larger examination of
how the plays in 1623-4 deal with the issue of the Spanish Match. See Dangerous Matter: English Drama
Nor were they the first to imagine him as a Protestant hero. Charles appears in the occasional works written for Henry’s funeral, the Palatine wedding, and Anna’s funeral. In his *Fvnerall Elegies vpon the most lamentable death of the thrice illustrious Prince Henrie, Prince of Wales*, Robert Allyne offers the standard lament for Henry, the champion of Protestantism, the prince who would have “throwne downe the walles of Rome.” However, he then imagines Charles not merely replacing Henry, but surpassing him: “*Henrie dy’d but to admit his better.*” Whereas Allyne sees Charles as his brother’s heir, Patrick Hannay pictures him as his mother’s. Offering a very different image of Charles in 1619, Hannay depicts him taking after Anna, who, in Hannay’s opinion, embodied peace and harmony.

This vision of the young Charles’s image as contested, ever-shifting, and always complicated crystallizes part of what this dissertation has tried to show to be true for all of the Stuarts: that their representations comprised a vast and complex mosaic which needs to be explored further by scholars. I have added some pieces to the picture and in the course of doing so have argued for the importance of considering the Stuarts in an international frame. While this dissertation has explicitly been about the Stuarts, it has also always implicitly been about occasional literature. I have hoped to demonstrate that occasional texts were not epideictic, but deeply engaged with their historical moment. Viewing occasions as opportunities, writers used the “now” to imagine what “might be.”

---

8 Allyne, A4r.

9 Ibid., A4v.
EDITIONS OF MANUSCRIPT SOURCES


Devon, Frederick, ed. *Issues of The Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out Of His Majesty's Revenue During The Reign of King James I*. London: John Rodwell, 1836.


Sawyer, Edmund, ed. *Memorials of Affairs of State In The Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (chiefly) from the Original Papers Of The Right Honourable Sir Ralph*
Winwood, Kt. Sometime 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 Principal Transactions of those Times Are faithfully related, and the Policies and Intrigues of those Courts at large discover’d. The whole digested in an exact Series of Time. To which are added Two Tables: One of the Letters, the other of the Principal Matter. Vol. 2. London: W.B. for T. Ward, 1725.


Walker, Patrick, ed. Letters to King James the Sixth from the Queen, Prince Henry, Prince Charles, the Princess Elizabeth and her husband Frederick King of Bohemia, and from their son Prince Frederick Henry. Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1835.

EARLY PRINTED SOURCES (TO 1700) AND LATER EDITIONS OF EARLY WORKS

Anon. The King of Denmarke's welcome: Containing his ariuall, abode, and entertainement, both in the Citie and other places. London: Edward Alde, 1606.


Anon. The Mariage of Prince Fredericke, and the Kings daughter, the Lady Elizabeth, zpon Shrouesunday last. With the showes on land and water, before, and after the wedding, as also the Maskes and Reuells in his Highnes Court, with the running at the Ring, by the Kings Maiestie, the Palsegraue, Prince Charles, and diuers others of the Nobilitie. Now The Second Time Imprinted, with many new additions, of the same triumphs, performed by the Gentlemen of the Innes of Court in the Kings Pallace of white Hall. London: Thomas Creede for William Barley to be sold by W. Wright, 1613.


Barlow, William. *An answer to a Catholike English-man (so by himselfe entitvled) who, without a name, passed his censure vpon the apology made by the Right High and Mightie Prince Iames by the grace of God King of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland &c. for the oath of allegiance: which censvre is heere examined and refvted / by the Bishop of Lincoln*. London: Thomas Haueland for Mathew Law, 1609.


-----. *A Large Examination Taken at Lambeth, according to his Maiesties direction, point by point, of M. George Blackwell, made Archpriest of England, by Pope Clement 8. Vpon occasion of a certaine answere of his, without the priuitie of the State, to a Letter lately sent vnto him for Cardinall Bellarmine, blaming him for taking the oath of Allegiance. Together with the Cardinals Letter, and M. Blackwels said answere vnto it.*


Butler, Charles. *The Feminine Monarchie Or A Treatise Concerning Bees, And The Dve Ordering Of Them Wherein The truth found out by experience and diligent observation, discovereth the idle and fondd conceipts, which many haue written anent this subiect*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1609.

Chapman, George. *An Epicede or Funerall Song: On the most disastrous Death, of the High-borne Prince of Men, Henry Prince of Wales, &c. With The Funeralls, and Representation of the Herse of the same High and mighty Prince; Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornewaile and Rothsay, Count Palatine of Chester, Earle of Carick, and late Knight of the most Noble Order of the Garter. Which Noble Prince deceased at St. James, the sixt day of November, 1612. And was most Princely interred the seuenth day of December following, within the Abbey of Westminster, in the Eighteenth yeere of his Age*. London: T. S. for John Budge, 1612.

-----. *The memorable maske of the two honorable houses or Innes of Court; the Middle Temple, and Lyncolns Inne*. London: George Eld for George Norton, 1613.


Coke, Roger. *A Detection Of The Court and State Of England During The Four Last Reigns And the Inter-Regnum. Consisting of Private Memoirs, &c. With Observations and Reflections. And An Appendix, discovering the present State of the Nation. Wherein are many Secrets never before made publick: As also, a more impartial Account of the
Civil Wars in England, than has yet been given. 2 vols. 3rd ed. London: Andrew Bell, 1696.

Daniel, Samuel. The order and solemnitie of the creation of the High and mightie Prince Henrie, eldest sonne to our sacred soueraigne, Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornewall, Earle of Chester, &c. as it was celebrated in Parliament House, on Munday the fourth of Junne last past. Together with the ceremonies of the Knights of the Bath, and other matters of speciell regard, incident to the same. Whereunto is annexed the royall maske, presented by the Queene and her ladies, on Wednesday at night following. London: William Stansby for John Budge, 1610.


-----.
The muses-teares for the losse of their hope; heroick and ne're-too-much praised, Henry, Prince of Wales. &c. Together with times sobs for the untimely death of his glory in that his darling: and, lastly, his epitaphs. Consecrated to the high and mighty prince, Frederick the fift, Count-palatine of Rheyn. &c. Wherevnto is added, consolatory straines to wrest nature from her bent in immoderate mourning; most loyally, and humbly wish't to the King and Queenses most excellent Maiesties. By John Davies of Hereford, their Maiesties poore beads-man, and vassall. London: George Eld for John Wright, 1613.

Donne, John. Pseudo-martyr Wherein out of certaine propositions and gradations, this conclusion is evicted. That those which are of the Romane religion in this kingdome, may and ought to take the Oath of allegiance. London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1610.

-----.

Drummond, William. The Works of William Drummond, of Hawthornden. Consisting of Those which were formerly Printed and Those which were design'd for the Press. Now published from the Author's Original Copies. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1711.

Ford, John. Honor Trivmphant. Or The Peeres Challenge, by Armes defensible, at Tilt, Turney, and Barriers. In Honor of all faire Ladies, and in defence of these foure positions following. 1. Knights in Ladies seruice haue no free-will. 2. Beauty is the maintainer of valour. 3. Faire Lady was neuer false. 4. Perfect Louers are onely wise. Mainteined by Arguments. Also The Monarches meeting: Or The King of Denmarkes welcome into England. London: Francis Burton, 1606.

Franchis, M. Ioannes Maria de. Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage: Betwixt, The High and Mightie Prince, Frederick; Covnt Palatine of Rheine, chiefe Sewer to the sacred Roman Empire, Prince Elector, and Duke of Bavaria, &c. And The most Illustrious Princesse, the Ladie Elizabeth her Grace, sole Daughter to the high and mightie James,


-----, trans. Anti-Coton, or A refutation of Cottons letter declaratorie: lately directed to the Queene Regent, for the apologizing of the Iesuites doctrine, touching the killing of kings A booke, in which it is proued that the Iesuites are guiltie, and were the authors of the late execrable parricide, committed vpon the person of the French King, Henry the fourth, of happy memorie. To which is added, a supplication of the Vniuersitie of Paris, for the preuentung of the Iesuites opening their schooles among them: in which their king-killing doctrine is also notably discouered, and confuted. Both translated out of the French, by G.H. Together with the translators animaduersions vpon Cottons letter. London: Thomas Snodham for Richard Boyle, 1611.

Hall, Joseph. The peace of Rome Proclaimed to all the world, by her famous Cardinall Bellarmine, and the no lesse famous casuist Nauarre. Whereof the one acknowledgeth, and numbers vp aboue three hundred differences of opinion, maintained in the popish church. The other confesses neere three score differences amongst their owne doctors in one onely point of their religion. Gathered faithfully out of their writings in their own words, and diuided into foure bookees, and those into severall decades. Whereto is prefixed a serious disswasiue from poperie. London: John Windet for John Legate, 1609.


-----, A happy husband or, Directions for a maide to choose her mate As also, a wiues behauiour towards her husband after marriage. By Patricke Hannay, Gent. To which is adioyned the Good wife, together with an exquisite discourse of epitaphs, including the choysest thereof, ancient or moderne. By R.B. Gent. London: John Beale for Richard Redmer, 1619.


Haydone, William. *The true picture and relation of Prince Henry his noble and vertuous disposition containing certaine observations and proofes of his towardly and notable inclination to vertue, of the pregnancie of his wit, farre above his age, comprehended in sundry of his witty and pleasant speaches. By W.H. With the true relation of the sicknesse and death of the same most illustrious prince, vwith the opening of his body. Written by a famous doctor of physick in French, and newly translated into English*. Leyden: William Christian, 1634.


-----. *A Marriage Trivmphe Solemnized In An Ephithalamivm, In Memorie of the happie Nuptials betwixt the High and Mightie Prince Count Palatine. And the most Excellent Princesse the Lady Elizabeth*. London: Edward Merchant, 1613.


Jewel, John. *The second tome of homilees of such matters as were promised, and intituled in the former part of homilees. Set out by the aucthoritie of the Queenes Maiestie: and to be read in every parishe church agreeably.* London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, printers to the Queenes Maiestie, 1571.


Marcelline, George. *The Triumphs of King Iames the First, Of Great Brittaine, France, and Ireland, King; Defender of the Faith. Published vpon his Maiesties aduertisement to all the Kings, Princes, and Potentates of Christendome, and confirmed by the wonderfull Workes of God, declared in his life. Deuoted, Dedicated, and Consecrated to the most excellent Prince Henry, Prince of Wales.* London: John Budge, 1610.


-----. *Epithalamium Gallo-Britannicum or, Great-Britaines, Frances, and the most parts of Europes vnspeakable ioy, for the most happy vnion, and blessed contract of the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales, and the Lady Henrette Maria, daughter to Henry the fourth, sirnamed the Great, late King of the French and Nauarre, and sister to Levvis the thirteenth: now king of the said dominions. Manifesting the royall ancestors and famous progenitors of the mighty Prince Charles, and the most illustrious princesse, the Lady Henrette, explaining the sweete interchanges of marriages, as haue beene betweene France and Great Britain.* London: Eliot’s Court Press for Thomas Archer, 1625.

Maxwell, James. *A Monvment of Remembrance, Erected in Albion, in Honor of the Magnificent Departvre from Britannie, and honorable receiuing in Germany, namely at Heidelberge, of the two most NOble Princes Fredericke, First Prince of the Imperiall bloud, sprung from glorious Charlemaigne, Count Palatine of Rhine, Duke of Bavier, Elector and Arch-sewer of the holy Romane Empire, and Knight of the Renowned order of the Garter & Elizabeth Infanta of Albion, Princesse Palatine, and Dutchesse of Bavier,
the onely Daughter of our most gratious and Soueraigne Lord Charles-Iames, and of his most Noble and vertuous Wife, Queene Anne. Both of them being almost the one and the same degree of lineall descent from 25 Emperours of the East and West, of Romanes, Greekes, and Germans, and from 30 Kings of Diuers countries. London: Nicholas Okes for Henry Bell, 1613.


-----. Carolanna, that is to say, A poeme in honour of our King, Charles Iames, Queene Anne, and Prince Charles but principally in honour of the immortall memory of our late noble & good Queen of Albion and Vnion, herein celebrated vnder the names of Dianna and Cimbrina, by allusion vnto her princely name and nation. Begun to be penned on her fatall day of Mars the second of March last; ended on the octaue, the next Mars day: and now published to summon all rankes and degrees in Christendome, especially in the northern kingdomes, of Britannie, Denmark, & Germanie, to celebrate her anniuersarie on the next second day of March, and to applaud her third coronation to be in heauen, at the next festiuall time of S. Iames, and S. Anne, and all Britanes to solemnize the memoriall theref on S. Annes day every yeare for ever. By James Anne-Son antiquarie and Maister of Arts. London: Edward Alld, 1619.

Morton, Thomas. The encounter against M. Parsons, by a review of his last sober reckoning, and his exceptions urged in the treatise of his mitigation. Wherein moreover is inserted: 1. A confession of some Romanists, both concerning the particular falsifications of principall Romanists, as namely, Bellarmine, Suarez, and others: as also concerning the generall fraude of that curch, in corrupting of authors. 2. A confutation of slaunders, which Bellarmine urged against Protestants. 3. A performance of the challenge, which Mr. Parsons made, for the examining of sixtie Fathers, cited by Coccius for proofe of Purgatorie ... 4. A censure of a late pamphlet, intituled, The patterne of a Protestant, by one once termed the moderate answerer. 5. An handling of his question of mentall equiuocation (after his boldnesse with the L. Cooke) vpon occasion of the most memorable, and feyned Yorkshire case of equiuocating; and of his raging against D. Kings sermon. London: William Stansby for John Bill, 1610.


Valentines day. With the Instalment of the sayd potent Prince Fredericke at Windsore, the 7. of Februarie aforesaid. London: Henry Robertes to be sold by Thomas Pavier, 1613.

Ovid. Ouids Metamorphosis Translated Grammatically, and also according to the propriety of our English tongue, so farre as Grammar and the verse will well beare. Written chiefly for the good of Schoole, to be used according to the directions in the Preface to the painefull Schoole-master, and more fully in the booke called Ludus Literarius, or the Grammar-schoole. London: Humfrey Lownes for Thomas Man, 1618.

Owen, Thomas. A letter of a Catholike man beyond the seas, written to his friend in England including another of Peter Coton priest, of the Society of Iesus, to the Queene Regent of France / translated out of French into English; touching the imputation of the death of Henry the IIII, late K. of France, to priests, Iesuites, or Catholicke doctrine. Saint Omer: English College Press, 1610.

Parsons, Robert. The judgment of a Catholicke English-man, living in banishment for his religion Written to his priuate friend in England. Concerninge a late booke set forth, and entituled: Tripli nodo, triplex cuneus, or, An apology for the oath of allegiance. Against two breves of Pope Paulus V. to the Catholickes of England; & a letter of Cardinall Bellarmine to M. George Blackwell, Arch-priest. Wherein, the said oath is shewed to be vnlawfull vnto a Catholicke conscience; for so much, as it conteyneth sundry clauses repugnant to his religion. Saint Omer: English College Press, 1608.


Peacham, Henry. Minerua Britanna or A garden of heroical deuises furnished, and adorned with emblemes and impresa's of sundry natures, newly devised, moralized, and published, by Henry Peacham, Mr. of Artes. London: Wa. Dight, 1612.

----- The period of mourning Disposed into sixe visions. In memorie of the late prince. Together with nuptiall hymnes, in honour of this happy marriage betweene the great princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhene, and the most excellent, and abundaut president of all virtue and goodnes Elizabeth onely daughter to our soueraigne, his Maistie. Also the manner of the solemnization of the marriage at White-Hall, on the 14. of February, being Sunday, and St. Valentines day. By Henry Peacham, Mr. of Artes. London: Thomas Snodham for John Helme, 1613.

----- A Most Trve Relation Of the Affaires Of Cleve And Gylick, As also Of all what hath passed this last summer, since the most Excellent and Victorious Prince, Mavrice of Nassav, toke the field with his Armie, encamping before Rees in Cleveland: and the losse of Wesel, taken in by the Marques Spinola. Vnto the breaking vp of our Armie in the

-----. Prince Henrie revived. Or A Poeme Vpon The Birth, And In Honor of the Hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick, First Sonne and Heire apparent to the most Excellent Princes, Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine, And the Mirrour of Ladies, Princesse Elizabeth, his Wife, onely daughter to our Soueraigne James King of Great Britaine. London: W. Stansby for John Helme, 1615.

Plaix, César de. The protestants and Iesuites vp in armes in Gulicke-land Also, a true and wonderfull relation of a Dutch maiden (called Eue Fliegen of Meurs in the county of Meurs) who being now (this present yeare) 36 yeares of age, hath fasted for the space of 14 yeares, confirmed by the testimony of persons, both honourable and worshipfull, (as well English, as Dutch. Truely translated according to the Dutch coppy. Translated by T. Wood. London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Bourne, 1611.


Reynolds, John. Votivae Angliae: or The desires and vvishes of England Contayned in a pathetickall discourse, presented to the King on New-yeares Day last. Wherein are vnfolded and represented, manie strong reasons, and true and solide motives, to perswade his Majestie to drawe his royall sword, for the restoring of the Pallatynat, and Electorat, to his sonne in lawe Prince Fredericke, to his onlie daughter the Ladie Elizabeth, and theyr princelie issue. Against the treacherous vsurpation, and formidable ambition and power of the Emperour, the King of Spayne, and the Duke of Bavaria, whose unjustlie possesse and detayne the same. Together with some aphorismes returned (with a large interest) to the Pope in answer of his. Utrecht, 1624.

Richer, Edmund. A treatise of ecclesiasticall and politike powver Shewing, the church is a monarchicall gouernment, ordainèd to a supernaturall and spirituall end, tempered with an aristocraticall order, (which is the best of all and most conformable to nature) by the great pastor of soules Iesus Christ. Faithfully translated out of the Latin originall, of late publikely printed and allowed in Paris. Now set fourth for a further warrant and encouragement to the Romish Catholikes of England, for theyr taking of the Oath of Allegiance; seeing so many others of their owne profession in other countries doe deny the Popes infalibility in indgement and temporall power ouer princes, directly against the
Robarts, Henry. *A most friendly farewell*, Given by a wellwiller to the right worshipful, Sir Frauncis Drake knight, Generall of her Maiesties Naue, which be appointed for this his honorable voyage, and the rest of the fleete bound to the Southward, and to all the Gentlemen his followers, and captains in this exploite, who set sale from Wolwich the xv. day of Iuly, 1585. London: T. East for Walter Mantell and Thomas Lawe, 1585.

-----. *A prayer for assistance against the Armada*. London: Edward Allde for Hency Car, 1588.

-----. *Fames Trumpet soundinge*. Or commemorations of the famous liues and deathes, of the two right honourable Knights of England: the right honourable Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Martin Calthrop, Lord Mayor of this honorable City of London, who deceased this yeere 1589. Not only necessary to bee seene, but also to be followed of euery worthy personage in their callings. London: J. Charlewood for Thomas Hacket, 1589.

-----. *Ovr Ladys Retorne to England*, accompanied with saint Frances and the good Iesus of Viana in Portugall, who coming from Brasell, arriued at Cluvelly in Deuonshire, the third of Iune 1592. A wonder of the Lorde most admirable, to note how many Spanish saintes are enforced to come one pilgrimage for Englande. With the most happie fortune of that braue gentill-man William Grassene Citizen of London, Captaine and oner of our Ladies. London: Abel Jeffes to be sold by William Parlye, 1592.

-----. *Lancaster his allarums, honorable assaultes, and suprising of the block-houses and store-houses belonging to Fernand Bucke in Brasill* With his braue attempt in landing in the mouth of the ordinance there, which were cannons culuering, cannon periall and sacres of brasse, with other sundry his most resolute and braue attempts in that country. From whence he laded of their spoyles and rich commodities he there found fiftenee good ships, which was sinemon, sugar, pepper, cloues, mace, calloco-cloth and brassel-wood with other commodities. With the names of such men of worth hauing charge within this most honorable attempt lost their liues. Published for their eternall honor: by a vvelvillier. London: Abel Jeffes for William Barley, 1595.

-----. *The Most royall and Honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, Christiern the fourth, King of Denmarke, &c. who with a Fleete of gallant ships, arriued on Thursday the 16. day of Iuly 1606 in Tylbery-Hope, neere Grauesend. With a relation of his meeting, by our royall King, the Prince and Nobles of our realme: the pleasures sundry times shewed, for his gracious welcome, and most famous and admirable entertainment at Theobalds. With the royall passage of Thursday the 31 of Iuly, thorough the City of London, and honorable shewes there presented them, and maner of their passing*. London: Henry Robarts to be sold by William Barley, 1606.

-----. *Englands Farevvell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke: With a relation of such shewes & seuerall pastimes presented to his Maiestie, as well at Court*
the fift day of August past, as in other places since his Honorable passage thorow the Citie of London. The most Honorable Entertainement of his Highnesse, aboord his Maiesties Ships in the roade of Gyllingause, neere the Citie of Rochester in Kent. With the Kings Entertainement aboord the Denmarke Ships, at Grauesend: As also their Honorable leaue-taking and farewell, Setting Sayle from Grauesend on Munday night, the eleuenth of August, 1606. London: William Welby, 1606.

Roberts, Thomas, of Tewkesbury. *Gloucsters Myte, Delivered With the mourneful Records of Great Britaine, into the Worlds Register. For the inrolement of the everlasting Fame and perpetually remembrance of our late most gratious Prince Henrie. With Motiues Repentance. The materiall points touched, appeare in the next Page.* London: William Hall for Jonas Man, 1612.

Sheldon, Richard. *Certain general reasons, prouing the lawfulness of the Oath of allegiance, written by R. S. priest, to his priuat friend. Whereunto is added, the treatise of that learned man, M. William Barclay, concerning the temporall power of the pope. And with these is ioyned the sermon of M. Theophilus Higgons, preached at Pauls Crosse the third of March last, because it containeth something of like argument.* London: Felix Kyngston for William Aspley, 1611.


Stuart, James, King of Scotland and England. *A Proclamation for the due execution of all former Lawes against Recusants, giuing them a day to repaire to their owne dwellings, and not afterwards to come to Court . . . And for the ministering of the Oath of Allegiance, according to the Law.* London: Robert Barker, 1610.

-----. *A Proclamation, whereby it is commanded, That the Oath of Allegiance be administered according to the Lawes.* London: Robert Barker, 1611.


Taylor, Augustine. *Epithalamium Vpon the All-Desired Nyptials of Frederike the fift, Prince Palatine of Rhene, chiefe Elector, Duke of Bauier, and Arch-Sewer to the Romane Empire. And Elizabeth, The onely daughter of Iames, by the Grace of God, King of great
Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. London: for Samuel Rand to be sold by Edward Marchant, 1613.

Taylor, John. Heauens Blessing, and Earths Joy. Or A true relation, of the supposed Sea-fights & Fire-workes, as were accomplished, before the Royall Celebration, of the al-beloved Mariage, of the two peerlesse Paragons of Christendome, Fredericke & Elizabeth. London: Joseph Hunt, 1613.

Thornborough, John. A Discovrse Plainely Proving the euident vtilitie and vrgent necessitie of the desired happie Vnion of the two famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland: by way of answer to certain obiections against the same. London: Richard Field for Thomas Chard, 1604.


Tourval, Jean l'Oiseau de. The French Herald Symmoning All Trve Christian Princes to a generall Croisade, for a holy warr against the great Enemy of Christendome, and all his slaues. Vpon the Occasion of the most execrable murther of Henry the grat. To the Prince. London: Edward Allde for Mathew Lownes, 1611.

-----. Three Preciovs Teares of Blood, Flowing from the wounded harts of three great French Ladies. In Memory, of the Vertues, complaint of the losse, and execration of the murther, of that thrice-worthy Monarch, Henry the Great. Now shed againe in English. To three of the most excellent among the excellentest Ladies of this little world, and of the greatest. London: John Budgge, 1611.

Tynley, Robert. Two Learned Sermons. The one, of the mischieuous subtilltie, and barbarous crueltie, the other of the false Doctrines, and refined Heresis of the Romish Synagogue. Preached, the one at Paules Crosse the 5. of Nouember, 1608. The other at the Spittle the 17. of Aprill, 1609. In the first, are examined diuers passages of that lewde English Libell, written by a Prophane Fugitiue, against the Apologie for the Oath of Allegeance. In the second, are answered many of the arguments published by Rob. Chambers Priest, concerning Popish Fugitiue, against the Apologie for the Oath of Allegeance. London: William Hall for Thomas Adams, 1609.

Warmington, William. A moderate defence of the Oath of Allegiance wherein the author proueth the said Oath to be most lawful, notwithstanding the Popes breues prohibiting the same; and solueth the chiefest obiections that are usually made against it; perswading the Catholickes not to resist souerainge authoritie in refusing it. Together with the oration of Sixtus 5. in the Consistory at Rome, vpon the murther of Henrie 3. the French King by a friar. Whereunto also is annexed strange reports or newes from Rome.


-----. *Epithalamia: or Nuptiall Poems vpon the Most Blessed and Happie Mariage Betweene the High and Mightie Prince Frederick the fifth, Count Palatine of the Rhein, Duke of Bauier, &c. and the Most Vertvovs, Graciovs and Thrice Excellent Princesse, Elizabeth, Sole Daughter to our dread Soueraigne, James by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, defender of the Faith, &c. Celebrated at Whitehall the fourteenth of Februarie 1612*. London: Edward Marchant, 1613.

Wood, T., trans. *The protestants and Iesuites vp in armes in Gulicke-land Also, a true and wonderfull relation of a Dutch maiden (called Eue Fliegen of Meurs in the county of Meurs) who being now (this present yeare) 36 yeares of age, hath fasted for the space of 14 yeares, confirmed by the testimony of persons, both honourable and worshipfull, (as well English, as Dutch. Truely translated according to the Dutch coppy*. London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Bourne, 1611.

LATER PRINTED SOURCES


-----, “Howard [married names Devereux, Carr], Frances, countess of Somerset.” *DNB*. Vol. 28. 343-5.


-----.

-----.

-----.

-----.

-----.

-----.

-----.

-----.


Horden, John. “Peacham, Henry (b. 1578, d. in or after 1644), writer and illustrator.” *DNB*. Vol. 43. 236-8.


Moore, Helen. “Roberts [Robarts], Henry.” *DNB*. Vol. 47. 166.


-----, “Brooke, Christopher.” DNB. Vol. 7. 879-80.


-----. *Triumphus nuptialis danicus: German court culture and Denmark: the “great wedding” of 1634*. Wiesbaden: Harrossowitz, 1996.


-----.


-----.


-----.

## Appendix A: Celebrations at the Christening of Friedrich in Württemberg (1616)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 10</th>
<th>March 11</th>
<th>March 12</th>
<th>March 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christening</td>
<td>Running-at-the-Ring, first day</td>
<td>Entries of: Lewis-Frederic, Magnus, Hohenloe as the three English Ladies</td>
<td>Entries of: Württemberg, Lewis-Frederic, and Earl of Hohenloe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Entries of: Württemberg as Priam</td>
<td>Württemberg’s Gentlemen of the Chamber as Knights of white and red united rose</td>
<td>Palatine as Harminius, leading Ancient German Warriors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Companies of Musicians (English, French, Italian) Perform</td>
<td>Palatine as Scipio</td>
<td>Buwinkhausen as Lasla Janush</td>
<td>Frederic as a French Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priam issues a challenge</td>
<td>Baden as Germany</td>
<td>Buwinkhausen as Aymon</td>
<td>Magnus as Myrina, Queen of Amazons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masque</td>
<td>Lewis-Frederic as Lucidor</td>
<td>Buwinkhausen as Lasla Janush</td>
<td>Frederic-Achilles as a member of the younger German gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geitzkofler as Queay Lurent Ise, Regent of Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Footfight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 14</th>
<th>March 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mock Tournament</td>
<td>Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Awards</td>
<td>Gift Exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: CHRISTIAN IV’S STATE VISIT (1606)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 17 (Thursday)</td>
<td>Christian arrives at Tilbury and proceeds up the Thames to Gravesend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18 (Friday)</td>
<td>James, Henry, and an assortment of nobles meet Christian. They travel to Greenwich together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19 (Saturday)</td>
<td>James, Christian, and diverse nobles ride to Eltham Park to hunt and kill bucks after which they dine at Greenwich. After dinner, Christian watches several sets of a tennis match between a French gentleman and Webbe, an English gentleman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20 (Sunday)</td>
<td>The Danes and Britons go to church together and return for a sumptuous feast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21 (Monday)</td>
<td>James and Christian hunt at Greenwich Park and dine at the White Tower on top of the hill in the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>James and Christian hunt at Eltham, then feast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>James and Christian hunt at Eltham, then feast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24 (Thursday)</td>
<td>James and Christian progress to Theobalds where shows and devices are presented to them. <em>The Entertainment of the Two Kings at Theobalds</em> (Ben Jonson) <em>Masque of Solomon and Queen Sheba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25 (Friday)</td>
<td>James and Christian hunt stag at Waltham Forrest, then return for private mirth and feasting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27 (Sunday)</td>
<td>They honor the Sabbath, resting and hearing sermons. The Earl of Salisbury doubles the feast, pomp and bounty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28 (Monday)</td>
<td>James and Christian depart in great state and gallantry from Theobalds and return to Greenwich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>James and Christian spend the day hunting and feasting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>The Children of Pauls perform a play called <em>Abuses</em>, containing both a comedy and a tragedy, delighting the kings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1 (Friday)</td>
<td>Christian has a private tour of London, visiting St. Pauls, Royal Exchange, Tower, Ordinance, Wardrobe, and Mint where he sees James’s menagerie of exotic animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2 (Saturday)</td>
<td>James and Christian hunt at Maribone and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7 (Thursday)</td>
<td>James and Christian travel to Windsor and install Christian as a Knight of the Garter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8 (Friday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
then, Hyde Park. They then return to Whitehall, after which they depart for Greenwich.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 3 (Sunday)</th>
<th>August 9 (Saturday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna is churched. The two kings are present and hear a learned sermon.</td>
<td>Christian prepares to leave. They travel to Rochester where Christian meets the mayor of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The court spends the day feasting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 4 (Monday)</th>
<th>August 10 (Sunday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian and James run at the ring in the tiltyard at Greenwich.</td>
<td>James and Christian go to Cathedral Church and hear a sermon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 5 (Tuesday)</th>
<th>August 11 (Monday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gowry celebrations, including tilting, bull and bear-baiting, wrestling, exercises of force, and fireworks. Christian runs at the tilt and earn accolades for his performance.</td>
<td>James and Christian travel to Gravesend. Christian puts on a fireworks display, showing the victory of the lion over the seven deadly sins. Christian and the Danes depart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 6 (Wednesday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the Masters of Defense display their skills in tiltyard. James shows Christian Richmond and Hampton Court.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: TEXTS ON CHRISTIAN IV’S VISIT IN THE STATIONERS’ REGISTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 July 1606</td>
<td>Francis Burton</td>
<td><em>Honor triumphant or the peers Challenge by Arms to be defended against all Comers &amp;c. Also the Monarchies meeting or the king of Denmark’s welcome into England</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 1606</td>
<td>Nathaniel Butter</td>
<td><em>Great Britain’s Kind Welcome to her Dear brethren the Danes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 1606</td>
<td>Master Bill</td>
<td><em>CAESARIS superscription, siue Conciuncula, Coram Duobus Potentissimus Regibus JACOBO Britanoe et CHRISTIANO Daniae A Doctore Thomae Playfero</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July 1606</td>
<td>Henry Roberts</td>
<td><em>the King of Denmark’s entertainment at Tilbery Hope by the king</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August 1606</td>
<td>Edward Alde</td>
<td><em>The King of Denmark’s welcome into England</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 1606</td>
<td>William Welby</td>
<td><em>England’s farewell to Christian the Fourth king of Denmark With a Relation of such shows and several pastimes presented to his Majesty, as well at Courte the first of August as in other places since his honorable passage through the City of London</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D: TEXTS ON THE DEATH OF PRINCE HENRY IN THE STATIONERS’ REGISTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 November 1612</td>
<td>Henry Gosson</td>
<td>A Poem called, <em>Great Brittanys greatest woe or an Elegiacall lamenting Poem for the Incomparable losse of losses of Henry our late hopefull Prince</em> by John Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November 1612</td>
<td>Humfreye Lownes, Junior</td>
<td>A Booke called <em>Lachrymae Domesticae. A viall of houshould teares shedd ouer prynce Henryes hearse</em> by his highnes first worst Poett and pencioner Josua Sylvester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Arthur Johnson</td>
<td>A booke called <em>great Bryttaynes moarninge garment given to all faythfull sorowfull subiectes at the death of Prynce Henry</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Jackson</td>
<td>A booke called <em>Lamentacons for the death of the late Illustrious prince and the dissolucon of his religious family</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Jackson</td>
<td>Two sermons preached in his Highnes Chappell at Saincte James on the 10th and 15th of Nouember the first twesday and sunday after his decease by Danyell Price Chaplen then in Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 1612</td>
<td>John Budge</td>
<td>A booke called, the obsequies and funeralles of the highe and mightie Prynce Henry. prince of Wales &amp;c Who deceased the. 6. Day of noouerber 1612 and Was pryncelie entered in the Abbaie of Westminster, the. 6. day of December folowinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 1612</td>
<td>William Barley</td>
<td>A ballad called, <em>A farwell to Prince Henry or his funerall teares shedd by his Country for his lyues deare losse &amp;c</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December 1612</td>
<td>Henry Les</td>
<td>A ballad called <em>Englandes sorowe for the deathe of the Most Vertuous and pierles Henry Ffriderick prince of Wales eldest son to our souereign lord kinge James. Who Deceased the 6 of December 1612 at Sainct James house</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December 1612</td>
<td>William Barley</td>
<td>A ballad called, <em>A Complaynt against Death for taking away the highe and hopeful Prince Henry of great Brittayne with the manner of his funeral</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 1612</td>
<td>John Budge</td>
<td>A booke called <em>An Epiced or funerall songe on the most Desastraous Deathe of the highe borne prince of men Henry Prince of Wales by George Chapman</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Pavier</td>
<td>A ballad called <em>the first and second parte of the Lyfe and deathe of the late noble prince Henry, with the order of his funerall</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 1612</td>
<td>Richard Redmer</td>
<td>A booke called <em>Epicedium or the three sisters teares for the Death of the late Royall Deceased Henry prince of Wales &amp;c together with the order of his highnes funerall</em>. By R.N. Oxon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 1612</td>
<td>John Wright</td>
<td>A booke called <em>the muses teares for the Losse of year hope, heroic and never too much praised Henry prince of Wales</em> by John Davies of Hereford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 1612</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>a booke called <em>Oratio funebris in honore Henrici excellentissimi Wallie principis proprium atque intimam eius effigie preferens, bonisque omnibus et domesticis et externis honoris ergo dicata, Authore Leonella Sharop sacre theologie professore</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Pavier</td>
<td>A ballad called <em>A lamentacon for ye Death of prince Henry</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 December 1612</td>
<td>Francis Burton</td>
<td>A booke called <em>prynce Henryes obsequies, or mournfull elegies vppon his Death</em> by A.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 December 1612</td>
<td>Master Welby</td>
<td>A booke called <em>funerall elegies vpon the death of prince Henry</em> by Cirill Turnour, John Webster, Thomas Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 1613</td>
<td>John Helme</td>
<td>A booke called <em>The period of Mourninge</em> by Henry Pecham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: The Palatine Wedding Celebrations in London (1613)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 27</td>
<td>Frederick and Elizabeth plight their troth in the Banqueting House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Wedding Ceremony&lt;br&gt;Thomas Campion’s <em>Lords’ Masque</em> at the Banqueting Hall in Whitehall&lt;br&gt;(Chamberlain says it was performed in the bancketting roome; in the old banqueting house)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>Frederick is formally installed as a Knight of the Garter at Windsor&lt;br&gt;Running at the Ring in the Tiltyard at Whitehall&lt;br&gt;George Chapman’s <em>The Memorable Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln’s Inn</em> (presented in the hall at court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>Court returns to London from Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11</td>
<td>Fireworks on the Thames&lt;br&gt;St. George saves Lucida, Queen of the Amazons, from the evil necromancer Mango&lt;br&gt;St. George battles a dragon&lt;br&gt;Hunting hounds chase a hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>Sea battle on the Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>Francis Beaumont’s <em>The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray’s Inn</em>&lt;br&gt;(Francis Beaumont); performed in the new Banqueting House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>Banquet for lords and ladies as well as chief participants in wedding masques (in a new Banqueting House, a separate wooden structure erected on the empty space of the terrace adjoining the stone Banqueting House, and decorated with Armada tapestries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 January 1613</td>
<td>Henry Gosson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February 1613</td>
<td>Master Welby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 1613</td>
<td>Henry Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 1613</td>
<td>John Trundell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 February 1613</td>
<td>William Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 February 1613</td>
<td>Edward White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 1613</td>
<td>George Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 1613</td>
<td>Raphe Blower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 1613</td>
<td>Henry Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 1613</td>
<td>John Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May 1613</td>
<td>Mistress White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 1613</td>
<td>Master Elde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 1613</td>
<td>Nathaniel Butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 1613</td>
<td>Master Welby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 1614</td>
<td>John Bill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX G: TEXTS ON ANNA’S DEATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Thane</td>
<td><em>The Scala Coeli of the Gracious Queen Anne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hannay</td>
<td>Nicholas Okes</td>
<td><em>Two Elegies On the late death of our Soueraigne Queene Anne with Epitaphes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maxwell</td>
<td>Edward Allde</td>
<td><em>Carolanna, That is to say, A Poem in Honor of Our King, Charles-James, Queen Anne, and Prince Charles, but principally in honor of the immortal memory of our late noble and good Queen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>Johannes Lichfield &amp; Jacobus Short</td>
<td><em>Academiae Oxoniensis Vynebria Sacra. Æternae Memoriae Serenissimaæ Reginæ ANNÆ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Slatyer</td>
<td>John Beale</td>
<td><em>ΘΡΗΩΔΙΑ . . . Elegies and Epitaphs [in honor of Queen Anne]</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>